



**TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**  
**Seventh Regular Session**  
28 September - 4 October 2011  
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

---

**PROPOSED STREAMLINED PART 2 ANNUAL REPORT**

---

**WCPFC-TCC7-2011/19**  
**2 September 2011**

**Paper prepared by the Secretariat**

**ISSUES:**

**Reporting Template**

- The Annual Report Part 2 (Part 2) template has continued to evolve from year to year, in line with the increase in CCM's responsibilities and obligations in the Commission. The increase in reporting requirements has created significant burden on some CCM's ability to keep up with both reporting deadlines and obligations, which has impacted the Commission's ability to accurately assess compliance. WCPFC7's adoption of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2010-03) has further highlighted the need for streamlining of the Part 2 reporting template, which remains an important tool for measuring compliance, but due to the current format, has become less effective over time.

**Reporting Deadline**

- The Part 2 reports are currently due 30 days prior to the annual TCC. This short time frame before TCC makes it almost impossible for the Secretariat to fulfill its reporting obligations required by CMM 2010-03, in time for review by the TCC. The Part 2 reports cover activities for the prior calendar year and hence, submission further in advance of the annual TCC is possible. An earlier deadline for Part 2 reporting would provide the Secretariat with the necessary time to compile data in support of the work of TCC.

**Funding for the Enhancement of IMS to Include Part 2 Reporting and Completion of Compliance Monitoring Reports**

- WCPFC7 discussed the option of further enhancing the capability of the Secretariat's Information Management System (IMS) to accommodate Part 2 reporting. In the intercessional period since WCPFC7, the Secretariat has

undertaken a thorough review of the Part 2 template and its incorporation into the IMS. The revised Draft template has been designed to accommodate its integration into the IMS, while also maintaining its ability to serve as a “stand-alone”, manual report.

- The implementation of the Commission’s Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2010-03) and the development of a Compliance Monitoring Report should be incorporated into the IMS and funding will be required to complete this task.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **TCC7 is invited to:**

- Consider the two versions of the revised draft streamlined Part 2 reporting format at **Attachment B**;
- Recommend the appropriate reporting format to be used for reporting in 2012 on 2011 activities;
- Advance deadline for submission of Part 2 reports to match deadline for reporting of scientific data (April 30);
- Recommend funding of US\$35,000 for the two-phase incorporation of Part 2 reporting and completion of the Compliance Monitoring Report into the IMS.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Reporting Template**

1. A small working group convened during TCC6 and developed a set of criteria for the Secretariat to follow when streamlining the Part 2 reporting template, better incorporating it into its information management system, and making the information available to CCMs. These include:
  - Cost effectiveness for CCMs and the Commission
  - A clear role for the Secretariat
  - Basing the reporting on fisheries management needs and priorities
  - A reporting format that is flexible and relevant to individual CCMs, while retaining consistency
  - Efficiency – avoiding duplication and repetition
  - Transparency (noting relevant data confidentiality rules)
  - Allows for effective monitoring of compliance with measures
2. In addition to those points noted in the TCC6 and WCPFC7 reports, the Secretariat was further guided by the following general principles:
  - CCMs are responsible for reporting in accordance with CMMs;

- If reports are already provided to the Commission, its service providers or available from MCS tools of the Commission, e.g., VMS, ROP, HSB&I, RFV, etc, then the requirement to report them in Part 2 is redundant. It is incumbent on the Secretariat to report on information received. Information not received remains open to CCM's queries;
  - Information reported in Part 2 that gives no added value to the compliance picture or is ambiguous, is not required to be reported and can be assessed in its absence.
3. CMM 2010-03 requires the Secretariat to complete a Draft Compliance Monitoring Report (Draft Report) for review by the TCC, comprised of sections relevant to each CCM as well as a summary of each CCM's compliance. The TCC then adopts a Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (Provisional Report) for review by the Commission. After considering the Provisional Report recommended by the TCC, the Commission adopts a Compliance Monitoring Report. The first step of this process requires the Secretariat to compile all data submitted by each CCM and complete an individual Draft Report, as well as a summary, for review by TCC. The information reported in Parts 1 and 2, along with information submitted to the SPC as the Commission's Science Provider, or in some circumstances to the Executive Director, all contribute to the development of the Draft Report. In addition, some data is readily available to the Secretariat through its regular monitoring and collection of data throughout the year, e.g. data collected through VMS, RFV and HSB&I programs.
  4. This year marks the first year for implementation of CMM 2010-03 and the Secretariat's compilation of Draft Reports. In carrying out this exercise, the Secretariat has identified a number of reporting requirements that are duplicated, which has assisted in the streamlining exercise of the Part 2 template. A detailed analysis of the existing Part 2 reporting requirements is at **Attachment A**.
  5. **Attachment B** contains the following two revised draft Part 2 template formats:
    - Version 1 – revised reporting format for eventual incorporation into IMS
    - Version 2 – revised reporting format consistent with existing format
  6. Both versions of the revised draft Part 2 reporting template reflect information and reporting requirements that are currently unobtainable from other reporting or information sources in the Commission. The format of Version 1 is designed in a "yes/no" manner and can easily be incorporated into a web-based system from which the Secretariat could access information to complete the Draft Reports for each CCM. It can also easily be maintained as a manual report, to be submitted as an email attachment. Version 2 is a modification of the existing Part 2 format and would continue to be submitted as an email attachment. Version 2 would not be as easily incorporated into the IMS in its current form.

7. It should be noted that the number of reporting paragraphs that have been slated for deletion from the Part 2 report does not mean that the information is not required or does not need to be reported. It simply means that those types of information are either already reported elsewhere or is collected in other ways and does not have to be provided through the Part 2 report. In addition, a number of CMMs specify reporting that has to take place through the Part 2 report and some of those may need to be amended if such reporting occurs elsewhere or information is collected in other ways.

### **Reporting Deadline**

8. The Compliance Monitoring Report has the potential to contribute significantly to the Commission's work and the Secretariat's ability to complete the first Draft Report for each CCM relies heavily on each CCM's compliance with the various reporting obligations and their deadlines. Advancing the reporting deadline for Part 2 reports to match the reporting deadline for scientific data (April 30) will greatly assist the Secretariat in its work. By the time Part 1 data is submitted (30 days before annual SC), the Secretariat can then begin compiling Draft Reports for each CCM, well in advance of the TCC.

### **IMS**

9. Some discussion took place at WCPFC7 on the potential for enhancement of the Commission's Information Management System to accommodate Part 2 reporting. This would be done on the principle that reporting should be easier and available technology should be utilized to the advantage of all CCMs. Version 1 of the revised draft Part 2 reporting template at **Attachment B** could be transferred to a web-based format in the IMS, where CCMs would simply provide the required information online through the secure side of the Commission's website. This work would be Phase 1 of a two-phase IMS enhancement project for compliance reporting purposes.
10. In addition, development of the Draft Reports by the Secretariat can also be done using the data that is available through the IMS, including Part 2 data, if approved. The IMS, therefore, will also need to be enhanced to allow the Secretariat to automatically generate individual CCM Draft Reports, based on the various pieces of information submitted by each CCM throughout the year. This work would be Phase 2 of a two-phase IMS enhancement project for compliance reporting purposes.

Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

*The following analysis reviews the current reporting requirements of Part 2 of CCM’s Annual Report to the Commission. The boxes on the left indicate the Secretariat’s suggested action for each reporting requirement of the current Part 2 template. Where the analysis results in retention of a particular reporting requirement, a proposed amended format for reporting is shown. Justifications for removal of certain reporting requirements from Part 2 are also noted. Two new reporting requirements are suggested to match with the Compliance Monitoring Scheme Reports under CMM 2010-03.*

**2.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES**

**2004-03: FISHING VESSEL MARKINGS AND IDENTIFICATION**

Delete

**Paragraphs 2 and 3** address the standard specifications for the marking and identification of fishing vessels, which becomes the vessel’s WCPFC Identification Number, or the WIN. Whether a CCM has applied these standards to its flagged vessels shows when it places its authorized vessels on the Commission’s Record of Fishing Vessels (CMM 2009-01) and a unique WIN is assigned to each vessel. In addition, non-compliance with the minimum standards for vessel identification can be revealed through other sources, including reports from ROP, HSB&I, and port State activities. CCMs do not need to report further on their implementation of these requirements through Part 2. Non-compliance with this measure is revealed through the RFV process, primarily, and a number of secondary processes where vessel identifying information is required. Suggest deletion.

**2005-03: NORTH PACIFIC ALBACORE**

Retain in Part 2

<b>Paragraph 2: No increase in current (2002-2004) fishing effort by boats fishing for NP Albacore in the Convention Area.</b>	Yes	No
Did any of CCM’s flagged vessels fish for NP Albacore in the Convention Area?		
If yes, indicate the number of vessels:		

Retain in Part 2

<b>Paragraph 3: Report all catches of North Pacific albacore to the WCPFC every six months for six month reporting periods (small coastal fisheries report annually).</b>	Yes	No
Did the CCM report all catches of North Pacific Albacore for the relevant reporting periods? (bi-annually or annually for small coastal fisheries)		
If annual catch estimates for North Pacific albacore catch have not been provided, please provide here.	Catch of North Pacific Albacore:	

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 4: Report all catches of albacore north of the equator and all fishing effort north of the equator in fisheries directed at albacore, by gear type. Report catches in terms of weight.</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM's report include aggregate effort data for the North Pacific Ocean?		
	If no, report effort by gear type here.	Effort for North Pacific Albacore:	

Delete	<b>Paragraph 7</b> calls for CCMs to “work to maintain, and as necessary reduce, the level of fishing effort on North Pacific albacore within the Convention Area commensurate with the long term sustainability of the stock.” There is no clear reporting requirement here. Reporting against this measure is done through the previous paragraphs. Suggest deletion.
--------	---

### 2006-04: STRIPED MARLIN (Southwest Pacific)

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 1: Limit the number of vessels fishing for striped marlin S of 15S to the highest level in any one year between 2000-2004, as reported to the Commission by 1 July 2007.</b>	No. of Vessels
	How many CCM vessels fished for striped marlin S of 15S in the previous year?	

Delete	<b>Paragraph 3</b> calls on CCMs to cooperate to protect the long-term sustainability and economic viability of the fisheries for striped marlin in the Southwest Pacific, and in particular to cooperate on research to reduce uncertainty with regard to the status of striped marlin stocks. CCMs cooperate through participation in WCPFC and the SC meetings, and through provision of scientific data, which is dealt with more explicitly in paragraphs 1 and 4. Responses from CCMs on their implementation of this paragraph are unlikely to provide any additional value to assist in assessing compliance with this measure. Suggest deletion.
--------	---

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 4: Report annually the catch levels of vessels that have taken striped marlin as a bycatch and catch levels of vessels fishing for striped marlin in the Convention Area south of 15S.</b>	Bycatch (mt)	Catch (mt)
	Report catch levels of vessels that have taken striped marlin as a bycatch in the Convention Area south of 15S:		
	Report catch levels of vessels fishing for striped marlin in the Convention Area south of 15S:		

### 2006-08: HIGH SEAS BOARDING AND INSPECTION PROCEDURES

Delete	<b>Paragraphs 7, 13, 14-24, 30-36, 38 and 40-44:</b> The information required by this CMM is obtainable through high seas boarding reports provided annually by CCMs during the regular TCC meetings. Any missing data would be revealed as a result of a boarding process, which has both pre- and post-requirements. Compliance with this measure can only be assessed after a boarding takes place and the relevant CCMs can review the process that was undertaken. Reporting through Part 2 is unnecessary. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

## 2007-01: REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 13</b> requires CCMs who opt to be part of the ROP to nominate a National Observer Coordinator. This is not necessarily a compliance issue, but is more administrative, in nature. The nominations are sent to the ED and the Secretariat can liaise with the relevant CCMs to ensure the appropriate information is submitted. It is unnecessary to report in Part 2 whether a CCM has nominated its ROP National Coordinator. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

Delete	<p><b>Attachment K, Annex C (1)</b> directs CCMs to use sub-regional and national observer programmes already in operation in the region, and encourages CCMs to submit data from the programmes as soon as possible. Information on CCM’s use and submission of data from the ROP can be obtained from the Commission’s Science Provider and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

New reporting requirement	<p><b>Paragraphs 10 and 14(vii): Explain duties to Captains and ensure that vessel operators comply with Guidelines in Annex B of CMM 2007-01</b></p>	Yes	No
	<p>Did CCM implement any new laws, regulations or policies in the last year to implement the requirement that vessel operators and Captains must be made aware of observer’s duties and responsibilities, and must comply with the provisions of Annex B of the CMM with respect to the rights and responsibilities of vessel operators, captains and vessel crew?</p>		
	<p>If yes, describe the measure(s) adopted and attach copies of relevant document(s).</p>		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement once CCMs have indicated they have adopted necessary measures and provided the relevant documents.*

## 2007-02 VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 9(a)</b> addresses the requirement for CCMs to “ensure that fishing vessels on the high seas in the Convention Area comply with the requirements established by the Commission for the purposes of the Commission VMS and are equipped with ALCs that shall communicate such data as determined by the Commission.” The only meaningful way to assess compliance with this requirement is through results of enforcement activity or port State controls. The Secretariat can also verify that vessels are equipped with the proper ALCs through comparison of the RFV with VTAFs and Fished/Did not Fish reports. Any gaps can be addressed through the Compliance Monitoring Scheme process. In addition, responses through Part 2 do not provide sufficient verifiable information that can be used to assess compliance. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	--

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

## 2007-04: SEABIRDS

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraphs 1 and 2: Implement the IPOA-Seabirds and report on implementation and status of NPOA-Seabirds, as appropriate.</b>	Yes	No
	Did the CCM adopt an NPOA-Seabirds or other measures to implement the IPOA-Seabirds in the previous calendar year?		
	If yes, describe measures or attach relevant documentation.		
<i>Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement for any CCM that has already implemented IPOA-Seabirds and adopted an NPOA-Seabirds or similar, and has provided such information to the Commission. Also note that it's not included in the Compliance Monitoring Report and is not a mandatory requirement for CCMs, as it is qualified by "to the extent possible" and "as appropriate". There is a need to determine whether not implementing IPOA-Seabirds or adopting NPOA-Seabirds constitutes non-compliance and regardless, whether responses should continue to be required for purposes of building a "general information" database (informal) within the Commission.</i>			
Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 1: To use two mitigation measures, at least one from Column A (side setting, bird curtain and weighted branch lines; night setting-minimum lights; Tori line; Weighted branch lines).</b>	Yes	No
	In the previous calendar year, did the CCM require its LL vessels to use at least two mitigation measures (and at least one from Column A of Table 1 in the CMM) in areas south of 30 degrees South and north of 23 degrees North?		
	If yes, describe how this requirement was met and monitored, and attach relevant documentation.		
Delete	<b>Paragraph 2</b> addresses adoption of measures for "other areas" and is not a mandatory reporting requirement. Suggest deletion.		
Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 4: If the CCM made any changes to its required mitigation measures or technical specifications for those measures in the previous year, please describe the relevant change(s) or attach document(s).</b>		
<i>Note: This reporting requirement is retained to capture any revisions that CCMs may make from time to time to national implementation of this measure. The information collected in paragraph 4 could contribute to an informal general information database within the Commission.</i>			
Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 5</b> encourages CCMs to conduct research to further develop and refine measures to mitigate seabird bycatch including mitigation measures for use during the hauling process.</p> <p><b>Paragraph 7</b> encourages CCMs to adopt measures aimed at ensuring captured seabirds are released alive. Neither paragraph contains mandatory requirements and therefore should not be included in Part 2. Suggest deletion of both paragraphs 5 and 7.</p>		



## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 9</b> requires CCMs to report in Part 1 all available information on interactions with seabirds, including bycatches and details of species. This does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.</p>	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>Part 1, 30 days before annual SC</b>	

### **2008-01: BIGEYE AND YELLOWFIN**

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 9: Not undermine measure by transferring purse seine effort to areas N20N or S20S</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Did any purse seine vessels fish in the area N20N or S20S in the previous calendar year?		
	If yes, indicate number of days fished.		

