

23 October 2013

Valerie Lanza  
Fishing Vessels Manager  
International Merchant Marine Registry of Belize  
Suite 204, Marina Towers  
Newtown Barracks, Belize City  
Ph: +501 223 5026 or 5031  
Fax: +501 223 5070 or 5048  
[valerie@immarbe.com](mailto:valerie@immarbe.com)

Dear Ms. Lanza,

Conservation and Management Measure on Cooperating Non-Members (CMM 2009-11) tasks the Executive Director with forwarding a copy of the relevant TCC recommendations and advice to non-member CNM applicant following TCC9.

Please find two documents attached to this letter for your review and consideration prior to WCPFC10:

- **Attachment 1:** Copy of relevant advice and recommendations from the Ninth Regular Session of the WCPFC Technical and Compliance Committee on CNM applications;
- **Attachment 2:** Copy of relevant advice and recommendations under the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2012-02), which identified potential compliance issues for individual CCMs. This is also attached, and you will find a copy of TCC9's assessment with covering executive summary to the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report.

Both sets of information have been forwarded to the Commission for consideration at WCPFC10.

Specifically in regard to Belize's CNM application, TCC9 asked if Belize could provide supplementary information, before WCPFC10, relating to CNM application requirements as set out in paragraph 3 and 11 of CMM 2009-11.

In accordance with CMM 2012-02, Belize may provide prior to or during the Commission meeting, additional advice or information relating to the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report, including any steps taken to address identified compliance issues. In addition TCC9 draft summary report states:

406. The TCC9 Chair noted that the CMR process for 2012 will continue with any CCM that wishes to provide additional information, or to request further review of its compliance information, to communicate

---

Kaselehlie Street  
P. O. Box 2356  
Kolonia, Pohnpei 96941  
Federated States of Micronesia

**Phone: +691 320 1992**  
**+691 320 1993**  
**Facsimile: +691 320 1108**  
**Email: [wcpfc@wcpfc.int](mailto:wcpfc@wcpfc.int)**

with the Secretariat prior to 30 days in advance of WCPFC10. The Secretariat will collate and provide updated information relevant to these CCMs Provisional CMR assessment scores as “additional advice or information” relating to the provisional CMR. This information is expected to be provided for all CCMs to access through the secure section of the WCPFC website, and in advance of WCPFC10. A small working group at WCPFC10 will review any updated assessments and finalize the provisional CMR for WCPFC10’s consideration.

Any responses to TCC9’s review of your CNM application or Provisional Compliance Monitoring Assessment can be sent to Glenn.Hurry@wcpfc.int, with a copy to the Compliance Manager lara.manarangi-trott@wcpfc.int. We would suggest that these should be provided to the Secretariat before 16<sup>th</sup> November, so that other CCMs can consider your information in advance of WCPFC10.

To confirm that Belize may also participate as an observer at WCPFC10, and details for the meeting and registration can be found on the WCPFC website <http://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/10th-regular-session-commission>

Sincerely,



Professor Glenn Hurry  
Executive Director

cc: Delice Pinkard  
Fisheries Officer  
International Merchant Marine Registry of Belize  
[fishingadmin@immarbe.com](mailto:fishingadmin@immarbe.com)

**Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott**  
WCPFC Compliance Manager  
[Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int](mailto:Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int)

## **Attachment 1: TCC9 Recommendations and Technical Advice**

### **BELIZE**

13. TCC9 reviewed the CNM application submitted by Belize against the requirements of CMM 2009-11. In accordance with para. 3 of CMM 2009-11, TCC9's recommendations and technical advice to the Commission are as follows:

a) TCC9 advises the Commission that the application from Belize dated 9 August 2013 was not received by the WCPFC Secretariat within the deadline set out in para 1 of CMM 2009-11. TCC9 also advises the Commission that the application met the requirement of being submitted in English.

