|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 07**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | Each CCM of the Commission shall ensure that fishing vessels fishing in the Convention Area, except for vessels that operate exclusively within waters under the national jurisdiction of the flag State, are prepared to accept an observer from the Commission ROP if required by the Commission. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement: ensure that vessels fishing in the CA, except for vessels that operate exclusively within waters under the national jurisdiction of the flag State, are prepared to accept an observer from the Commission ROP if required by the Commission. |  | YES (fully implemented) | The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) has the power to request to place an observer on a boat at any time under both the Management Plan and the conditions of the Statutory Fishing Rights in the ETBF. This would also give AFMA the power to place an ROP observer on a vessel (the relevant provisions have been provided to the Secretariat). (CMR 2010 & 2011) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | Belize is currently awaiting the passing of its new high seas fishing Act which is named the Aquatic Living Resources Bill.  After the passing of this new Bill which will constitute the legal framework for the implementation of an observer program and other measures, Belize will collaborate with established organization Cap Fish, whose observer pool shall be utilized.   Belize state in 2011 CMR: “While we do not have any reservations to have WCPFC ROP Observers on our Belize vessels, we only have one (1) vessel that operate in the overlap area of IATTC and WCPFC. As no agreement has been signed between the two RFMOs regarding the management of the area. We would hope that the commission would consider delaying the compliance of this requirement until this matter is settled or the Secretariat can advise us how to proceed in this case" | **No issues detected** |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | All national measures for observers are contained in the Marine Resources Act 2005 (sections 57-58) and in the terms and conditions of the vessel license and/or in any applicable access agreement | **No issues detected** |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | Each tuna purse seine vessel is required by the Government to have observer from ROP before leaving port for fishing. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Ecuador |  | N/A | Complementary regulations of IATTC | **No issues detected** |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fiji is prepared to accept observers from the Commission ROP on its vessels whenever required by the Commission. Fiji also actively participates in sub-regional arrangements such as US Treaty and FSM Arrangement.   Under Fiji's licensing and high seas authorisation, it is an obligation of all Fiji fishing vessels to accept observers as and when required | **No issues detected** |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Under the PNA 3IA and the FSM Marine Resource Act 2002 Section 404: (3) the operator shall:  (a) accept the Authority's authorized observers;  (b) provide any authorized observer, while on  board the vessel, at no expense, with officer level accommodations, food and medical facilities;  (c) meet the following costs of the authorized  observer:  (i) full travel costs to and from the  vessel;  (ii) salary; and  (iii) full insurance coverage; | **No issues detected** |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia already implemented through Ministry Regulation No. 12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Seas | **No issues detected** |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fisheries Agency of Japan has an authority to require Japanese fishing vessels to accept ROP observers (2010 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) | Korea requires its fishing vessels to carry caring ROP observer if required by RFMO (2010 & 2011 CMR)   Korean flagged vessels in the WCPFC-CA have only regional observers onboard (AR Pt 2, 2013) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Condition for licensing vessels | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | New Zealand received accreditation for the New Zealand Observer Programme to be a part of the WCPFC ROP on 25 June 2009. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Panama |  | N/A |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | All PNG licensed vessels that fish inside or outside the waters under PNG jurisdiction require observers to be placed on-board as a condition of their license. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fisheries Observers are deployed on purse seine and ring net vessels operating within Philippine EEZ since 2010. This is in line with the implementation of WCPFC Conservation and Management Measures (CMM 2008-01) and the Philippine Fisheries Administrative Order 236 entitled “Rules and Regulations on the Operations of Purse Seine and Ring Net Vessels Using Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) locally known as Payaos during the FAD Closure Period as Compatible Measures to WCPFC CMM 2008- 01” in order to check and validate the reduction of catch on bigeye and other tuna species by reducing the net depths of the inspected and accredited cooperating Philippine flagged vessels operating in the Philippine EEZ. | **No issues detected** |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | Effective April 2010 the U.S. published regulations regarding observer requirements (50 CFR Part 300). All U.S. regulations can be found under www.ecfr.gov. | **No issues detected** |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | yes, in  our case, we work with the Observer program of KIribati   The vessels carry 100% onboard observers on all the trips.  They carry one observer from IATTC and WCPFC (Kiribati) program.  El Salvador doesn't have a Observer program, we use the Kiribati's observer program (AR Pt 2, 2013) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  | **Need additional informatio** |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have adopted measures to require our fishing vessels fishing in the Convention Area, except for vessels that fish exclusively in our national waters to be prepared to accept an observer from the Commission ROP. