

**3rd Meeting of the Compliance and Technical Committee
Valdivia, Chile, 21 to 23 January 2016**

COMM-04-07; Annex 2

Provisional Compliance Report

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| 1.04 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The Secretariat did not receive an acknowledgement from the Russian Federation regarding inclusion of the FV MYS MARIU into the 2015 draft IUU List.</p> <p>The Secretariat did not receive an implementation report from the Russian Federation and is therefore unable to assess whether the Russian Federation has applied paragraphs 5, 11 and 12 concerning notification of owners, and measures taken to eliminate IUU activities, (with respect to the Final 2015 IUU List which includes the Russian Federation flagged vessel "AURORA").</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The CTC noted that this was the second time that Russia has had a vessel on the IUU list, and that the CTC should consider a rating of priority non-compliant.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant against Paragraph 2(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |
| 2.03 | EU | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>An EU vessel (FV ARTICO) conducted unauthorised bottom fishing activities in the SPRFMO Area during November 2014.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The EU has undertaken bottom fishing activities within the period 2004-2006 referred to in Paragraph 8 (c) of CMM 2.03 which potentially could entitle the EU to undertake bottom fishing activities in the Convention Area. However formally speaking the EU has not yet established a bottom fishing footprint in accordance to the procedure of paragraph 8 (a) of CMM 2.03. This is also the case for the alternative procedure established in paragraphs 16 to 20 of CMM 2.03. Therefore the EU is not currently authorised to undertake bottom fishing activities in the Convention Area.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant against Paragraph 2(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>In this regard, in relation with the activities of FV Artico in 2014, the EU has conducted an inquiry which confirmed that FV Artico undertook bottom fishing activities in the SPRFMO Convention Area in 2014 (July-November). As a result of this, the 2015 fishing license of FV Artico for SPRFMO has been withdrawn and no license will be granted for 2016. Moreover, the European Commission has adopted an Action Plan in concert with Portugal in order to improve their control system, notably in regard to the chain of control and the inspection and infringements regime.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: The EU confirmed that the FV Artico undertook bottom fishing activities in 2014 before EU had established a bottom fishing footprint as per requirements of CMM2.03. After being notified of the activities, the EU conducted an investigation and withdrew the FV Artico's fishing licence for 2015 and 2016. The EU explained that it had provided all relevant information to the Secretariat including VMS tracks and catches of the FV Artico, but acknowledged that this was late due to the Artico investigation.</p> <p>The EU and Portugal have adopted an action plan to improve processes in all steps of dealing with MCS and infringements. The action plan aims to strengthen the capacity of a State to control and follow up infringements. This action plan applies more broadly than just for issues relating to FV Artico.</p> | implementation of obligations. |
| 2.03 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>An unauthorised vessel (FV MYS MARI; not included in the SPRFMO Vessel Record) flagged to the Russian Federation conducted bottom fishing activities in the SPRFMO Area during February 2015. The vessel has been included in the SPRFMO Draft IUU List.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The Russian Representative at the CTC submitted an official statement according to which the Russian Federation was in the process of investigating this case but the case was not yet concluded. Russian Federation informed the meeting that the</p> | <p>Priority Non-Compliant with Para 8(c).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>investigation might take another two or three months. He assured the CTC that Russia had withdrawn the vessel's licence to fish until the investigations were finalised and that the vessel was not currently fishing.</p> <p>Russia asked that a decision to include the MYS MARII in the SPRFMO IUU list be deferred to the next CTC meeting when Russia would be able to offer more information. Some Members voiced concerns with a deferral of the SPRFMO decision and other Members requested further information on the vessel owner, the history of the vessel and the fishing authorisations held by the vessel.</p> | |
| 2.04 | Australia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Australia only achieved 85% observer coverage for bottom trawls during the 2013/14 reporting period and this may impact the exemption from applying the mitigation measures stipulated in Para 2 of Annex 2.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Australia applies the following seabird mitigation measures for vessels consistent with Annex 1 and Annex 2 of CMM 2.04:</p> <p>For longline fishing Australia prohibits the discharge of biological material during shooting and hauling and requires all vessels to use bird scaring lines. As Australia has maintained more than 10% observer coverage level for at least the last five years with a seabird mortality rate of less than 0.01 birds/1000 hooks, only one mitigation measure is required.</p> <p>Australian trawl vessels have recorded observed seabird mortality of less than one mortality per vessel per year, which is below the trigger threshold.</p> <p>However, owing to the fact that Australia did not achieve the required 100% observer coverage for trawl vessels in 2014; it will not be exempt from applying the measures outlined in para 1 of annex 2 to Australian flagged trawl vessels opting in the Area until it can meet the conditions of para 2, annex 2.