b) TCC9 advises the Commission that Belize has i) provided a commitment to cooperate fully; ii) provided an explicit commitment to accept high seas boarding and inspection; and iii) provided an explicit commitment to make a financial contribution commensurate with what it would be assessed should it become a Contracting Party or member of the Commission pursuant to the scheme of contributions established by the Commission in accordance with Article 18(2) of the Convention. The WCPFC Secretariat will provide, as part of the documentation to be provided for FAC7, and in accordance with the decision of WCPFC7 that all CNMs should make an annual contribution that is 50% of the amount that would be payable if the CNM was to become a member of the Commission, an estimate of Belize's financial contribution for 2014 based on the draft budget for 2014. The WCPFC Secretariat advised TCC9 that Belize has paid a financial contribution for 2013 in the amount of \$15,959.

c) TCC9 advises the Commission that, based on the best information available, Belize complied with the participatory rights specified by the Commission at WCPFC8.

(d) TCC9 requested the Secretariat ask Belize to provide the following:

- (i) Information on compliance with the provision of the Convention and the conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission and the fisheries laws and regulations of coastal States in the Convention Area (3(b));
- (ii) Information with regards to responding to any IUU activities by vessels flying its flag that have been brought to its attention, in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention (3(c));
- (iii) Information on compliance with conservation and management measures of other Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (3(d));
- (iv) Information of what measures taken to ensure compliance by its vessels with the Commission's conservation and management measures (11(c));
- (v) Information of responses to alleged violations of conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission and any IUU activities of vessels flying its flag, in a timely manner (11 (d)).

**14. TCC9 recommends that the Commission consider Belize's application for CNM status in 2014, subject to the additional information identified by TCC9 being provided to, and accepted by, the Commission.**

**PROVISIONAL COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT  
(COVERING 2012 ACTIVITIES)**

**Executive Summary**

**INTRODUCTION**

The TCC9 noted that the Compliance Monitoring Scheme is in its third trial year and agreed to follow a new process for reviewing the Draft Compliance Monitoring Report (Draft Report). TCC9 reviewed the Draft Report for 39<sup>1</sup> CCMs in a closed Working Group session. This year's assessment focused on an assessment of CCMs' implementation of their obligations and highlighted issues related to our understanding of existing obligations. In addition, it highlighted the need for clarity in the Secretariat's role in preparing the Draft Report.

Paragraph 1 of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2012-05) outlines the purpose as follows:

**Section I - Purpose**

1. The purpose of the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme (the Scheme) is to ensure that Members, Cooperating Non-Members and, where appropriate, Participating Territories (CCMs) implement and comply with obligations arising under the Convention and conservation and management measures (CMMs) adopted by the Commission. The Scheme is designed to:

- (i) assess CCMs' compliance with their obligations;
- (ii) identify areas in which technical assistance or capacity building may be needed to assist CCMs to attain compliance;
- (iii) identify aspects of conservation and management measures which may require refinement or amendment for effective implementation;
- (iv) respond to non-compliance through remedial options that include a range of possible responses that take account of the reason for and degree of non-compliance, and include cooperative capacity-building initiatives and, in case of serious non-compliance, such penalties and other actions as may be necessary and appropriate to promote compliance with CMMs; and
- (v) monitor and resolve outstanding instances of non-compliance.

**PROCESS FOLLOWED DURING TCC9**

1. The WG conducted the compliance review obligation-by-obligation, taking into account the potential compliance issues identified by the Secretariat as well as any additional information provided and compliance issues identified by CCMs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Obligations reviewed in the dCMRs were "NOT APPLICABLE" for three (Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mexico, Senegal) CCMs.