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 10</b> requires CCMs to limit their high seas purse seine fishing effort (days) to 2004 or the average of 2001-2004 levels. This information is submitted to the Commission’s Science Provider through Operational Catch and Effort Data and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.</p>	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>April 30</b>	

Delete	<p><b>Paragraphs 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 29</b> are applicable for 2009, only. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

New reporting requirement	<b>Paragraph 18: Implement compatible measures (to PNA 3IA) in non-PNA EEZs to reduce PS fishing mortality on BET</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Did the non-PNA member implement compatible measures to the PNA 3IA in its own EEZ?		
	If yes, describe the measure(s) adopted or attach relevant document(s).		

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 23</b> requires CCMs to submit a FAD Management Plan for high seas FAD fishing that meets minimum guidelines in Attachment E (to CMM 2008-01). Plans are posted on the website but currently are not reviewed by the Commission for content. Compliance with the first requirement to submit a FAD Management Plan can be assessed by whether the Plan is posted on the Commission’s website. Compliance with the second requirement that the Plan shall meet minimum guidelines can only be assessed by thorough review of Plans once they are submitted. Any member may review another member’s Plan at any time, once such Plan has been posted. To date, the Commission through TCC has not elected to conduct any reviews of FAD Management Plans that have been submitted. It is suggested that reporting against this requirement in Part 2 is unnecessary at this time and does not allow for an accurate or thorough assessment of compliance with this paragraph. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 26: CCMs independently or collaboratively with industry, explore and evaluate mitigation measures for JBET and JYFT taken around FADs and present the results annually to the Commission (and also through the SC and TCC at each regular session).</b>	Yes	No
	Has CCM conducted any research in the previous year with respect to mitigating impact of FADs on juvenile BET and YFT?		
Delete	<b>Paragraph 28</b> requires CCMs with purse seine vessels fishing in the Convention Area and NOT exclusively within their own EEZ, to carry an observer from the ROP. Information on compliance with this requirement can be obtained from ROP, RFV and VMS data and does not need to be reported in Part 2. Suggest deletion.		
Delete	<b>Paragraph 33</b> requires phased reductions of LL BET catch by CCMs whose longline vessels caught more than 2000t of BET prior to 2008. The time period for phased reduction is 2009 (10%), 2010 (30%) and 2011 (30%). Data is reported to the Commission’s Science Provider and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>April 30</b>	
Delete	<b>Paragraph 39</b> calls for CCMs to take necessary measures to control other commercial tuna fisheries. This data is reported to the Commission’s Science Provider and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>April 30</b>	
Delete	<b>Paragraph 40</b> requires CCMs to comply with the Commission’s rules and requirements on “Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission”. Compliance is measured by whether or not the Commission’s Science Provider has the data. Suggest deletion.	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>April 30</b>	
Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 42: Prohibit landings, transshipment and commercial transactions from known IUU fishing activities.</b>	Yes	No
	Has the CCM adopted any measure(s) to prohibit landings, transshipment and commercial transactions resulting from known IUU fishing activities? If yes, attach relevant document(s).		
Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 43: Report on the outcomes of port monitoring activities of landings and transshipments to assess the amount of catch by species.</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM conduct any port monitoring activities of landings and/or transshipments? If yes, provide catch estimates collected, by species.		

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 45</b> requires CCMs to report to each TCC on the implementation of this CMM for their fishing vessels operating on the high seas and/or in waters under national jurisdiction, and that the TCC will prepare a template for reporting this requirement. It is suggested that the above reporting paragraphs fulfill this requirement and that no separate template is necessary. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

## 2008-03: SEA TURTLES

Retain in Part 2	<p><b>Paragraph 1</b> calls on CCMs to implement, as appropriate, the FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations and to ensure the safe handling of all captured sea turtles, in order to improve their survival. Paragraph 2 contains the reporting requirement. Suggest deletion.</p>
------------------	--

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 2: Report progress on implementation of FAO Guidelines and any information collected on interactions with sea turtles.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Has the CCM adopted any measures to implement the FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations and to ensure the safe handling of all captured sea turtles for all fisheries covered under the Convention in which the CCM is active?		
	If yes, describe measure(s) adopted or attach relevant document(s).		
	Has CCM required the collection of any information on sea turtle interactions by its flagged vessels fishing in the Convention Area?		
	If yes, attach reports of any interactions and indicate whether data collected through ROP or other means.		

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 3</b> calls on CCMs to report all sea turtle interaction data recorded through the ROP to the Commission, in accordance with paragraph 2 or other agreed data collection provisions. Any data collected, by whatever means, is requested in paragraph 2. Reporting through paragraph 3 in Part 2 is redundant. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	--

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 4</b> requires CCMs to require their fishermen to bring aboard, if practicable, any captured hard-shell sea turtle that is comatose or inactive as soon as possible and foster its recovery, including giving it resuscitation, before returning it to the water. CCMs are further required to ensure that fishermen are aware of and use proper mitigation and handling techniques, as described in the WCPFC Guidelines for the Handling of Sea Turtles. Paragraph 2 assesses CCMs implementation of FAO Guidelines or other appropriate safe handling techniques and also includes reporting of sea turtle interactions. Reporting against paragraph 4 would be redundant. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete

**Paragraph 5** relates to the purse seine fishery; **Paragraph 6** to the longline fishery, and; **Paragraph 7** to the shallow-set swordfish fishery. Information required by reporting against paras 5, 6 and 7 can be obtained through responses to Paragraph 2, which seeks information on measures adopted for all fisheries and reports of interactions from all fisheries.

**Paragraphs 5(d) and 8(b)** require CCMs to report on the results of research trials and to do so at least 60 days before the SC and TCC meetings (8(d)). There is a need to determine in the first instance whether conducting research and not reporting results constitutes non-compliance and secondly, if a CCM doesn't report its research results, how would anyone know that research took place? Reporting on these particular paragraphs is both unrealistic and unlikely to provide information useful for assessing compliance. Suggest deletion.

### 2008-04: DRIFTNETS ON THE HIGH SEAS

Retain in  
Part 2

<b>Paragraph 2: Take all measures necessary to prohibit the use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas in the Convention Area</b>	Yes	No
Has the CCM adopted any measures to prohibit its fishing vessels from using large-scale driftnets on the high seas in the Convention Area?		
If yes, describe measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement.*

Retain in  
Part 2

<b>Paragraph 5: Summary of MCS action related to large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas in the Convention Area</b>	Yes	No
Did the CCM engage in any MCS action in the previous calendar year with respect to large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas in the Convention Area?		
If yes, provide summary of MCS action.		