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>AU stated that they considered that, within the reporting period, they were compliant with requirements of CMM 2.04, but acknowledged that they did not achieve 100% observer coverage in 2014 and would therefore not be exempt from additional requirements in accordance with Annex 2 to CMM 2.04.</p> | <p>Not assessed – Annex 1 para 1.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>The EU presented a different reading of the 5 year requirement for 100% observer coverage in that this requirement only comes into force from the start of when the measure comes into force (in the case of CMM 2.04 this is 31 July 2015). The EU stated that a requirement to implement a measure before the date it is in force causes legal uncertainties.</p> <p>Members agreed that compliance could not be assessed against this paragraph until the issue was clarified. To this end, the CTC recommends to the Commission that the following amendment be made to that paragraph:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Where a Member or CNCP has maintained spatially and temporally appropriate observer coverage for the previous 5 or more consecutive the previous 5 or more consecutive years at levels greater than 10% and recorded a seabird mortality rate less than 0.01 birds/ 1000 hooks, that Member may choose to:”.</p> <p>The CTC further recommends that if this amendment is adopted by the Commission Australia should be marked compliant with this paragraph.</p> | |
| 2.04 | China | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>China’s annual report submitted for SC-03 did not contain a section on seabird mitigation and interactions.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>According to the information fed back from the fishing vessel and the observer on board, they didn’t find the case that the trawling accidentally caught seabird. So it is neglected in the annual national science report. China will add a section on seabird mitigation and interactions in the next year national science report.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>China reported that they understand that their vessels did not discharge biological material and therefore the vessels are exempt from using mitigation measures under CMM2.04, but needed to confirm with industry on discharging biological materials. Additionally, China reported that CMM2.04 does not apply to squid fisheries and should be assessed as not applicable in relation to compliance measures in the compliance report.</p> <p>China reported that their vessels did not any catch seabirds but acknowledged that China did not report this in National report and will ensure this is reported next year.</p> <p>The CTC reminded Members and CNCPs that there is an obligation to report on seabird interactions, even in cases where there are no interactions as a ‘nil’ report still conveys important information.</p> | <p>Non-Compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| 2.04 | Korea | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Korea's annual report did not report specifically on seabird mitigation measures nor observed seabird interaction data.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Korean fishing vessels deployed streamer lines during operation to mitigate the incidental mortality of seabirds. Observers' reports indicate that the vessels did not have any interactions with seabirds.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Korea acknowledged that they reported information on interactions (of which there were none) through observer reports but not the national report to the SC. Korea stated that they had learned from this process and will reflect information in future annual reports.</p> | <p>Non-Compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.04 | New Zealand | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>New Zealand's annual report did not report specifically on seabird mitigation measures nor observed seabird interaction data.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>New Zealand agrees that we are non-compliant with paragraph 8 of CMM 2.04, next year's SC report will be modified to include information on seabird mitigation measures used and interactions observed</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>New Zealand acknowledged that it had mistakenly only included information on mitigation measures and observed seabird interaction data in observer report and not their national report to the SC. NZ stated they will accept a non-compliance rating for this.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.04 | Peru | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Peru's annual report did not report specifically on seabird mitigation measures nor observed seabird interaction data.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>According to reports from observers IMARPE aboard the trawler fleet midwater operating in the Convention of SPRFMO is not registered interactions with seabirds, so it did not include any comment on the National Report and also, for the moment, has not been necessary to apply any mitigation measure.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Peru recognised that they had overlooked the commitment to report specifically on seabird measures and seabird interaction data in the annual report to SC. Peru noted they did not have any interactions to report. Peru further explained that they require 100% coverage on all vessels operating in the convention area and no mortalities were reported by observers. Peru stated that they will include a paragraph on seabird observations in the future.</p> | including gaps in implementation. |