ADOPTED BY CMS WG  
30 Sept 2013

2. Where a CCM determined that an obligation was “Not Applicable” but there was information available for that particular CCM, an assessment was made if other CCMs determined that the information suggested that the obligation was “Applicable”. If other CCMs agreed that the obligation was “Not Applicable”, then an “N/A” was applied.
3. For some obligations that were determined to be “self assessments” and information had not been previously provided as required, but was provided during the WG, CCMs agreed to give a “Compliant” assessment, even where that information had not been verified. For those obligations where additional verification was required by the Secretariat or SPC, CCMs agreed to give a “Potential Compliance Issue” assessment pending review by the Secretariat or SPC.
4. For those CCMs that were not present during the WG, “Potential Compliance Issue” assessments were given in all cases where issues had been highlighted through the dCMR evaluations for those CCMs.
5. The WG noted that additional time would be required during WCPFC10 to review information from those CCMs assessed as “Potential Compliance Issue” that may have submitted additional information to the Secretariat following TCC9.
6. The WG noted willingness by some CCMs with respect to payback efforts in 2013 where catch limits had been exceeded and those CCMs noted that due respect should be given to those CCMs that have taken such remedial action.
7. In reviewing compliance with paragraph 4 of CMM 2010-05, the WG was unable to make an assessment for one CCM due to a lack of agreement by that CCM on the requirement for implementation.
8. Where CCMs were in disagreement as to the appropriate outcome of the assessment, the Chair requested that the CCMs seek to resolve their differences in the margins of the WG and agree to a solution for the WG to move forward in conducting an assessment.
9. Some CCMs were uncomfortable giving “Compliant” assessments to CCMs that had provided information during the TCC or just prior to the TCC and the information had not been given at least a preliminary review by the Secretariat. This related specifically to reviewing information submitted in accordance with paragraph 11 of CMM 2009-06. This situation can be in part addressed through establishing clear criteria on information submission deadlines.
10. The WG was unable to conduct an assessment of compliance with CMM 2007-01, Attachment K, Annex C, paragraph 4 due to a lack of clear understanding amongst CCMs of the obligation.

ADOPTED BY CMS WG  
30 Sept 2013

11. Although the WG did conduct an assessment of compliance with CMM 2007-01, Attachment K, Annex C, paragraph 6, CCMs noted the challenges in making the assessment without clear information from CCMs on the metric used to calculate the percentage of longline observer coverage. CCMs should identify in Annual Report Part 2 the metric used to calculate the percentage of longline observer coverage.
12. The WG did not conduct an assessment for any CCMs in Section 1 of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission on "Annual Catch Estimates" relating to discards due to lack of agreement on whether discard reporting is mandatory or encouraged.
13. The WG did not consider any information provided by CCMs in Section 1 of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission on "Annual Catch Estimates" relating to Sharks due to lack of agreement on whether the reporting provision was mandatory for 2012.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WG FOR INCLUSION AS DECISION POINTS  
IN THE TCC9 RECORD**

14. TCC9 found that conducting the review of the Draft Report on an obligation-by-obligation basis proved useful and informative. TCC9 recommends that improvements to the process continue to be made taking into account the recommendations of this record.
15. TCC9 recommends a greater consultation between CCMs and the Secretariat in the preparation of the dCMRs noting that this is still a work in progress.
16. TCC9 recommends that the WG be given sufficient time in the Agenda to conduct its review of the Draft Report, noting that it took significant time during TCC9 to complete its review
17. TCC9 recommends that in the development of new CMMs, the Commission take into account the outcomes of the CMR process with respect to clarifying obligations.
18. TCC9 recommends that all CCMs make best efforts to provide any additional information to the Secretariat identified during the WG review at least 30 days prior to WCPFC10.
19. TCC9 reiterated the confidentiality of the Draft and Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report and also notes that the same level of confidentiality applies to the discussions and outcomes of the WG.
20. There is a need to distinguish between the obligation to submit information and the obligation to meet an agreed deadline and/or format. The TCC9 recommended that the CMS CMM be amended to ensure that

ADOPTED BY CMS WG  
30 Sept 2013

reporting deadlines are assessed as part of the compliance review, and that this be done in addition to review of the implementation. This includes deadlines for submission of Annual Reports Part 1 and 2, Scientific Data, and “Fished/Did Not Fish” reports, among others.

21. Most CCMs reiterated that the process of the CMS and outcomes of the CMS must take into account the special requirements of SIDS and in particular Article 30 and Resolution 2008-01. This includes aspects of CMMs, conduct of assessments and the actions agreed to assist SIDS to resolve any implementation issues identified.