### 2009-01: RECORD OF FISHING VESSELS (RFV)

Delete

**Paragraph A.1(a-i)** is a list of obligations for *members (including CNMs)* of the Commission to undertake in authorizing their vessels to operate in the Convention Area. Essentially, compliance with these measures can really only be assessed during a flag State response to an alleged violation. Further, the undertakings outlined in Para A.1(a-i) are not linked to whether or not a member can place a vessel on the RFV. There are no real mechanisms in place to verify that members are in compliance with the requirements of Para A.1(a-i) until the flag States are called on to respond to alleged violations. At that time, their actions with respect to exercising control over their flagged vessels can be assessed. In other words, if a flag State places a vessel on the Record, it is saying, de facto, that it has complied with all of the requirements of Paragraph A.1(a-i). Furthermore, the internal review and reporting requirement in paragraph C.15 addresses member's actions with respect to its authorizations. Suggest deletion.

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete

**Paragraph A.2(a-c)** addresses the interactions between *member* vessels and *non-member* vessels with respect to transshipping and bunkering and requires members to take measures to ensure that such activities only take place according to certain conditions. The issue of transshipment with non-member carriers is addressed in the Transshipment Measure, and does not need to be reported on here. Bunkering is not addressed in the transshipment measure, but the same principle applies. Like paragraph A.1 above, compliance with this requirement is difficult to measure unless an alleged violation takes place, where the flag State's response can be evaluated against its requirements in this paragraph. Reporting against this requirement in Part 2 does not yield any meaningful information that can be used for compliance assessment purposes. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph A.4(a-e)** requires *members* to include specific conditions in their authorizations to fish. Items (a)-(d) are specific, while (e) says "any other specific conditions to give effect to the provisions of the Convention and conservation and management measures adopted pursuant to it." Measuring compliance with (e) will be nearly impossible. Measuring compliance with (a)-(d) would require each member to submit a copy of their fishing authorizations to the Commission for review, which is unrealistic. Again, like the paragraphs preceding this one, compliance can only really meaningfully be assessed after an alleged violation occurs and an investigation reviews whether certain measures, etc, were taken by the flag State prior to the alleged violation taking place. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph B.5 and B.6(items (a)-(r))** relate to the Commission's RFV. Paragraph B.5 requires *members* to maintain a national record of vessels entitled to fly its flag and authorized to fish in the Convention Area beyond its area of national jurisdiction. Paragraph B.6(items (a)-(r)) requires members to submit detailed information (items (a)-(r)) to the Executive Director on each vessel that it has authorized to fish under paragraph B.5, in accordance with Annex IV of the WCPF Convention. The submission of vessel information under paragraph B.6 implies that members have complied with the requirement of B.5. Moreover, compliance with both paragraphs is measured by the completeness and accuracy of the information for each vessel on the Commission's RFV, something that can be assessed on a daily basis and does not need to be reported on in Part 2. Also, the TCC reviews Member's compliance with the RFV information requirements every year. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph B.7** outlines the process for *members* to follow when new vessels are added to their national records or changes are made to the vessels they've placed on the RFV under paragraph B.6. Compliance is assessed when the process is followed, or not followed and a violation occurs. Reporting against this in Part 2 is unnecessary. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph B.8** requires each *member* of the Commission to respond to the ED's request for any information with respect to vessels entered in the member's national record within 15 days of such request. Compliance is measured by whether the member responds accordingly, not through reporting in Part 2. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph B.9** requires each *member* to submit to the ED a list of all vessels that appeared in its national record of fishing vessels *at any time in the preceding calendar year* that fished in the Convention Area beyond its area of national jurisdiction. This paragraph addresses the requirement for members to indicate for each of its vessels on the RFV whether it "fished" or "did not fish". Compliance with this requirement can be assessed by whether the member submitted this report for each of its vessels, as recorded by the Secretariat. It is unnecessary for members to report against this in Part 2. Suggest deletion.

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph C.15: <i>Members (or flag States) with vessels on the Commission RFV or the Interim Register to review their internal actions and measures taken with respect to vessels it has authorized to fish in the Convention Area under paragraph A.1, and report annually to the Commission.</i></b>	Yes	No
	Did the member or flag State conduct an internal review of actions and measures it has taken pursuant to Paragraph A.1 of this measure, in respect of its flagged vessels authorized and operating in the Convention Area?		
	If yes, attach report.		

Delete	<b>Paragraph C.18</b> requires each <i>CCM</i> to provide factual information to the ED if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a vessel that is not on the Record or the [Interim] Register is or has been engaged in fishing for or transshipment of highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area. Compliance with this requirement is assessed if a <i>CCM</i> provides information to the ED, but if no <i>CCM</i> provides any information, there is no real compliance issue to assess and nothing for the ED to report. Reporting in Part 2 does not accurately measure a <i>CCM</i> 's compliance with this paragraph. Suggest deletion.
--------	---

Delete	<b>Paragraph C.23</b> requires the <i>flag State</i> or the <i>responsible State</i> of a vessel on the RFV that is included on the WCPFC IUU List, to revoke the vessel's authorization to fish beyond the national jurisdiction of its flag State. <sup>1</sup> The ED is to then remove the vessel from the RFV as soon as practicable <u>after</u> being notified by the flag State or responsible State under 7(c). The qualifying statement in this requirement is that the revocation of the vessel's authorization should be "consistent with applicable national law", which makes it subjective to the flag State's or responsible State's relevant national laws.  Because of the qualifiers in this paragraph, it is not non-compliance if a flag State or responsible State does not revoke an IUU-Listed vessel's authorization to fish, if doing so would not be in accordance with applicable national law. Reporting in Part 2 on non-mandatory actions is unnecessary. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

Delete	<b>Paragraphs D.28-31</b> relate to the process for placing a non-member carrier or bunker vessel on the Commission's Interim Register. <i>CCM</i> 's compliance with this process is assessed by whether or not the required information is submitted to the ED that enables the non-member carrier or bunker to be placed on the Interim Register. It is not necessary for a <i>CCM</i> to report on whether or not it followed this process in Part 2. If the process is followed, the non-member vessel is placed on the Register. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

## 2009-02: HIGH SEAS FAD CLOSURES AND CATCH RETENTION

Delete	<b>Paragraph 12</b> requires vessel operators to submit discard reports to the ED within 48 hours after any discard. As the Secretariat is the recipient of such information, it can monitor compliance with this requirement and report accordingly. It is redundant for <i>CCM</i> s to report against this in Part 2. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

<sup>1</sup> Note that the automatic removal by the Commission of a vessel that is placed on the IUU List from the RFV will be discussed at TCC7.

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 13</b> requires vessel operators to provide copies of the discard reports in paragraph 12 to the WCPFC observer on board. ROP observer data goes to the Commission’s Science Provider and compliance with this requirement can be assessed using data held by the Commission. CCMs do not need to report against this in Part 2. Suggest deletion.</p>	
--------	--	--

### 2009-03: SWORDFISH

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 3: Don’t shift effort to areas N of 20S</b>	Yes	No
	Did any of the CCM’s flagged vessels fish for swordfish in the southwest Pacific N of 20S in the previous calendar year?		
	If yes, report catch and effort and identify which vessels fished N of 20S:		

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 8</b> requires CCMs to report in Part 1 on the number of vessels that fished for SWO and the total catch for (a) vessels flying flag south of 20S; (b) vessels operating under charter as part of domestic fishery S of 20S; (c) any other vessels fishing in national jurisdiction S of 20S. Reporting this information again in Part 2 is redundant. Suggest deletion.</p>	<b>Report due</b>	
		<b>Part 1; 30 days before SC</b>	

### 2009-05: DATA BUOYS

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 1: Prohibit vessels from fishing within 1nm of any data buoy in the high seas of the Convention Area</b>	Yes	No
	Has the CCM adopted any measures to ensure that its fishing vessels do not interact with or fish within 1nm of any data buoy in the high seas of the Convention Area?		
	If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 3: Prohibit fishing vessels from taking on board any data buoy unless authorized or requested to do so by the Member or owner responsible for the buoy.</b>	Yes	No
	Has the CCM adopted any measures to ensure its fishing vessels do not take on board any data buoy unless specifically authorized or requested to do so by the Member or owner responsible for the buoy?		
	If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 5: Require vessels that become entangled with a data buoy to remove the entangled fishing gear with minimal damage to the data buoy. CCMs are encouraged to require their fishing vessels to report any incidents of entanglement, including identifying information for the data buoy and date, location and nature of the entanglement.</b>	Yes	No
	Has the CCM adopted any measures to require its fishing vessels that become entangled with a data buoy to record and report the incident and information on efforts to remove the entangled fishing gear with as little damage as possible to the data buoy?		
	If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