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | 59 placements on Locally based Longliners Vanuatu Maintains a 100% observer coverage on All Vanuatu Flagged Carriers   There is a 100% observer coverage policy on all locally based foreign fishing vessels plus a 100% coverage policy on all domestic offloadings and transhipments   Vanuatu flagged purse seiners have 100% observer coverage in compliance with PNA requirements | **No issues detected** |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | When fishing in WCPFC Convention area, including in the overlap area, EU vessels carry on board a WCPFC Observer from the PNA Programme (Kiribati). The observer coverage is in accordance with the relevant CMMs. In addition, in 2012, both WCPFC (PNA) and IATTC observers were present on board when EU vessels fish across the Pacific and/or in the overlap area to avoid any loopholes. Each observer records only within his respective Convention area. To date, according to EU experience, neither the Captain of the observed vessel, nor the Flag state have received any copy of an observer or debriefer compliance report for review, for comments or for information as foreseen in this CCM. | **No issues detected** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 09**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | CCMs shall source observers for their vessels as determined by the Commission. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement: CCMs shall source observers for their vessels as determined by the Commission. |  | YES (fully implemented) | The WCPFC has accredited Australia’s National Scientific Observer Program in accordance with the WCPFC’s Regional Observer Programme. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Cook Islands National Observers are trained in collaboration with and under the standards set by SPC and FFA. | **No issues detected** |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | Each tuna purse seiner has observer on board before leaving port for fishing. No observer from China has been deployed on China-flagged tuna purse seine vessels as currently all such observers are from PNA countries, therefore we are not able to provide observer data to the Commission | **No issues detected** |  |
| Ecuador |  | N/A | MOU WCPFC - IATTC | **No issues detected** |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fiji is prepared to accept observers from the Commission ROP on its vessels whenever required by the Commission.   Under Fiji's licensing and high seas authorisation, it is an obligation of all Fiji fishing vessels to accept observers as and when required | **No issues detected** |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | FSM-flagged vessels source observers from the RMI, pursuant to a bilateral arrangement between the FSM and RMI. FSM national observers are not allowed to be placed on FSM-flagged vessels (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Indonesia |  | NO (not implemented) | Indonesia advised in AR Pt 2, 2013 that the national measure to implement CMM 2007-01 is in Ministry Regulation No.12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Sesas | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | PS observers are sourced from SIDS ROP (2010 & 2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) | Korean flagged vessels in the Convention Area have only regional observers onboard | **No issues detected** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | 100% coverage on PS. Reciprocal arrangement with FSM (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | New Zealand sources its observers for the tropical purse seine fleet from the Kiribati observer program | **No issues detected** |  |
| Panama |  | N/A |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | PNG has over 200 active observes and can adequately source observers internally for ROP trips. Requirement for non-national observers except when vessels operate principally in coastal waters but venture occasionally onto the HS or waters of a neighbouring State | **No issues detected** |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fisheries Administrative Order Number 240 Series of 2012 provides for the Rules on Fisheries Observers on board Philippine flagged fishing vessels that fish into the high seas. It also indicates that Fisheries Observers shall also be put in place in waters under its jurisdiction in stages. | **No issues detected** |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | The U.S. was granted Interim Authorization of its Pacific Islands Regional Office Observer Program on 7 March 2009, effective 1 March 2009, and was granted authorization of its Pacific Islands Regional Office Observer Program in December 2010. As of 2009, when the U.S. was granted interim authorization, the U.S. has used its program to implement its obligations under the CMM. | **No issues detected** |  |
| El Salvador |  | N/A | The vessels carry 100% onboard observers on all the trips.  They carry one observer from IATTC and WCPFC (KIRIBATI) program | **No issues detected** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have submitted monthly observer deployment reports to the Secretariat so as to implement this paragraph. We have stipulated measures to require our fishing vessels fishing in the CA, except for vessels that fish exclusively in our waters to be prepared to accept observer from the Commission ROP. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | as above.  In addition 2011 CMR states ROP observers utilized | **No issues detected** |  |
| European Union |  | N/A | as above (CMM 2001-01 p.07) | **No issues detected** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 10**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | CCMs shall explain to the vessel captain, observer duties relevant to appropriate  measures adopted by the Commission. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement: CCMs shall explain to the vessel captain, observer duties relevant to appropriate measures |  | YES (fully implemented) | This is implemented through the general conditions placed on all holders of Statutory Fishing Rights in the ETBF (the relevant conditions have been provided to the Secretariat). (CMR 2010 & 2011) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | All relevant compliance issues are notified to our vessel owners and operators through legally binding fishing circular.  These are required to be kept on board the vessels at all time and random inspections are carried out in which these are audited for compliance.  The master of the vessel is responsible to ensure that these circulars are implemented (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Placement meeting occurs between vessel captain and placement officer. Requires observer and captain to sign a document acknowledging each parties responsibilities. | **No issues detected** |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | China established national observer program since 2001, and well-trained and qualified observer from Shanghai Ocean University were sent thereafter to tuna fishing vessels operating on high seas of WCPFC, ICCAT, IOTC and IATTC.  The Ministry of Agriculture officially issued in 2010 Public Notice on Observer Deployment, stating that each deepsea fishing company has the obligation to receive observer on board as deployed by the Government.  