| 2.04 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The Russian Federation did not submit an implementation report and hence the secretariat is unable to assess whether paragraphs 7 and 8 have been applied during 2014/15.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Russia stated that they would take steps to improve the situation.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.04 | Vanuatu | <p>Issue: Vanuatu did not deploy any observers during the 2014/15 period. Vanuatu's annual report did not report specifically on seabird mitigation measures nor observed seabird interaction data.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Vanuatu commented that in 2016 observers will be required to record seabird interactions in 2016 and that there were not observers in 2015 due to Cyclone Pam destruction.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The destruction caused in Vanuatu by Category 5 Cyclone Pam in March 2015 and the subsequent redeployment of many public servants to disaster relief and recovery efforts resulted in delays in reporting and the absence of observers on Vanuatu vessels.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 8.</p> <p>No further action.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| 2.04 | Chinese Taipei | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei's annual report did not report specifically on seabird mitigation measures nor observed seabird interaction data.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The vessels of Chinese Taipei currently operating in the Convention Area are not using either demersal longline or trawl gear. This CMM is not applicable to Chinese Taipei.</p> <p>In addition, Chinese Taipei has only conducted squid jigging in the Area. Due to the fishing pattern of squid jigging, there was no information about non-target species bycatch</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei stated that this information was in their Annual report to the SC and their assessment is that they are compliant with this requirement.</p> <p>Chinese Taipei explained that its vessels only conducted squid jigging in the Convention Area and therefore this CMM is not applicable and due to the fishing pattern of squid jigging, there was no information about non-target species bycatch.</p> <p>The CTC identified that CMM 2.04 is unclear in terms of its application to squid jigging and recommend that this measure should be revised in order to clarify this issue.</p> | Compliant (not applicable). |
| 2.05 | Chile | <p>Issue:</p> <p>All 12 of Chile's revoked authorisations during the 2014/15 period were notified late.</p> <p>Chile has provided images for 56% of its authorised vessels.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Administrative arrangements have been made to avoid future delays in the reporting of new or revoked authorisations.</p> <p>New images of Chilean authorised vessels have been provided to the Executive Secretariat. Currently, photographs of starboard, port and stern have been provided for 65% (123 vessels) of the Chilean authorised vessel. At least one photograph</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 5 and 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>has been provided for 5% (9 vessels) of the Chilean authorised vessel. The remaining photographs will be soon provided to the Executive Secretariat.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Chile acknowledged that they had submitted the reports of revoked authorisations late and that it has made arrangements to avoid delays in reporting in future. Chile also stated that they are Improving their systems to get all vessel photographs to the Secretariat as soon as possible.</p> | |
| 2.05 | China | <p>Secretariat assessment:</p> <p>China has provided images for 10% of its authorised vessels.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>There are hundreds of China's authorised vessels fishing in SPRFMO Convention Area. It needs time to collect images of all the vessels, as many of them are fishing on sea throughout the year and there is not possibility to take images of them on sea. China will try the best to collect all the images of the China flagged vessels in SPRFMO records as soon as we can.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>China commented that due to the large numbers of authorised Chinese vessels in the SPRFMO area, this is a difficult task, but that it will try to collect and record the images as soon as it can.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 5.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.05 | EU | <p>Secretariat assessment:</p> <p>The EU communicated information concerning the <i>Pacific's</i> revoked authorisation one month late.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The EU acknowledges some delays in the submission/revocation of authorisations. They are working with the relevant national administrations to address this issue and avoid its repetition in the future.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 8.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| | | The EU acknowledged the delay of reporting this, and other reporting obligations, and commented that it is working with the relevant national administrations to improve systems and flow of information to avoid delays in the future. The EU noted however that it did transmit all data required. | |
| 2.05 | Korea | <p>Secretariat assessment:</p> <p>Korea has submitted images for 26% of its authorised vessels. Note the images do include the 7 that were actually fishing in the SPRFMO Convention Area.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments regarding vessel images were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.05.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 5.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.05 | New Zealand | <p>Secretariat assessment:</p> <p>New Zealand has not submitted any vessel images.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>All photos of NZ authorised vessels have since been submitted to the SPRFMO Secretariat, we believe we are now compliant with this measure.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>New Zealand commented that it has now provided photos of all its authorised vessels in the SPRFMO area.</p> | <p>Non-Compliant with para 5.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.05 | Russia | <p>Secretariat assessment:</p> <p>Russia has not submitted an implementation report. The secretariat is unable to assess whether it has applied paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of 2.05 regarding the authorisation of fishing vessels.