### 2009-06: TRANSHIPMENT

Delete	<b>Paragraph 5</b> says that CCMs <i>may</i> notify the Executive Director of its designated port(s) for transshipment. This is not a requirement and therefore should not be assessed for compliance. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

Delete	<b>Paragraph 7</b> addresses the issue of responsibility under charter arrangements. There is no reporting requirement here. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

Delete	<b>Paragraph 10</b> requires CCMs to complete a Transshipment Declaration for each transshipment in the Convention Area, for both offloading and receiving vessels. The Declarations are to be sent to the Executive Director only in specific circumstances. The reporting requirement is ambiguous and the Secretariat can only report on information it receives. Suggest deletion on the basis that transshipment information can be obtained from other sources with more reliable verification mechanisms. Can also rely on information reported through Paragraph 11.
--------	--

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 11 requires CCMs to report on all transshipment activities covered by the Measure, including transshipment that occurs inside EEZs and in ports, and to use the guidelines for reporting contained in Annex II of the CMM</b>	Yes	No
	Did any of CCM's vessels engage in transshipment activity anywhere in the Convention Area, or tranship fish caught in the Convention Area outside the Convention Area, in the previous year?		
	Attach reports of all CCM vessel's transshipments in the Convention Area, using the information requirements contained in Annex II		

Delete	<b>Paragraph 12</b> requires CCMs to provide notice of transshipment at sea in cases of force majeure or in predetermined circumstances, and ensure notices include information contained in Annex III of the CMM. The Secretariat can only report on compliance with the required notice, including its content, if it receives one. It is unrealistic for CCMs to report against this unless an actual event takes place in these circumstances and a notice is filed. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

Delete	<b>Paragraph 13</b> requires the use of ROP observers for transshipments at sea. Compliance with this requirement can be assessed using the transshipment notices, followed by reports (declarations) and compared against ROP observer deployments and ROP data submissions. All of this information can be cross-checked only when the first step (provide notice) is followed. Responses to this question in Part 2 are unlikely to reveal information that can be used for compliance assessment. Suggest deletion.
--------	---



## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete

**Paragraph 14** addresses the observer's obligations with respect to implementing the requirements of the measure. These include verifying transshipment quantities with catch reports, logsheets, VMS data and port data. This is information that is reported through the ROP data provisions, not through Part 2. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 22** states that the responsibility for pre-transshipment notices and declarations for transshipments involving non-CCM vessels lies with the vessel master of the carrier vessel or the chartering CCM. This is not really a reporting requirement and is more of a designation of responsibility. If a transshipment takes place involving a non-CCM vessel, compliance will be assessed based on the notification and reporting procedures associated with the transaction. Information on instances of non-compliance would only come to light if a third party reports relevant information to the Commission. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 24** addresses transshipment in circumstances involving either force majeure or serious mechanical breakdown, and the requirement to submit notification and a Transshipment Declaration to the Executive Director (already addressed in para 12). Compliance with this requirement can only be assessed if the required notifications and declarations were submitted to the ED in the required time frames. If these requirements are not met, the ED has no way of knowing whether transshipment took place in these circumstances, unless it is reported by a third party. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 26** sets out the required process for New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines to request an exemption to the ban on purse seine transshipment at sea. This process can only be used by three CCMs and does not need to be included in Part 2. Compliance with these requirements for the three named CCMs is assessed when their application is reviewed by the TCC. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 29** follows on from paragraph 26 and states that CCMs shall only authorize those purse seine vessels that have received an exemption by the Commission to engage in transshipment outside of port. CCMs shall issue vessel specific authorizations outlining any conditions or requirements identified by the Commission or CCM, and shall require that vessel operators carry such authorizations on board at all times. Information on compliance with this requirement can be assessed through ROP data. Again, this requirement is specific to three CCMs and their compliance with these requirements can be assessed in their annual applications, which are reviewed by the TCC. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 30** continues with the requirements for the three named CCMs when applying approved exemptions to their authorized vessels, as placed on the RFV. Compliance with this requirement is assessed by reviewing details for the relevant vessels on the RFV, and addressed accordingly, noting that vessels fishing exclusively within its own EEZ are not required to be on the RFV. Reporting on compliance with this in Part 2 is unlikely to provide any additional information for compliance assessment purposes. Suggest deletion.

Delete

**Paragraph 35 (and paragraph 34)** addresses transshipment on the high seas for other than purse seine vessels and associated requirements. The Secretariat can only report on those who complied. Non-compliance can only be revealed through VMS, ROP and patrols. Suggest deletion.

*Note: Paragraph 34 is not currently part of Part 2, but it contains the requirement for CCMs to notify the Commission which vessels are authorized by the CCM to tranship on the high seas, and an explanation for such authorization. Paragraph 35 addresses the conditions for CCMs to follow for its authorized vessels. Transshipments can be detected via VMS and where transshipments are detected using VMS, such information can be cross-checked with any authorizations that have been submitted to the Commission. Further, observers may also record such activities during their time onboard vessels.*

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

## 2009-08: CHARTER NOTIFICATION SCHEME

Delete

**Paragraph 2** requires CCMs whose nationals were involved in chartering arrangements at the time the measure was adopted (2009) to notify the details of such arrangements to the Executive Director by 1 July 2010. The Secretariat can only report on those notifications it received. Non-notification does not necessarily mean non-compliance, unless known chartering is taking place and a third party reports it to the Commission, which it can do at any time. CCMs do not need to report on their compliance with this requirement in Part 2. Suggest deletion

Delete

**Paragraph 3** requires CCMs to notify the Executive Director and the flag State of any charter arrangements concluded after 1 July 2010, and to do so within 15 days or 72 hours before commencement of fishing activities. The Secretariat can note compliance with this requirement as notifications are received and report annually to the TCC, as is the current practice. It is unnecessary for CCMs to also report on compliance with this requirement in Part 2. Suggest deletion.

## 2009-09: VESSELS WITHOUT NATIONALITY

Delete

**Paragraph 5** relates to the reporting of vessels without nationality by CCMs to the Secretariat. The Secretariat can only report on information it receives and CCMs can report on this at any time. If no information is received, it is not necessarily an issue of non-compliance. It is unnecessary to require reporting on this through Part 2. Suggest deletion.

## 2009-10: MONITORING OF PURSE SEINE VESSEL LANDINGS AT (non-CCM) PORTS

Delete

**Paragraph 1** requires the “Commission and the CCMs” to work together to establish in 2010 an arrangement with a non-CCM (Thailand) to enable collection of species and size composition data from canneries in the non-CCM regarding purse seine catch in the Convention area, and report progress to the Commission. This is an awkward and unclear reporting requirement and responses are unlikely to provide any useful information for assessing compliance with this measure. Suggest deletion.

## 2009-11: COOPERATING NON-MEMBERS

Delete

**Paragraph 1, 2(a-g), 9 and 11** outline the process for applying for CNM status in the Commission. This only applies to a small number of countries and since their compliance with the process is assessed separately during the TCC, it is unnecessary to include this in Part 2. Suggest deletion.

## 2010-01: NORTH PACIFIC STRIPED MARLIN

Delete

**Paragraph 7** calls for a phased reduction of NP Striped Marlin catches north of the Equator, starting in 2011. This information is submitted to the Commission’s Science Provider and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.