*RECOMMENDATIONS ON SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS*

22. TCC9 recommends that the Commission clarify that for CMM 2005-03, the reporting responsibility lies with the flag State.
23. TCC9 recommends that the Commission clarify that CCMs identify in their 2014 Annual Report Part 2 which metric they used to calculate the percentage of longline observer coverage for 2013.

**ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS**

24. Self-assessments pose challenges for verification and compliance assessment, due to lack of sufficient information available to verify implementation. It was noted that this situation would change over time with the improvements to reporting and data available for verification.
25. With respect to charter notifications under paragraph 3 of CMM 2011-05, notification to the flag State of any of its vessels operating under charter to another CCM is critical to avoid double counting by both the flag State and the chartering State reporting the same catch.
26. Some CCMs noted that there were a number of discrepancies in the data held by the CCM and that held by the Secretariat.
27. CCMs noted that the provision of “Size Composition Data” is a flag State responsibility. Where data is also available through coastal State reporting through other programs, the compliance assessment should be focused on flag States meeting their reporting obligations except for vessels operating under charter arrangement.
28. One CCM pointed out the practical difficulty of providing operational data noting the huge volume of information that would be required from a large fleet.
29. PNA advised that CMM 2011-01 noted PNA’s intention to use 2010 as the basis for the VDS TAE in 2012. This was not an obligation imposed by the Commission. SPC provided data to TCC9 that PNA EEZ effort in 2010 was 43,832 days and effort in 2012 was 40,929 days. PNA therefore advised that its intention has been successfully achieved.

ADOPTED BY CMS WG  
30 Sept 2013

30. One CCM noted their discomfort with the way the process was conducted underlying its inconsistency and stressing its disagreement with the decision referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 3 of this report.
31. The WG noted the importance of setting criteria at the beginning of its work.



**PROVISIONAL COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENTS**

<b>CCM</b>		<b>Provisional Assessment</b>
1	Australia	Compliant
2	Belize	Compliance Review
3	Canada	Compliance Review
4	China	Compliance Review
5	Cook Islands	Compliant
6	Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea	Compliant*
7	Ecuador	Compliance Review
8	El Salvador	Compliance Review
9	European Union	Compliance Review
10	Federated States of Micronesia	Compliance Review
11	Fiji	Compliance Review
12	French Polynesia	Compliant
13	Indonesia	Compliance Review
14	Japan	Compliance Review
15	Kiribati	Compliance Review
16	Korea (Republic of)	Compliance Review
17	Marshall Islands	Compliance Review
18	Mexico	Compliant*
19	Nauru	Compliant
20	New Caledonia	Compliant
21	New Zealand	Compliant
22	Niue	Compliant
23	Palau	Compliance Review
24	Panama	Compliance Review
25	Papua New Guinea	Compliance Review
26	Philippines	Compliance Review
27	Samoa	Compliant
28	Senegal	Compliant*
29	Solomon Islands	Compliance Review
30	St. Kitts and Nevis	Compliance Review
31	Chinese Taipei	Compliance Review
32	Thailand	Compliant
33	Tokelau	Compliant
34	Tonga	Compliant
35	Tuvalu	Compliance Review
36	United States	Compliance Review
37	Vanuatu	Compliance Review
38	Vietnam	Compliant
39	Wallis and Futuna	Compliance Review

\*Obligations reviewed in the dCMRs were “NOT APPLICABLE” for these CCMs.