Necessary assistance must be provided to the observer by the fishing vessel/fishing company.  Failure to receive observer will lead to serious punishment by the Government. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fiji carries out pre-placement procedures prior to an observers placement upon a fishing vessel. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | When placing observers, FSM requires vessel operators/captains to sign a “placement form” acknowledging they are aware of their responsibilities to the observers (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia advised in AR Pt 2, 2013 that the national measure to implement CMM 2007-01 is in Ministry Regulation No.12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Seas | **No issues detected** |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | WCPFC CMMs, including ROP CMM, are explained to captains through industry group (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) | Guidelines provided and training sessions to fishermen (2010 CMR) The Korean government translated new CMMs into Korean and compiled those with the CMMs adopted in the past to distribute to vessel owners, operators, crews and fish receivers (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Conducted during observer placement meetings (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Information provided to the fishing companies | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | This is standard practice for all NZ vessel operators (and skippers) with observers embarked both domestic and international. Failure to do so is a direct breach of the NZ FA(96) section 252(3) and attracts significant fines of up to 250K. If any issues relating to obstruction of observers on NZ flagged vessels are detected during debrief then this is followed up by the NZ authorities and dealt with as soon as practically possible. (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Panama |  | N/A |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | The roles and duties of the observer are explained during observer placement and during Compulsory Inspections prior to licence issuance. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | During the briefing process vessels captain is oriented with regards to observer duties. | **No issues detected** |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | Effective April 2010 the U.S. published regulations regarding observer requirements (50 CFR Part 300). During observer placements vessel captains are informed about the observer duties as well as the captain and crew obligations. All U.S. regulations can be found under www.ecfr.gov. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Observer Coordinator briefs captain, observers duty on board vessels before placement onboard starts. | **No issues detected** |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | El Salvador doesn't have a Observer program, we use the Kiribati's Observer Program (AR Pt 2, 2013) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We stipulated measures to require our fishing vessels fishing in the Convention Area, except for vessels that fish exclusively in our waters to be prepared to accept an observer from the Commission ROP. Observer duties relevant to appropriate measures are included in those measures. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | The National Observer placement agreement  provides for the signature of the vessels master to confirm understanding of observer duties! | **No issues detected** |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | CMM 2007-01 as such has been notified to the national autorities of the EU member States and this notification in EU law constitutes an obligation for compliance with the measure (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 14 vii)**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | The Commission ROP shall operate in accordance with the following principles:  The Commission ROP shall be operated to ensure that observers shall not be unduly obstructed in the discharge of their duties. To this extent, CCMs of the Commission shall ensure that vessel operators comply with the Guidelines in Annex B — Guidelines for the Rights and Responsibilities of Vessel Operators, Captains and Crew. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement: CCMs shall ensure that vessel operators comply with the Guidelines in Annex B- Guidelines for the Rights and Responsibilities of Vessel Operators, Captains and Crew. |  | YES (fully implemented) | This is implemented through the general conditions placed on all holders of Statutory Fishing Rights in the ETBF (the relevant conditions have been provided to the Secretariat). (CMR 2010 & 2011) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | All relevant compliance issues are notified to our vessel owners and operators through legally binding fishing circular.  These are required to be kept on board the vessels at all time and random inspections are carried out in which these are audited for compliance.  The master of the vessel is responsible to ensure that these circulars are implemented (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Observer and captain sign a document acknowledging each parties responsibilities. Observer duties and responsibilities are clearly articulated in the terms and conditions of the licence and/or and applicable access agreement. | **No issues detected** |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | The Ministry of Agriculture officially issued in 2010 Public Notice on Observer Deployment, stating that each deepsea fishing company has the obligation to receive observer on board as deployed by the Government.  Necessary assistance must be provided to the observer by the fishing vessel/fishing company.  Failure to receive observer will lead to serious punishment by the Government | **No issues detected** |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) | N/A | **No issues detected** |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fiji carries out pre-placement procedures prior to an observers placement upon a fishing vessel where the rights and responsibilities of the captain and crew are explained. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | When placing observers, FSM requires vessel operators/captains to sign a “placement form” acknowledging they are aware of their responsibilities to the observers (2011 CMR) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia already implemented through Ministry Regulation No. 12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Seas | **No issues detected** |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Guidelines provided to the fishing companies | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | This is outlined in the HSFP | **No issues detected** |  |