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>No comment was provided by Russia.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The CTC noted that the lack of an implementation report meant that their compliance could not be assessed.</p> | <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.05 | Panama | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Panama has not submitted an implementation report. The secretariat is unable to assess whether it has applied paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of 2.05 regarding the authorisation of fishing vessels.</p> <p>Panama has only provided images for 46% of its vessels.</p> <p>The Panama flagged vessel the <i>Asian Cosmos</i> transhipped in the SPRFMO Area during June 2015 without being on the SPRFMO record of vessels. After enquires by the secretariat, notification regarding the vessels authorisation was provided on 28 July 2015.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Panama considered that there was an administrative misunderstanding between the Secretariat and Panama which prevented the vessel notification being provided to the SPRFMO Secretariat 15 days before the vessel entered the Convention Area and subsequently transhipped. Panama will ensure that they notify the Secretariat of all new vessels 15 days before they enter the Convention Area.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para's 2, 3 and 4.</p> |
| 2.05 | Peru | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Vessel images have only been submitted for one vessel (WESTELLA).</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 5.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>No relevant information provided in compliance report.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Peru recognised that it is non-compliant with this requirement and provided a commitment to provide images as soon as possible.</p> | <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.07 | Belize | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because Belize did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Belize notified withdrawal date of effect of withdrawal in May. No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> |
| 2.07 | Ecuador | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because Ecuador did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| 2.07 | Cook Islands | <p>Secretariat Assessment: The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because the Cook Islands did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.07 | Cuba | <p>Secretariat Assessment: The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because Cuba did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.07 | Faroe Islands | <p>Secretariat Assessment: The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because the Faroe Islands did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| 2.07 | Korea | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>According to its implementation report Korea conducted 86 inspections during the 2014/15 period but it has not provided any inspection reports to the Secretariat.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>During the applicable period, no inspection was carried out.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Korea clarified that Korea had 86 inspectors and not 86 inspections and that no FFVs entered Korean ports.</p> | Compliant |
| 2.07 | Chinese Taipei | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei conducted an inspection during the 2014/15 period but the report has not been provided to the Secretariat yet.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>In our understanding, CMM 2.07 itself didn't provide a format of what an inspection report should contain before the Annexes being developed at COMM3. To fulfil the obligation of a port state, Chinese Taipei had conducted port inspection taken place before COMM3. Chinese Taipei has now submitted the relevant report.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei explained that during the current compliance reporting period, one FFV entered port on 8 January. Chinese Taipei used the existing format for reporting as they did not implement the new reporting format until the Secretariat informed Chinese Taipei of the new template. Chinese Taipei has since updated the format to ensure they meet all necessary reporting requirements.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 20.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 2.07 | Colombia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The secretariat is unable to assess whether a compliance issue has occurred because Columbia did not submit an implementation report.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 2.07.</p> | to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation. |
| 3.01 | Chile | <p>Secretariat Assessment: Chile submitted 1 monthly report outside the specified timeframe (8 days late).</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: The involuntary late submission of December 2014 and June 2015 monthly reports were result of domestic eventualities. Arrangements have been made to avoid future delays.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: Chile acknowledged that they were late in providing info arrangements have been made to avoid future delays.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 11.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.01 | China | <p>Secretariat Assessment: China submitted 1 monthly report outside the specified timeframe (10 days late).</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: The report of November 2014 was submitted late because then we were verifying the transshipment activities. We found the vessels did conduct transshipment in October and November but the transshipment information in October was omitted. So we verified the transshipment, updated the October report and submitted the November report, which led to the delay.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 3.01.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 11.