<b>Report due</b>
<b>April 30</b>

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 8: Report on measures taken to implement the reductions in catch and the total catch taken against the established limits</b>	Yes	No
	Did the CCM implement any measures to reduce their catch of NP Striped Marlin?		
	If yes, describe the measure(s) taken or attach relevant document(s).		

### 2010-02: EASTERN HIGH SEAS POCKET SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA

Delete	<b>Paragraph 2</b> requires flag States to report to the Commission at least 6 hours prior to entry and no later than 6 hours prior to exiting the E-HSP, including catch (kilograms) on board. The Secretariat is receiving reports and monitoring this requirement and CCMs do not need to report again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.
--------	--

### 2010-03: COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME

Delete	<b>Paragraphs 11, 18 and 21</b> call for CCMs to provide responses to the Secretariat on actions taken to address information gaps or potential compliance issues identified in individual Compliance Monitoring Reports prepared by the Secretariat. Compliance with these paragraphs is assessed through the receipt of such Reports and the information contained in those Reports. It is unnecessary for CCMs to report on those actions again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.
--------	---

### 2010-04: PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

Delete	<b>Paragraph 4</b> calls on CCMs to report to the Executive Director by 31 July 2011 and 2012 measures they used to implement paragraphs 2, 3, 6 and 7 of this CMM. There is no need to report again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.	<b>Report due</b>
		<b>31 July 2011 and 2012</b>

### 2010-05: SOUTH PACIFIC ALBACORE

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 4: Report annually the catch levels of fishing vessels that have taken South Pacific Albacore as a bycatch as well as the number and catch levels of vessels actively fishing for South Pacific albacore in the Convention area south of 20°S.</b>	Yes	No
	Did any of CCM's vessels take South Pacific Albacore as a bycatch or a target catch in the Convention Area south of 20°S?		
		<b>Catch</b>	<b>No. of Vessels</b>
	If yes, indicate the catch amount and if target species, indicate the number of vessels actively fishing.		

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

### 2010-06: IUU VESSEL LISTING

Delete	<p><b>Paragraphs 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 20, 22, 26, 27</b> outline the steps CCMs must follow in order to place a vessel on the IUU List, as well as remove a vessel from the IUU List intercessionally. Compliance is measured by whether a CCM follows the required steps to place a vessel on the Draft IUU List. “Non-compliance” simply means the vessel does not get placed on the list. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

### 2010-07: SHARKS

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paras 1 and 2: Implementation of IPOA and if NPOA applicable, report status</b>	Yes	No
	Did the CCM implement the FAO IPOA-Sharks in the previous calendar year?		
	Did the CCM adopt an NPOA-Sharks in the previous calendar year?		
If no, indicate the status of development of an NPOA-Sharks:			

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement. It is also more of a general information requirement.*

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 3</b> states that NPOAs or other relevant policies for sharks should include measures to minimize waste and discards from shark catches and encourages the live release of incidental catches of sharks. This is not a mandatory requirement. Suggest deletion.</p>
--------	---

Delete	<p><b>Paragraph 4</b> requires CCMs to include key shark species in their annual catch and effort reporting to the Commission. This information is provided to the Commission’s Science Provider and does not need to be reported again in Part 2. Suggest deletion.</p>	<b>Reports due</b>	
		<b>April 30</b>	

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 4: Report retained and discarded shark catches in Part 2 Annual Report.</b>	Yes	No
	Does CCM have any retained and/or discarded shark catches to report for the previous calendar year?		
	If yes, provide catch information	<b>Discards (mt)</b>	<b>Retained (mt)</b>

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 6: Take measures to ensure fishers utilize all retained catches of shark</b>	Yes	No
	Has CCM adopted any new measures in the previous calendar year to require full utilization of retained shark catches?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).			

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 7: Implement 5% fin-to-weight ratio</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to implement the 5% fin-to-weight requirement?		
	If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement for any CCM that has already adopted relevant measures to implement this requirement.*

Retain in Part 2	<b>Paragraph 9: Take necessary measures to prohibit vessels from retaining, transshipping, landing or trading of fins harvested in contravention of this CMM</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to control harvesting of shark fins?		
	If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

Retain in Part 2	<b>Para 10: Take measures to encourage the release of live sharks that are caught incidentally and are not used for food or other purposes</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to encourage the live release of incidental shark catches?		
	If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

Delete	<b>Paragraph 11</b> provides for coastal States to adopt alternative measures for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving and managing sharks within areas of national jurisdiction. It is, for all intents and purposes, an exemption for coastal States to take measures that may be other than those prescribed in the CMM, in respect of sovereignty and sovereign rights, and the rights of artisanal and traditional fishers. There is no explicit reporting requirement here, and hence its inclusion does not provide any additional information for compliance assessment purposes. Suggest deletion.		
--------	---	--	--

Retain in Part 2	<b>Para 12: Report on implementation of this CMM and any alternative measures adopted pursuant to paragraph 11</b>	Yes	No
	Did CCM adopt any alternative measures (to those specified in the CMM) in the previous calendar year for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving and managing sharks within areas of national jurisdiction?		
	If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

*Note: Paragraph 12 also calls for CCMs to report on implementation of this CMM, which is already done through answering questions to earlier paragraphs. Requesting blanket reporting in paragraph 12, in addition to earlier paragraphs, creates duplication and inefficiency. Suggest the only reporting requirement for paragraph 12 is in respect of alternative measures that may have been adopted pursuant to paragraph 11.*

## Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

Delete	<b>Paragraph 13</b> calls on CCMs to review the implementation and effectiveness of this CMM and adopt additional measures, based on advice from the SC, the TCC and the Commission. There is no real reporting requirement here and the review process is done through the Commission meetings, not through reporting in Part 2. Suggest deletion.
--------	---

Retain in Part 2	<b>Report on CCM measures adopted for conservation and management of HMFS in areas under national jurisdiction (Art. 23(3))</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
	<b>Brief summary of management methods used for Highly Migratory Fish Species (HMFS) in areas under national jurisdiction.</b>	

*Note: CCMs should continue to provide information on measures (including updates) adopted for areas under national jurisdiction, for purposes of establishing a database of general information within the Commission. In most cases, national legislation is public information and posted on websites, so reporting could simply be in the form of providing the appropriate link.*

Delete	<b>Report on CCM measures adopted for regulating the activity of vessels which fish in the Convention Area. (Art. 23(4)) Examples provided below but further fields may be added</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
	<del>Vessel Registration and Authorisation Procedures.</del>	
	<del>Control of fishing vessels.</del>	
	<del>Instruction/education/extension programs for industry including vessel owners, operators, crews and fish receivers/buyers.</del>	
	<del>Port access and inspections (such as FAO Port Measures where applicable).</del>	

*Note: These are only indicative reporting fields, not mandatory. Information on these measures can be obtained through other reporting means. Suggest deletion.*

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

## 2.2 MONITORING AND INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

The information is to be in a summarized form.

Activity	Frequency/Numbers/ % Coverage	Comment
<del>VMS</del>		<i>This information is collected by the Secretariat; suggest deletion.</i>
<del>Transhipments</del>		<i>Information is collected through reporting on CMM 2009-06; suggest deletion</i>
Transhipment inspections		
At-sea inspections		
Port inspections		
<del>Observer monitoring</del>		<i>Information is collected through the ROP; suggest deletion.</i>
Monitoring of trade and domestic distribution of HMFS.		
Inspections of domestic-only vessels		
High seas boardings and inspections of flag vessels.		

## 2.3 SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES

The completion of this section should be in summarized form.