| Panama |  | N/A |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | The roles and duties of the observer are explained during observer placement and during Compulsory Inspections prior to licence issuance. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | During the briefing process vessels captain is oriented with regards to observer duties. | **No issues detected** |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | Effective April 2010 the U.S. published regulations regarding observer requirements (50 CFR Part 300). During observer placements vessel captains are informed about the observer duties as well as the captain and crew obligations. All U.S. regulations can be found under . | **No issues detected** |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | El Salvador doesn't have a Observer program, we use the Kiribati's Observer Program (AR Pt 2, 2013) | **No issues detected** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  | Need additional information |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We stipulated domestic regulation to require vessel operators not to obstruct observers from performing their duties. | **No issues detected** |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | Observer placement agreements signed by the Vessels Master to confirm compliance with guidlines. | **No issues detected** |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | as above (CMM 2007-01 p.10) | **No issues detected** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 Att K, Annex C 04**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | Implementation programme for the Regional Observer Programme  No later than 31 December 2008:   * Existing sub-regional programmes and national programmes shall be regarded as a part of the ROP, and shall continue unless otherwise determined by the Commission. * Data obtained through these observer programmes shall be submitted to the Commission and shall be considered Commission data. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Observer Provider Requirement:  No later than 31 Dec 2008: data obtained through these observer programmes shall be submitted to the Commission and shall be considered Commission data |  | YES (fully implemented) | The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) Observer Program monitored 406,827 hooks in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery in 2012. 6.2% of total number of hooks deployed by domestic longliners. There was no Australian purse seine activity in 2012.                                            AR Pt 1: Historically, the vast majority of the catch and effort by Australian longliners has been taken within the AFZ, with little effort on the adjacent high seas (Table 4, shows 99% of effort in number of hooks was within this CCMs EEZ (65 hooks or 1% of effort was in high seas)     *SPC advised that no observer data for longline trips by this CCMs flagged vessels during 2012 have been received to date (as at 16 July 2012).                                 There were no Australian purse seine vessels that fished in 2012, and although there were some longline vessels that were reported to have fished beyond this CCMs area under national jursidiction, the level of effort was estimated to be 65 hooks. On this basis no issues detected* | No issues detected |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | Belize is currently awaiting the passing of its new high seas fishing Act which is named the Aquatic Living Resources Bill. After the passing of this new Bill which will constitute the legal framework for the implementation of an observer program and other measures etc. Belize will collaborate with established organization Cap Fish, whose observer pool shall be utilized.    *As mentioned in our attached Annual Part 1 report, we do not currently have any at-sea observer programmes but are willing to cooperate and make use of any pool of observers which will be set up by WCPFC. To further control our vessels, we have now implemented a transhipment moratorium under measure FVC-13-11. This moratorium will apply to all fishing vessels in the WCPFC area until we have finalized negotiations with WCPFC on joining their ROP.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | All Cook Islands Observers are accredited with FFA/SPC. All observer data is provided to the WCPFC Science Provider (SPC/OFP)   SPC advised that observer data for 2 longline trips by this CCMs flagged vessels during 2012 have been received to date (as at 16 July 2013). | No issues detected |  |
| China |  | NO (not implemented) | AR Pt 2:No observer from China has been deployed on China-flagged tuna purse vessles as currently all such observers are from PNA countries, therefore we are not able to provide observer data to the Commission.   AR Pt 2: Qualified observers from Shanghai Ocean Unversity were sent to Chinese longliners in 2012 to meet the5% coverage requirement.   LONGLINE = SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 1429 were the total estimated ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012, and 4 ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage= 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]    *Information on observers for longline fisheries was submitted to the Commission on July 16 in AR1, which includes the area coverage, duration of the trip and the information collected by the observers.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 2013: All Observer data sets from the years 2012 to the years prior have been delivered to the Secretariat for the Pacific Community for further analysis   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 4 ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage level < 0%).  [3 non-ROP trips had been received] [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised | No issues detected |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 was received days before dCMR was finalised.   The NFOP achieved 433 observed trips in 2012 covering longline, pole and line, and purse seine vessels. Of the 433 observer placements, 415 trips were on purse seiners, 18 trips on longlines, and 4 pole and lines (Table 8). The top three flag vessels for observer placement were with Japan at 153, 82 on FSMA vessels, and Chinese Taipei at 70 placements. Observer coverage for the purse seine fleet is 100% for each of the fleets and 5% observer longline coverage began in early 2012.   