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| 3.01 | EU | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The EU submitted 1 monthly report outside the specified timeframe EU's VMS data for the 4th Quarter of 2014 was provided 1 month late.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The EU acknowledges some delays in data submission for monthly catch reports for jack mackerel. We are working with the relevant national administrations to address this issue and avoid its repetition in the future.</p> <p>The EU acknowledges some delays in VMS data submission. We are working with the relevant national administrations to address this issue and avoid its repetition in the future.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The EU noted that they still submitted all data required but acknowledged that the data was late and that the EU is working with the relevant national administrations to avoid delays in the future.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 11 and 15.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.01 | Korea | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Korea provided 1 monthly report (for September 2015) 14 days late Korea's 2nd Quarter VMS data for 2015 was supplied 6 days late.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The report was submitted late due to an administrative error.</p> <p>The VMS data covering the 2nd quarter of 2015 (for the <i>F/V Gwang Ja Ho</i>) was submitted on July 16, 2015, along with the monthly catch report for June.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 3.01</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 11 and 15.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| 3.01 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Currently the Russian Federation submits a single email with VMS data attached every 2 hours. This means that Quarterly VMS data is not being collated and supplied as required.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 3.01</p> | <p>Non-compliant with Para 13.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.01 | Vanuatu | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Vanuatu submitted 1 monthly report outside the specified timeframe (10 days late)</p> <p>All of Vanuatu's VMS reports were provided outside the required timeframe (13, 30 and 115 days late).</p> <p>Vanuatu did not achieve 10% observer coverage for 2014/15.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>2015 was a difficult year for Vanuatu. No observers in 2015 following cyclone Pam destruction in Vanuatu.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The destruction caused in Vanuatu by Category 5 Cyclone Pam in March 2015 and the subsequent redeployment of many public servants to disaster relief and recovery efforts resulted in delays in reporting and the absence of observers on Vanuatu vessels.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 11, 15 and 22.</p> <p>No further action.</p> |
| 3.01 | Peru | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The Peruvian VMS information was supplied as pdf images requiring manual data entry by the Secretariat.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 15.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The VMS information also will be provided in manual data entry in Annex A. In case of the <i>Damanzaihao</i> vessel, has been disabled.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Peru explained that the administration was used to working with hard copies of information and when requested electronic copies, the administration sent information in PDF by email. Peru has addressed this with its administration and this issue is currently being resolved.</p> | for non-compliance including gaps in implementation. |
| 3.01 | Liberia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Liberia submitted 3 monthly reports outside the specified timeframes (5, 11 & 21 days late).</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Liberia is currently taking swift measures (including revising our internal procedures) to ensure that monthly reports are collected from our vessels and submitted to the Commission within twenty (20) days of the end of the month pursuant to Paragraph 11 of CMM 2.02.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>No specific comments. Addressed as part of package of reporting non-compliances with CMM 3.01</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 11.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.01 | Panama | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Panama has not provided any monthly reports during the 2014/15 period, however other members have reported that its vessels are operating in the fishery.</p> <p>Panama has also not provided any VMS reports during the 2014/15 period.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> | <p>Priority Non-compliant with paras 11 and 15.</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Panama explained that the obligation to comply with reporting requirements in CMM3.01 was very difficult as, under their domestic legislation, Panama had to make an administrative resolution before they could require vessels to submit the relevant information to report to the Commission. Panama is now making the administrative resolution and will be able to report the information for to SPRFMO in 2016.</p> <p>Members of the CTC expressed concern about Panama's overall reporting and requested that Panama develop a compliance action plan to address these issues.</p> <p>Secretariat confirmed that it received VMS reports and monthly reports from Panama during the meeting.</p> | |