Retain in Part 2

Activity	Frequency	Incidents/CMM Clause	Comment
Seagoing patrols			
Aerial surveillance			

## 2.4 INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTION ACTIVITY

The completion of this section should be in summarized form to the level of detail that domestic requirements allow

Retain in Part 2

Activity	Number	CMM Clause	Reason and summary outcome
Investigations			
Outcomes - penalties or other action			
- No further action			

# Annual Report to the Commission - Analysis of Existing Part 2 Reporting Requirements

## 2.5 FURTHER MCS MEASURES TAKEN AND OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

Delete

- ~~Inform relevant changes to national legislation.~~
- ~~Trade measures (if adopted by the Commission).~~
- ~~Cooperating non-CCMs annual reporting (to maintain cooperating status).~~
- ~~Prompt IUU fishing activity reporting (Art 25(2,3)); estimated IUU catch within EEZ?~~
- ~~NPOA reporting/IPOA actions taken through RFMO.~~

*Note: These are indicative reporting fields and not mandatory. Much of this information is also reported elsewhere. Suggest deletion.*



*The following is a proposed revised Part 2 reporting template and would be similar to the format developed for web-based reporting through the Secretariat’s Information Management System (IMS).*

**2.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES**

**2005-03: NORTH PACIFIC ALBACORE**

<b>Paragraph 2: No increase in current (2002-2004) fishing effort by boats fishing for NP Albacore north of the Equator.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did any of CCM’s flagged vessels fish for NP Albacore north of the Equator?		
If yes, indicate the number of vessels:		

<b>Paragraph 3: Report all catches of North Pacific albacore to the WCPFC every six months for six month reporting periods (small coastal fisheries report annually).</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the CCM report all catches of North Pacific Albacore for the relevant reporting periods? (bi-annually or annually for small coastal fisheries)		
If annual catch estimates for North Pacific albacore catch have not been provided, please provide here.	<b>Catch of North Pacific Albacore:</b>	

<b>Paragraph 4: Report all catches of albacore north of the equator and all fishing effort north of the equator in fisheries directed at albacore, by gear type. Report catches in terms of weight.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM’s report include aggregate effort data for the North Pacific Ocean?		
If no, report effort by gear type here.	<b>Effort for North Pacific Albacore:</b>	

**2006-04: STRIPED MARLIN (Southwest Pacific)**

<b>Paragraph 1: Limit the number of vessels fishing for striped marlin S of 15S to the highest level in any one year between 2000-2004, as reported to the Commission by 1 July 2007.</b>	<b>No. of Vessels</b>
How many CCM vessels fished for striped marlin S of 15S in the previous year?	

<b>Paragraph 4: Report annually the catch levels of vessels that have taken striped marlin as a bycatch and catch levels of vessels fishing for striped marlin in the Convention Area south of 15S.</b>	<b>Bycatch (mt)</b>	<b>Catch (mt)</b>
Report catch levels of vessels that have taken striped marlin as a bycatch in the Convention Area south of 15S:		
Report catch levels of vessels fishing for striped marlin in the Convention Area south of 15S:		

**2007-01: REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME**

<b>Paragraphs 10 and 14(vii): Explain duties to Captains and ensure that vessel operators comply with Guidelines in Annex B of CMM 2007-01</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM implement any new laws, regulations or policies in the last year to implement the requirement that vessel operators and Captains must be made aware of observer's duties and responsibilities, and must comply with the provisions of Annex B of the CMM with respect to the rights and responsibilities of vessel operators, captains and vessel crew?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) adopted and attach copies of relevant document(s).		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement.*

**2007-04: SEABIRDS**

<b>Paragraphs 1 and 2: Implement the IPOA-Seabirds and report on implementation and status of NPOA-Seabirds, as appropriate.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the CCM adopt an NPOA-Seabirds or other measures to implement the IPOA-Seabirds in the previous calendar year?		
If yes, describe measures or attach relevant documentation.		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement.*

<b>Paragraph 1: To use two mitigation measures, at least one from Column A (side setting, bird curtain and weighted branch lines; night setting-minimum lights; Tori line; Weighted branch lines).</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
In the previous calendar year, did the CCM require its LL vessels to use at least two mitigation measures (and at least one from Column A of Table 1 in the CMM) in areas south of 30 degrees South and north of 23 degrees North?		
If yes, describe how this requirement was met and monitored, and attach relevant documentation.		

<b>Paragraph 4: If the CCM made any changes to its required mitigation measures or technical specifications for those measures in the previous year, please describe the relevant change(s) or attach document(s).</b>

**2008-01: BIGEYE AND YELLOWFIN**

<b>Paragraph 9: Not undermine measure by transferring purse seine effort to areas N20N or S20S</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did any purse seine vessels fish in the area N20N or S20S in the previous calendar year?		
If yes, indicate number of days fished.		

Annual Report to the Commission – Draft Revised Part 2 Reporting Template (web-based)

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

<b>Paragraph 18: Implement compatible measures (to PNA 3IA) in non-PNA EEZs to reduce PS fishing mortality on BET</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the non-PNA member implement compatible measures to the PNA 3IA in its own EEZ?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) adopted or attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Paragraph 26: CCMs independently or collaboratively with industry, explore and evaluate mitigation measures for JBET and JYFT taken around FADs and present the results annually to the Commission (and also through the SC and TCC at each regular session).</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has CCM conducted any research in the previous year with respect to mitigating impact of FADs on juvenile BET and YFT?		

<b>Paragraph 42: Prohibit landings, transshipment and commercial transactions from known IUU fishing activities.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measure(s) to prohibit landings, transshipment and commercial transactions resulting from known IUU fishing activities?		
If yes, attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Paragraph 43: Report on the outcomes of port monitoring activities of landings and transshipments to assess the amount of catch by species.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM conduct any port monitoring activities of landings and/or transshipments?		
If yes, provide catch estimates collected, by species.		

**2008-03: SEA TURTLES**

<b>Paragraph 2: Report progress on implementation of FAO Guidelines and any information collected on interactions with sea turtles.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measures to implement the FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations and to ensure the safe handling of all captured sea turtles for all fisheries covered under the Convention in which the CCM is active?		
If yes, describe measure(s) adopted or attach relevant document(s).		
Has CCM required the collection of any information on sea turtle interactions by its flagged vessels fishing in the Convention Area?		
If yes, attach reports of any interactions and indicate whether data collected through ROP or other means.		

**2008-04: DRIFTNETS ON THE HIGH SEAS**

<b>Paragraph 2: Take all measures necessary to prohibit the use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas in the Convention Area</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measures to prohibit its fishing vessels from using large-scale driftnets on the high seas in the Convention Area?		
If yes, describe measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement.*

<b>Paragraph 5: Summary of MCS action related to large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas in the Convention Area</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the CCM engage in any MCS action in the previous calendar year with respect to large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas in the Convention Area?		
If yes, provide summary of MCS action.		

**2009-01: RECORD OF FISHING VESSELS (RFV)**

<b>Paragraph C.15: Members (or flag States) with vessels on the Commission RFV or the Interim Register to review their internal actions and measures taken with respect to vessels it has authorized to fish in the Convention Area under paragraph A.1, and report annually to the Commission.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the member or flag State conduct an internal review of actions and measures it has taken pursuant to Paragraph A.1 of this measure, in respect of its flagged vessels authorized and operating in the Convention Area?		
If yes, attach report.		