The FSM observer program provided observers to over five distant water fishing countries in 2012; e.g. Chinese Taipei, USA, China, Japan and the FSMA fleet. The PNA 3rd Implementing Agreement’s, 100% observer coverage requirement results in a greater number of observers being placed on purse seine vessels. Only18 longline placements were made for the entire 2012 period. FSM and RMI continued with a bilateral arrangement for reciprocal placements of observers on their respective vessels. The Reciprocal Arrangement was successfully carried out by both parties to obtain 100% coverage for both countries. A total of 83 observer placements from the FSM NFOP were made for RMI vessels in 2012. Table 8 in AR Pt 1 - reports no longline observer placements on FSM flagged longliners in 2012. | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Indonesia |  | NO (not implemented) |  | **Need additional information** |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.7 reports on Japanese observer programs: PS & LL.  Offshore longline: 32 cruises, 574 operations observed; distant water longline: 4 cruises, 311 operations observed.    LONGLINE = SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 873 were the total estimated ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012, and 5 ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage= 1%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return. This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1: The RMI had yet to establish observer coverage on longline vessels in 2012 thus no interactions available.  . In 2012, all of the 31 active RMI observers were deployed on purse seine vessels covering a provisional total of 108 trips. | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Data from the New Caledonia observer programme provided to the SPC - OFP    AR Pt 1 (pg1): This fleet (New Caledonia longline) operates in the New Caledonian EEZ, and rarely fishes in the adjacent high seas.  In 2012, each of the 19 licensed domestic longliners fished in the New Caledonian EEZ. Similarly to past years there were no foreign vessels licensed or chartered to operate in the New Caledonian EEZ.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 22 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC. (coverage level = 7%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | No issues detected |  |
| Nauru |  | YES (fully implemented) | Nauru has National Observer Program with contributing in Subregional Observer program. Data submission through SPC for Commission. Nauru require more trainings for observers, debriefers funding for data processing positions, equipments scanners, electronic reporting devices such as tablets. | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | Through 100% observer coverage longline vessels targeting southern bluefin tuna (STN), NZ has achieved the required 5% coverage outlined in Attachment K, Annex C, 6     SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 15 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC. (coverage level = 6%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | No issues detected |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Data gathered from the Philippine Fisheries Observer Program are submitted /presented during the WCPFC-SC meetings.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 3 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and no ROP trips or non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]  *Philippines noted this requirement and we will provide the needed data. PH observer program do not cover/place obsevers to PH longline vessels. If observers were placed to these PH longline vessels this could have been provided by ROP of other CCMs. PH do not have access to ROP data of PH longline vessels that are fishing in Kirribati waters. PH needs guidance on how to access these ROP data provided to PH longline vessels.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Palau |  | YES (fully implemented) | in accordance with FFA and PNA Observers requirements. | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Solomon Islands Observer is part of ROP. Observer data obtained are provided to SPC/FFA | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  | SPC advised as at 16 July 2013 that 0 longline ROP trips by this CCMs vessels were estimated to have occurred in 2012.                        [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]                                                        [as an aside SPC reported that 0 non-ROP trips for this CCMs flagged vessels had been received.    ] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | Our national observer programme was interim authorized by the Secretariat in 2009 as part of the WCPFC ROP. Full authorization was granted in 2011. We submitted observer data on 2011.7.7 and 2012.2.1 respectively.    As for longline fishery, we achieved 3.52% observer coverage for 2012. Monthly observer deployment reports have been submitted to the Secretariat. We are working on the difficulties of limited space of small fishing vessel, safety concerns and insufficient qualified observers.   AR Pt 1(2013) (pg 1)In 2012, 37 observers were deployed on the tuna longline fishing vessels operating in the Pacific Ocean. (pg 5-6) In 2012, totaled 26 observation trips were conducted on Large scale TLL vessels. Furthermore, in 2012 the observer program was extended to the Small scale TLL fleets. There were 11 observation trips were conducted on STLL vessels in 2012. All LTLL vessels operate outside the EEZ of Taiwan; most of the STLL vessels operate in the EEZ of Taiwan with some operate on the high seas or in the PICS’ EEZ through relevant agreements.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 1481 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 22 ROP trips had been received at SPC. (coverage level = 1%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | No issues detected |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | The U.S. was granted interim authorization of its Pacific Islands Regional Office Observer Program on 7 March 2009, effective 1 March 2009, and was granted authorization of its Pacific Islands Regional Office Observer Program in December 2010. As of 2009, when the U.S. was granted interim authorization, the U.S. has used the national program to implement its obligations under the CMM. In December 2012 it submitted longline observer data for the first three quarters of 2012. The final quarter of 2012 longline data was submitted in May 2013.   AR Pt 1: Starting on January 1, 2010, the observer coverage rate in the US purse seine fishery in the Convention Area has been 100%. Through an agreement with the FFA, the 100% observer coverage rate was maintained throughout 2010, 2011 and 2012. The data collected under this arrangement by FFA-deployed observers are currently provided directly to the WCPFC.   All US longline vessels are subject to observer placement as a condition of the fishing permits issued by NOAA Fisheries.  Overall, 267 out of 1,309 deep-set trips were observed, as well as all 72 shallow-set trips, resulting in a combined coverage rate of 24.5% for the Hawaii-based longline fishery in 2012 (Table 3).  For the American Samoa-based component of the U.S. longline fishery, 2012 was the sixth full calendar year monitored by observers. The coverage rate was 19.8%--for a total of 24 trips and 662 sets.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 222 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 222 ROP trips had been received at SPC. (coverage level = 200%) [estimates of U.S. trips in their waers of national jurisdiction are currently not available to SPC]   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | No issues detected |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | Data from the national programe is provided to the commission    For the 5% coverage, Vanuatu is targeting its Long Distant Longliners and so far there has been 1% of coverage (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.17)   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 3 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC. (coverage level = 1%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | No issues detected |  |