| 3.02 | Chile | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Chile's 2014 Purse seine data and Landings data were received 9 days late.</p> <p>Chile's observer data missed fishing event end dates and times.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Involuntary late submission of "2014 Fishing Activity Data" and "2014 Landings Data" were result of domestic eventualities, that lead to a misunderstanding of the deadlines in the reporting of these information. Arrangements have been made to avoid future delays.</p> <p>Between mid-2014 and 2015, adjustments to the data input process were made, which affected the fields "Set start date and time" and "Set end date and time", leaving them with no information during such period. The adjustment in the process included changing these fields for "Pumping start date and time" and "Pumping end date and time", to allow a more accurate identification of the set start and end. Due to this, when conducting processes for the submission of the SPRFMO requirements, the field "Set end date and time" was null. Following an assessment period, it was decided to re-establish data input of the "Set start date and time" and "Set end date and time" fields in the data input process, for the submission of information after 2015.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Chile acknowledged the late report and reported that arrangements have been made to avoid future delays. Chile also acknowledged that data input adjustments resulted in missing fishing event dates and time. Chile will try their best to be in line with the reporting requirements but due to technical issues, Chile highlighted that the same issue may also occur in 2016.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 1(e) and 2(c).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| 3.02 | China | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>China's 2014 pelagic trawl data only contained information for target species and not bycatch species. China's 2014 Squid Jigging activity data has not been provided.</p> <p>China's 2014 observer data has not been submitted.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>China Overseas Fisheries Association (COFA) and SHOU were authorized by the Chinese government to jointly undertake the CJM and GIS fishing activities data collection. The CJM fishing activities data were submitted to DIWG in accordance with requirements of CMM3.02. But due to very few catch of non-target species, China CJM fishing vessels recorded the catch without classification in fishing log in 2014. COFA and SHOU have informed all of China CJM fishing vessel to correct it. But it is difficult for Chinese squid jigging vessels to meet the requirements of CMM3.02 absolutely in such a short time, because there are hundreds of squid jigging vessels fishing in the South Pacific area, it needs much more time and effort to collect all the data required by the CMM from the vessels. China will continue working on the improvement of the squid data collection so as to meet the SPRFMO requirements completely.</p> <p>COFA and SHOU have a programme for the observers' training, selection, dispatch, etc. Each year 1-2 scientific observers are dispatched to Chinese CJM fishing vessels. The annual observer implementation report will be submitted to the Secretariat later before the deadline in CMM3.02. China have already submitted 2014 data package including fishing activity data, transshipment data, landing data and observe data before the deadline. The 2014 Observer data may be lost in the package and it will be re-submitted.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>China acknowledged that they didn't provide bycatch information for trawl or squid fishery activity data as bycatch information was not included in logbooks. China will ensure that bycatch information is collected from this year. China reported they have not provided squid activity data because CMM3.02 has complex data requirements for jigging vessels and China has a lot of vessels targeting squid. Compiling the data from all vessels is a large job. China stated their commitment to allocate more manpower and money to improve their data collection and reporting process in coming years.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 1(e) and 2(c).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>China also reported, and the Secretariat confirmed, that they had already provided the annual implementation report and current table indicating that they hadn't was wrong. The 2014 data has since been re-submitted as a package including fishing, transshipment, observer data.</p> <p>China proposed to task the SC to review the data requirement for squid jigging activity contained in Annex 4 of CMM 3.02.</p> | |
| 3.02 | EU | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>EU Annual Catch data was provided 20 days late (para1(a))</p> <p>EU's 2014 demersal longline and demersal landings data was submitted 2.5 months late.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The EU acknowledges some delays in data submission for annual catch data. This was due to the verification/consolidation of the figures. We are working with the relevant national administrations to address this issue and avoid its repetition in the future.</p> <p>The EU has conducted an inquiry which confirmed that <i>FV Artico</i> undertook bottom fishing activities in the SPRFMO Convention Area in 2014 (July-November) without a footprint being established and without an observer onboard. As a result of this, the 2015 fishing license of <i>FV Artico</i> for SPRFMO has been withdrawn and no license will be granted for 2016. Moreover, the European Commission has adopted an Action Plan in concert with Portugal in order to improve their control system, notably in regard to the chain of control and the inspection and infringements regime.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The EU noted that there was a discrepancy between aggregated data and individual data from the monthly report therefore submitted information late. The problem has now been solved.</p> <p>The EU acknowledged the delay in providing the longline and landing data was due to the inquiry being undertaken into <i>FV Artico</i>.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para1(a) and 1(e).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| 3.02 | Korea | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Korea's 2014 observer data indicates trawls were conducted for Squid in late August 2014, but there is no information about these activities in the pelagic trawl data.</p> <p>Korea did not provide an adequate observer implementation report during 2014/15.