**2009-03: SWORDFISH**

<b>Paragraph 3: Don't shift effort to areas N of 20S</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did any of the CCM's flagged vessels fish for swordfish in the southwest Pacific N of 20S in the previous calendar year?		
If yes, report catch and effort and identify which vessels fished N of 20S:		

**2009-05: DATA BUOYS**

<b>Paragraph 1: Prohibit vessels from fishing within 1nm of any data buoy in the high seas of the Convention Area</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measures to ensure that its fishing vessels do not interact with or fish within 1nm of any data buoy in the high seas of the Convention Area?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Paragraph 3: Prohibit fishing vessels from taking on board any data buoy unless authorized or requested to do so by the Member or owner responsible for the buoy.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measures to ensure its fishing vessels do not take on board any data buoy unless specifically authorized or requested to do so by the Member or owner responsible for the buoy?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Paragraph 5: Require vessels that become entangled with a data buoy to remove the entangled fishing gear with minimal damage to the data buoy. CCMs are encouraged to require their fishing vessels to report any incidents of entanglement, including identifying information for the data buoy and date, location and nature of the entanglement.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has the CCM adopted any measures to require its fishing vessels that become entangled with a data buoy to record and report the incident and information on efforts to remove the entangled fishing gear with as little damage as possible to the data buoy?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

**2009-06: TRANSHIPMENT**

<b>Paragraph 11 requires CCMs to report on all transshipment activities covered by the Measure, including transshipment that occurs inside EEZs and in ports, and to use the guidelines for reporting contained in Annex II of the CMM</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did any of CCM's vessels engage in transshipment activity anywhere in the Convention Area, or tranship fish caught in the Convention Area outside the Convention Area, in the previous year?		
Attach reports of all CCM vessel's transshipments in the Convention Area, using the information requirements contained in Annex II		

**2010-01: NORTH PACIFIC STRIPED MARLIN**

<b>Paragraph 8: Report on measures taken to implement the reductions in catch and the total catch taken against the established limits</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the CCM implement any measures to reduce their catch of NP Striped Marlin?		
If yes, describe the measure(s) taken or attach relevant document(s).		

**2010-05: SOUTH PACIFIC ALBACORE**

<b>Paragraph 4: Report annually the catch levels of fishing vessels that have taken South Pacific Albacore as a bycatch as well as the number and catch levels of vessels actively fishing for South Pacific albacore in the Convention area south of 20°S.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did any of CCM's vessels take South Pacific Albacore as a bycatch or a target catch in the Convention Area south of 20°S?		
If yes, indicate the catch amount and if target species, indicate the number of vessels actively fishing.	<b>Catch</b>	<b>No. of Vessels</b>

**2010-07: SHARKS**

<b>Paras 1 and 2: Implementation of IPOA and if NPOA applicable, report status</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did the CCM implement the FAO IPOA-Sharks in the previous calendar year?		
Did the CCM adopt an NPOA-Sharks in the previous calendar year?		
If no, indicate the status of development of an NPOA-Sharks:		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement. It is also more of a general information requirement.*

<b>Paragraph 4: Report retained and discarded shark catches in Part 2 Annual Report.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Does CCM have any retained and/or discarded shark catches to report for the previous calendar year?		
If yes, provide catch information	<b>Discards (mt)</b>	<b>Retained (mt)</b>

Annual Report to the Commission – Draft Revised Part 2 Reporting Template (web-based)

PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011

<b>Paragraph 6: Take measures to ensure fishers utilize all retained catches of shark</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Has CCM adopted any new measures in the previous calendar year to require full utilization of retained shark catches?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) or attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Paragraph 7: Implement 5% fin-to-weight ratio</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to implement the 5% fin-to-weight ratio requirement?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

*Note: This would be a one-time only reporting requirement.*

<b>Paragraph 9: Take necessary measures to prohibit vessels from retaining, transshipping, landing or trading of fins harvested in contravention of this CMM</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to control harvesting of shark fins?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Para 10: Take measures to encourage the release of live sharks that are caught incidentally and are not used for food or other purposes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM adopt any measures in the previous calendar year to encourage the live release of incidental shark catches?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Para 12: Report on implementation of this CMM and any alternative measures adopted pursuant to paragraph 11</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Did CCM adopt any alternative measures (to those specified in the CMM) in the previous calendar year for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving and managing sharks within areas of national jurisdiction?		
If yes, briefly describe measure(s) and attach relevant document(s).		

<b>Report on CCM measures adopted for conservation and management of HMFS in areas under national jurisdiction (Art. 23(3))</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
Brief summary of management methods used for Highly Migratory Fish Species (HMFS) in areas under national jurisdiction.	

**2.2 MONITORING AND INSPECTION ACTIVITIES**

The information is to be in a summarized form.

Activity	Frequency/Numbers/% Coverage	Comment
Transshipment inspections		
At-sea inspections		
Port inspections		
Monitoring of trade and domestic distribution of HMFS.		
Inspections of domestic-only vessels		
High seas boardings and inspections of flag vessels.		

**2.3 SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES**

The completion of this section should be in summarized form.

Activity	Frequency	Incidents/CMM Clause	Comment
Seagoing patrols			
Aerial surveillance			

**2.4 INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTION ACTIVITY**

The completion of this section should be in summarized form to the level of detail that domestic requirements allow

Activity	Number	CMM Clause	Reason and summary outcome
Investigations			
Outcomes - penalties or other action			
- No further action			



**TEMPLATE (for reporting on 2011 activities)**  
**ANNUAL REPORT TO THE COMMISSION**  
**1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2011**

**PART 2. MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE**

**2.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES**

Report on CCM steps to implement conservation and management measures in the Convention area (Article 23(2)c)	Implemented: Indicate “yes” or “no” If no, explain why not (Paragraph No.)				Measures in place
CMM 2005-03: Conservation and Management Measure for North Pacific Albacore	(2)	(3)	(4)		
CMM 2006-04: Conservation and Management Measures for Striped Marlin in the South West Pacific	(1)	(4)			
CMM 2007-01: Conservation and Management Measure for the Regional Observer Programme.	(10)	(14(vii))			
CMM 2007-04: Conservation and Management Measure for Mitigating the Impact of Fishing on Seabirds.	(1)	(2)	(1)	(4)	
CMM 2008-01: Conservation and Management Measure for Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna in the WCPO	(9)	(18)	(26)	(42)	(43)
CMM 2008-03: Conservation and Management for Sea Turtles.	(2)				

CMM 2008-04: Conservation and Management Measure to Prohibit the Use of Large Scale Driftnets on the High Seas in the Convention Area.	(2)	(5)							
CMM 2009-01: Record of Fishing Vessels and Authorization to Fish	(C.15)								
CMM 2009-03: Conservation and Management for Swordfish.	(3)								
CMM 2009-05: Conservation and Management Prohibiting Fishing on Data Buoys	(1)	(3)				(5)			
CMM 2009-06: Conservation and Management on the Regulation of Transshipment	(11)								
CMM 2010-01: Conservation and Management on North Pacific Striped Marlin	(8)								
CMM 2010-05: Conservation and Management on South Pacific Albacore	(4)								
CMM 2010-07: Conservation and Management on Sharks	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(12)	

<b>Report on CCM measures adopted for conservation and management of HMFS in areas under national jurisdiction (Art. 23(3))</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Brief summary of management methods used for Highly Migratory Fish Species (HMFS) in areas under national jurisdiction.	Attach copies or provide links to national legislation and regulations, or any updates if already provided.

## 2.2 MONITORING AND INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

The information is to be in a summarized form.

Activity	Frequency/Numbers/% Coverage	Comment
Transshipment inspections		
At-sea inspections		
Port inspections		Include investigations and outcomes
Monitoring of trade and domestic distribution of HMFS.		
Inspections of domestic-only vessels		
High seas boardings and inspections of flag vessels.		Report observation of alleged violations, including any proceedings instituted and sanctions applied.

## 2.3 SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES

The completion of this section should be in summarized form.

Activity	Frequency (Days/Hours)	Incidents/CMM Clause	Comment
Seagoing patrols			
Aerial surveillance			

## 2.4 INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTION ACTIVITY

The completion of this section should be in summarized form to the level of detail that domestic requirements allow

Activity	Number	CMM Clause	Reason and summary outcome
Investigations			
Outcomes – penalties or other action			
- No further action			