| European Union |  | N/A | 2011 CMR:  EU is not part of ROP but observers obtained through PNA/Kiribati.  The obligation to submit ROP data to the Commission is not applicable to EU but rather to thse States that have national observer programmes that form part of the WCPFC ROP   AR Pt 1 included a contribution  related to one Portuguese longline vessel that operated in 2012.  In 2012, “ARTICO” fished in the WCPFC‐CA during seven months, corresponding to 143 fishing days (June - Dec 2012).  There was no information provided on Spanish longline vessels.     SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 19 ROP trips for Spanish flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and an unknown number for Portugues flagged longline vessels. 0 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand. It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Need additional information** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-01 Att K, Annex C 06**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | No later than 30 June 2012, CCMs shall achieve 5% coverage of the effort in each fishery under the jurisdiction of the Commission (except for vessels provided for in paras 9 and 10). In order to facilitate the placement of observers the logistics may dictate that this be done on the basis of trips. |

| **CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **Potential issues** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | no later than 30 June 2012 achieve 5% coverage of effort the effort in each fishery under the jurisdiction of the Commission. CMM 2007-01 Att K Annex C defers implementation of the ROP for troll and pole and line vessels.  ROP scope is vessels fishing exclusively on the high seas of the Convention Area; and vessels fishing on the high seas and in the waters under the national jurisdiction of on or more coastal States and vessels fishing in the waters under the jurisdiction of two or more coastal States (CMM 2007-01 para 5). |  | YES (fully implemented) | The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) Observer Program monitored 406,827 hooks in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery in 2012. 6.2% of total number of hooks deployed by domestic longliners. There was no Australian purse seine activity in 2012.                                           AR Pt 1: Historically, the vast majority of the catch and effort by Australian longliners has been taken within the AFZ, with little effort on the adjacent high seas (Table 4, shows 99% of effort in number of hooks was within this CCMs EEZ (65 hooks or 1% of effort was in high seas)   SPC advised that no ROP trips were expected for this CCM, no observer data for longline trips by this CCMs flagged vessels during 2012 have been received to date (as at 16 July 2012).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **No issues detected** |  |
| Belize |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Belize is currently awaiting the passing of its new high seas fishing Act which is named the Aquatic Living Resources Bill. After the passing of this new Bill which will constitute the legal framework for the implementation of an observer program and other measures etc. Belize will collaborate with established organization Cap Fish, whose observer pool shall be utilized.      Belize only has one fishing vessel which operated at 10-15N between April, May and June    SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 had been received, from an estimated total of 2 ROP trips. (coverage level < 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]  *Belize is currently awaiting the passage of its new high seas fishing Act which is named the Aquatic Living Resources Bill. After the passage of this new Bill which will constitute the legal framework for the implementation of an observer program and other measures etc. Belize will collaborate with established organization CapFish, whose observer pool shall be utilized. Until negotiations are finalized in this respect, Belize has implemented a transhipment moratorium through a measure FVC-13-11 where no high seas or at port transhipments will be authorized unless the vessel is under an ROP established by the RFMO.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Cook Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Approximately 10% observer coverage was achieved on all fishing vessels licenced by the Cook Islands.                       AR Pt 2: All Cook Islands Observers are accredited with FFA/SPC. All observer data is provided to the WCPFC Science Provider (SPC/OFP)                                                   AR Pt 1 2013, table 1 b reported that high seas longline effort was 33,745 hooks beyond this CCMs EEZ.                                                       AR Pt 1 2013 page 10: 2012 observer data has been provided to, and is being processed by SPC.                                                              AR Pt 1 2013 page 9: Eighteen Cook Islands flagged vessels were active and authorised to fish within the Convention Area in 2012. Among these, two domestically based vessels were authorised to fish within the Cook Islands area of national jurisdiction and the remaining fifteen vessels were licenced to fish both within the Cook Islands EEZ and the High Seas, though rarely fished beyond the waters of national jurisdiction. Three vessels based in foreign ports were authorised for the High Seas only.    SPC advised that 98 non-ROP trips were expected in 2012 for this CCMs flagged longline vessels and 2 non-ROP observer trips for longline trips by this CCMs flagged vessels during 2012 have been received to date (as at 16 July 2012).  . [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** | **See dCMR\_**  **addInfo\_CK** |