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The vessel attempted to fish Squid, which resulted in nil catch, hence the omission. The omitted information has been provided in an amended submission.</p> <p>The annual report submitted to the third Scientific Committee meeting includes the observer implementation report.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Korea explained that a Trawler tried to fish for squid after jack mackerel fishing. Only the jack mackerel catch was reported and the squid catch data was reported late.</p> <p>Korea apologised for not providing observer implementation report. They noted that the deadline and format for the observer implementation report is not clear in the measure. Korea suggested discussing observer data submission requirements within the proposed observer program working group.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 1(e) and 2(c).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.02 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>The Russian Federation did not submit an implementation report and thus the Secretariat is unable to assess whether the Russian Federation has applied paragraph 5, regarding data verification.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The CTC noted that the lack of an implementation report meant that their compliance could not be assessed.</p> | <p>Non-compliant.</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| 3.02 | Vanuatu | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Vanuatu's 2014 pelagic trawl data was received 8 days late and only contained information for target species and not bycatch species. Vanuatu's 2014 Landings and Transshipment data was also received 8 days late.</p> <p>Vanuatu did not provide an observer implementation report during 2014/15.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>There is a national observer program, but no coverage of SPRFMO activity in 2015. No observer implementation report submitted. No comment received in relation to trawl data.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The destruction caused in Vanuatu by Category 5 Cyclone Pam in March 2015 and the subsequent redeployment of many public servants to disaster relief and recovery efforts resulted in delays in reporting and the absence of observers on Vanuatu vessels.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 1(e) and 2(c).</p> <p>No further action.</p> |
| 3.02 | Chinese Taipei | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei's 2014 Squid jigging data is not provided in accordance with CMM 3.02 Annex 4 (i.e. data are reported annually, not daily; spatial resolution is 5⁰, not 0.1⁰, vessels are grouped and effort data are missing).</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>The Annex 4 requires members and CNCPs to collect the data for squid jigging on a daily basis by individual vessel. However, according to CMM 3.02 para 1(e), "Compile data on fishing activities... Such data are to be provided in sufficient detail to facilitate effective stock assessment." In our understanding, it does not require data to be provided directly as Annex 4 format. The 5 x5 degree data of the vessel number and catch in live weight is considered sufficient in our opinion.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Chinese Taipei stated that due their very small fleet of 10 vessels, they have aggregated information reported to secretariat in accordance with domestic principals of data confidentiality. They stated that providing data for these vessels at a finer resolution is not appropriate until the SPRFMO SC or Commission confirm that finer resolution is required for effective stock assessment.</p> | <p>Not assessed</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| 3.02 | Peru | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Peru's 2014 pelagic trawl data only contains catch information for target species and not bycatch species.</p> <p>Peru did not provide an adequate observer implementation report during 2014/15.</p> <p>As Peru's VMS data is being provided as pdf images requiring manual data entry the data is not being submitted in the correct excel template.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>We only have information for target species catches, which is provided by the fishing vessels representatives.</p> <p>The observer implementation report has now been submitted as Annex B.</p> <p>The implemented system is the SISESAT, with which is performed the monitoring of fishing vessels flying the national flag that develop extractive activities in the area of the convention, and complies with the requirements of paragraphs 3 (b) and 3 (c). The VMS information also will be provided in manual data entry.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Peru explained that they have 100% observer coverage on board vessels and that it has now submitted its observer implementation report. This was acknowledged by the Secretariat.</p> <p>Peru explained that the administration was used to working with hard copies of information and when requested electronic copies, the administration sent information in PDF by email. Peru has addressed this with its administration and this issue is currently being resolved.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with paras 1(e), 2(c) and 3(b).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.02 | Liberia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Liberia has not submitted detailed transshipment data for 2014.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>Detailed transshipment data for 2014 is being provided to the Commission as an attachment to this Draft Compliance Report. Liberia apologizes for the late submittal and will ensure that transshipment data for 2015 is submitted by June 2016.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 1(e).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Liberia commented that it has now provided the transshipment data. It will work to ensure it meets transshipment reporting timeframes by June 2016.</p> | including gaps in implementation. |