| China |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Qualified observers from Shanghai Ocean Unversity were sent to Chinese longliners in 2012 to met the5% coverage requirement.                              AR Pt 1: From July, 2012 to April 2013, eight (8) observers were trained and dispatched to Chinese longline vessels in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Table 4 Trip information of Chinese scientific observer deployed in the Pacific Ocean during 2012 (8 trips)   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 1429 were the total estimated ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012, and 4 ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage level < 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]                      *During 2012, eight(8) scientific observers for longline fishery were dispatched for the Pacific Ocean. This coverage is approaching 5% and China shall improve national observer programme in the future.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Fiji |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 (pg17): As in Fiji's 2013 Part 1 report, the 2012 observer coverage was 8.5%.  Trips varied from the one to two week vessels fishing primarily in Fiji’s Archipelagic and Territorial waters and on vessel going upwards of three weeks in the Fiji’s EEZ area.  The Fiji National Observer data, once fully debriefed is entered into Fiji’s harmonised observer data summary for further analysis with respect to reporting purposes and compliance or rather noncompliance issues. All Observer data sets from the years 2012 to the years prior have been delivered to the Secretariat for the Pacific Community for further analysis. The Fiji Observer program was, in the year 2012, able to secure funds and implement its first fully funded training program and in the same light, further its only trainee trainer’s certification process.  These observers, having met the criterion of the SPC/FFA PIRFO certification were immediately deployed to long line vessels fishing in Fiji’s EEZ area and the adjacent and surrounding High Seas pockets. AR Pt 1 (pg4)In the year 2012, this Fiji flagged long‐line vessel fleet consisted of a vessel fleet that had a license cap of 70 vessels, 11 of which were chartered fishing vessels. In addition to this, a total of 43 vessels were Fiji flagged and authorised to fish in the High Seas pocket by Fiji, 10 less vessels from the year 2011.   AR Pt 1 (pg 3)The Fiji flagged long line fleet is one that predominantly targets albacore. For the year 2012, approximately 64% of the fishing occurred in Fiji’s waters with 36% in the High Seas pockets. When taking into consideration the overall catches by this fleet, that is to include catches in other EEZs, approximately 26% of the overall catch for this fleet was made in other EEZs, where the Fiji flagged long line vessels are licensed to.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 4 ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage level < 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]  *With little or no progress on the MOUs with other CCMs after 30th June 2012, Fiji has gone ahead and trained more observers to be placed on Fiji flagged vessels operating in the Convention Area achieving an observer coverage of 8.5%. Fiji plans to further increase this coverage by running national training to complement the sub-regional Observer training. In 2012, Fiji conducted one national training and participated in two sub-regional trainings. In the meantime, Fiji welcomes any CCM who is willing to enter into an MOU to share observers. Further to this, Fiji has contributed immensely to the monitoring of vessels operating throughout the WCPO through the treaties and arrangements. Fiji Observers are placed on foreign flagged vessels that come under the US Treaty and FSM Arrangement.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 7 non-ROP trips had been received by SPC (coverage level = 3%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]   AR Pt 1, Table 8 in AR Pt 1 - reports no longline observer placements on FSM flagged longliners in 2012. | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Indonesia |  |  | NO (not implemented) | AR Pt 1 (pg 7): In terms of national observer program, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries has released Regulation Number 01 Year 2013 concerning observer programme. DGCF has organized national observer training since 2006. During 2006 ‐ 2012, Indonesia has trained 58 persons of ex‐fishing vessel crew and 34 government employees. This training program was financed by Indonesia Government, OFCF‐Japan, and Japan Trust Fund. On 2012, Indonesia has deployed 14 observers for 14 fishing vessels on November 2012.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 16 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and no ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Japan |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 (pg 8): The observer program for longline in the WCP-CA started in 2008. The information of fishing vessels, fishing operations and almost all the catches in each operation were identified and measured as much as observer can. Six cruises of distant water longline vessels and 32 cruises of small offshore longline vessels were observed in the 2012 calendar year. The data from 4 distant water cruises and 32 small offshore cruises were inputted to the database and the remaining data will be inputted soon. The number of operations which was recorded by the observers ranged from 2 to 26 in the small offshore longline vessels and 72 to 113 in the distant water longlines. The total number of catches which was recorded by each observer ranged from 163 to 858 individuals and 1,014 to 10,600 individuals, respectively (Table 9). Offshore longline: 32 cruises, 574 operations observed; distant water longline: 4 cruises, 311 operations observed.     SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 873 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 5 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level < 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  | SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and no ROP or non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]   AR Pt 1: three longline vessels namely Teraka no.8, Teraka no. 18 and Teraka no.28 actively fish in the WCPFC Convention area | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Achieved 5% coverage in terms of the effort in long line fishery by having observers sourced from PNA national obserber program on board for over 1,740days by June 2012.   AR Pt 1 (pg 7): The high-seas and within the coastal states in the South Pacific have been the main fishing grounds for Korean longline fishery and purse seine fishery as well. There was a sort of change in the longline fishing operation types. Longline vessels used foreign ports for fishing base near the fishing grounds from the beginning but they has gradually equipped with deep freezing facilities and used use home ports for fishing base since 1972. All longline vessels have based domestic ports since 1999.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 254 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 5 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 2%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **No issues detected** |  |