| 3.02 | Panama | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Panama's detailed transshipment data was not submitted using the correct template and was missing information on species and transshipment location.</p> <p>Panama did not submit an implementation report and thus the Secretariat is unable to assess whether Panama has applied paragraph 5 regarding data verification.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Panama made a commitment to send all reporting information to the Secretariat on time in future.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 1(e).</p> <p>Undertake a compliance review to identify reasons for non-compliance including gaps in implementation.</p> |
| 3.03 | Belize | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Belize did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | Priority non-compliant. |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| 3.03 | Cook Islands | <p>Secretariat Assessment: Cook Islands did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |
| 3.03 | Cuba | <p>Secretariat Assessment: Cuba did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |
| 3.03 | Faroe Islands | <p>Secretariat Assessment: The Faroe Islands did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>The Secretariat confirmed that it received the Implementation report on 14 January 2016 from the Faroe Islands just prior to the start of the CTC meeting. Due to the extreme lateness of submission, the CTC was unable to consider the implementation report.</p> <p>The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |
| 3.03 | Korea | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Korea did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> <p>Korea's implementation report was received 14 days late.</p> <p>The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>Non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> |
| 3.03 | Russia | <p>Secretariat Assessment:</p> <p>Russia did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report:</p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations:</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve</p> |

| CMM | Member or CNCP | Assessment of Member and CNCP compliance with CMMs | Suggested Compliance status and follow up. |
|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention. | implementation of obligations. |
| 3.03 | Ecuador | <p>Secretariat Assessment: Ecuador did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>Priority non-compliant.</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |
| 3.03 | Panama | <p>Secretariat Assessment: Panama did not submit an implementation report.</p> <p>Comment by member in draft compliance report: No comments were received.</p> <p>CTC discussion and recommendations: The Secretariat confirmed that it received the Implementation report from Panama during the CTC meeting. Due to the extreme lateness of submission, the CTC was unable to consider the implementation report.</p> <p>The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.</p> | <p>Priority Non-compliant with para 4(bis).</p> <p>Develop a compliance action plan to rectify non-compliance and/or improve implementation of obligations.</p> |

Executive Summary: Recommendations

Proposals to amend or improve existing CMMs:

- The CTC recommends to the Commission that the following amendment be made to paragraph 1(b)(ii) of Annex 1 of CMM 2.04:
 “Where a Member or CNCP has maintained spatially and temporally appropriate observer coverage for **the previous 5 or more consecutive** years at levels greater than 10% and recorded a seabird mortality rate less than 0.01 birds/ 1000 hooks, that Member may choose to:”.
- The CTC further recommends that if this amendment is adopted by the Commission Australia should be marked from ‘not assessed’ to ‘compliant’ with this paragraph.
- The CTC recommends that the Commission revise CMM 3.03 to develop a procedure and template for the follow up identified in Annex I of such measure. Until such revision is adopted, the CTC recommends that the following should apply:
 - o Compliance Review: the concerned Member or CNCP shall transmit to the Secretariat any missing information, if the relevant information has not yet been provided
 - o Compliance Action Plan: the concerned Member or CNCP shall provide the Secretariat with detailed information on how it will rectify the non-compliance and/or improve the implementation of the measure.
- The concerned member or CNCP will submit the compliance review and/or the compliance action plan within 90 days of the end of the Commission meeting.

Identified obstacles to implementation:

- The CTC identified that CMM 2.04 is unclear in terms of its application to squid jigging and recommend that this measure should be revised in order to clarify this issue.
- China reported they have not provided squid activity data because CMM3.02 has complex data requirements for jigging vessels and China has a lot of vessels targeting squid. Compiling the data from all vessels is a large job. China stated their commitment to allocate more manpower and money to improve their data collection and reporting process in coming years.
- Chinese Taipei stated that due to their very small fleet of 10 vessels, they have aggregated information reported to secretariat in accordance with domestic principles of data confidentiality. They stated that providing data for these vessels at a finer resolution is not appropriate until the SPRFMO SC or Commission confirm that finer resolution is required for effective stock assessment.

Provision of CMMs and other Commission decisions that area Priority to be monitored and reviewed:

- The CTC strongly encouraged the submission of implementation reports from all Members and CNCPs. Failing to report any information compromises the effectiveness of CMMs and the ability for the Commission to meet its objectives under the Convention.
- The CTC reminded Members and CNCPs that there is an obligation to report on seabird interactions for trawlers and longliners, even in cases where there are no interactions as a 'nil' report still conveys important information.
- The CTC recommends that the SC provide more clarity on what is 'sufficient detail' under paragraph 1(e) of CMM 3.02.