| Marshall Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 0 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 0 ROP and non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]   AR Pt 1: four longline vessels which typically fished within the RMI EEZ north of the equator | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| New Caledonia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Coverage by the New Caledonia observer programme in 2012: 6.5%.   AR Pt 1 (pg5) In 2012, 22 trips were observed by 6 observers onboard 13 vessels of the domestic companies, representing 292 days at sea and almost 10 660 fish observed. Over this period of time the observer activity covered about 6.5 % of all the longline sets. The detailed data from this activity are provided in table 4 in annex.   AR Pt 1 (pg1): This fleet (New Caledonia longline) operates in the New Caledonian EEZ, and rarely fishes in the adjacent high seas.  In 2012, each of the 19 licensed domestic longliners fished in the New Caledonian EEZ. Similarly to past years there were no foreign vessels licensed or chartered to operate in the New Caledonian EEZ.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 22 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 7%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **No issues detected** |  |
| New Zealand |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Through 100% observer coverage longline vessels targeting southern bluefin tuna (STN), NZ has achieved the required 5% coverage outlined in Attachment K, Annex C, 6     SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 15 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 6%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **No issues detected** |  |
| Philippines |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 3 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and no ROP trips or non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]   *Philippines would like to clarify that based on records we have 24 longline vessels registered and 4 have fished for 2012. Philippines do not have access to the ROP data provided to these PH-LL vessels.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  | RFV: 6 longline vessels and 1 purse seine vessel flagged to Tuvalu. AR Pt 1 (pg 3): In 2012 Tuvalu government still maintain its joint ventures from previous years. The number of Tuvaluan flagged fishing vessels remains at 7. All these 7 boats fish in the Tuvalu EEZ as well as waters of neighboring countries from Marshall Islands, PNG, Nauru, Kiribati and Fiji.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and no ROP trips or non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have achieved 100% observer coverage in purse seine fishery. As for longline fishery, we achieved 3.52% observer coverage for 2012. Monthly observer deployment reports have been submitted to the Secretariat. We are working on the difficulties of limited space of small fishing vessel, safety concerns and insufficient qualified observers.   AR Pt 1(2013) (pg 1)In 2012, 37 observers were deployed on the tuna longline fishing vessels operating in the Pacific Ocean. (pg 5-6) In 2012, totaled 26 observation trips were conducted on Large scale TLL vessels. Furthermore, in 2012 the observer program was extended to the Small scale TLL fleets. There were 11 observation trips were conducted on STLL vessels in 2012.  All LTLL vessels operate outside the EEZ of Taiwan; most of the STLL vessels operate in the EEZ of Taiwan with some operate on the high seas or in the PICS’ EEZ through relevant agreements.   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 1481 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 22 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 1%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised]   AR Pt 2 2012 - Chinese Taipei provided a plan for meeting 5% coverage   *We would like to advise that the definition of small is still pending. We therefore follow our plan to gradually address the limited space of small fishing vessel and the safety concerns. We seek cooperation with other observer providers to have more qualified observer deployed on our fishing vessels and to have access to more observer data. In addition, we would like to work with other stakeholders to work on the Electronic Observer Project to address the above-mentioned difficulties related to small fishing vessel.* | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| United States of America |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | The U.S. purse seine fleet in 2012 operated under 100% observer coverage. The longline fleet is divided into a shallow set component, which operates under 100% observer coverage, and a deep set component which in 2012 operated under a 19.8% coverage for the American Samoa longline fleet and a 20.4% observer coverage for the Hawaii longline fleet.    SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 222 ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 222 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 200%) [estimates of U.S. trips in their waers of national jurisdiction are currently not available to SPC]   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **No issues detected** |  |
| Vanuatu |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | The national licensed fishing fleet is based overseas and thus there is a contraint in fundings and logistic in the implementation of the provision.   For the 5% coverage, Vanuatu is targeting its Long Distant Longliners and so far there has been 1% of coverage (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.17)   SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: no ROP trips for this CCM’s flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and 3 non-ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 1%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |
| European Union |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 included a contribution  related to one Portuguese longline vessel that operated in 2012.  In 2012, “ARTICO” fished in the WCPFC‐CA during seven months, corresponding to 143 fishing days (June - Dec 2012).  There was no information provided on Spanish longline vessels.     SPC advised that as at 16 July 2013: 19 ROP trips for Spanish flagged longline vessels in 2012 were expected, and an unknown number for Portugues flagged longline vessels.  0 ROP trips had been received at SPC.  (coverage level = 0%).   [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | **Potential compliance issue** |  |