## 2013 Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (for 2012 activities)

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
<b><i>CMM 2005-03: North Pacific Albacore</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Belize, Canada, China, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States	Tuvalu	
<i>Paragraph (3)</i>	Belize, Canada, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States, Vanuatu	China, Tuvalu	China [2] <sup>1</sup>
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	Belize, Canada, China, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Philippines	
<b><i>CMM 2006-04: Striped Marlin</i></b>			

<sup>1</sup> The bracketed number refers to the number of years of potential compliance issues

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
<b>CMM/Data Provision</b>	<b>Compliant</b>	<b>Potential Compliance Issue</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue</b>
<i>Paragraph (1)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, European Union, Korea, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	Australia, Belize, Cook Islands, China, Fiji, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, New Caledonia, Tonga, Chinese Taipei, United States, Vanuatu, Samoa	Indonesia	
<b><i>CMM 2007-01: Regional Observer Programme</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (7)</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Kiribati, Panama	Kiribati [2]
<i>Paragraph (9)</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Japan, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New	Indonesia, Panama	

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph (10)</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph (14)(vii)</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Kiribati, Panama	
<i>Att K, Annex C, Paragraph (4)</i>	Not Assessed	Not Assessed	

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
<i>Att K, Annex C, Paragraph (6)</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, Korea, New Caledonia, New Zealand, United States	Belize, China, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	
<b>CMM 2007-04: Seabirds</b>			
<i>Paragraph (9)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Palau, Wallis & Futuna	
<b>CMM 2008-01: Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna</b>			
<i>Paragraph (9)</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<i>Paragraph (10)</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El	European Union	European Union [2]

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Salvador Indonesia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<i>Paragraph (17)</i>	Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu		
<i>Paragraph (18) (limit)</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, New Caledonia, Niue, Philippines, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, United States, Vanuatu, Wallis & Futuna		
<i>Paragraph (18) (spatial and temporal closures)</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, New Caledonia, Niue, Philippines, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, United States, Vanuatu, Wallis & Futuna		
<i>Paragraph (19)</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines,		

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph 23</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States, Vanuatu	Indonesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Tuvalu,	Kiribati [2], Indonesia [3]
<i>Paragraph (26)</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tokelau, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph (28)</i>	China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Indonesia	

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
<i>Paragraph (31)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, European Union, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States	China, Indonesia	China [3], Indonesia [2]
<i>Paragraph (32)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, European Union, New Zealand, Philippines		
<i>Paragraph (33)</i>	Indonesia, Japan, Chinese Taipei, United States	Korea	Korea [2]
<i>Paragraph (39)</i>	Japan	Indonesia, Philippines	Philippines [2]
<i>Paragraph (43)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, Cook Islands, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese, Taipei, Thailand, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vietnam, Vanuatu	Wallis & Futuna	
<b>CMM 2011-01: Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna</b>			
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Not Assessed	Not Assessed	



	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
<i>Paragraph (3)</i>	Philippines		
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Indonesia	
<i>Paragraph (5)</i>	China		
<b><i>CMM 2009-01: Record of Fishing Vessels</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (9)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, Cook Islands, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Tonga, United States, Vanuatu	Ecuador, Kiribati, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu	
<b><i>CMM 2009-02: High Seas FAD Closure</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan,		

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph (12)</i>	China, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Kiribati	
<b>CMM 2009-03: Swordfish</b>			
<i>Paragraph (1)</i>	Australia, China, European Union, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Australia, China, European Union, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<i>Paragraph (3)</i>	Australia, China, El Salvador, European Union, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, Chinese Taipei,	Belize	Belize [3]

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	United States		
<i>Paragraph (8)</i>	Australia, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tonga, United States, Vanuatu	Indonesia	
<b>CMM 2009-06: Transshipment</b>			
<i>Paragraph (11)</i>	Australia, China, Cook Islands, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Tonga, United States	Belize, Ecuador, Indonesia, Marshall Islands, Panama, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	
<i>Paragraph (13)</i>	Belize, China, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Panama, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Paragraph (34)</i>	China, Japan, Korea, Chinese	Belize, Indonesia, Kiribati,	

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Taipei, United States, Vanuatu	Panama, Philippines	
<i>Paragraph (35)(a)(ii)</i>	China, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei, United States, Vanuatu	Belize, Indonesia, Kiribati, Panama, Philippines	
<i>Paragraph (35)(a)(iii)</i>	China, New Zealand, United States	Belize, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Panama, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Vanuatu	
<i>Paragraph (35)(a)(iv)</i>	China, New Zealand, United States	Belize, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Panama, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Vanuatu	
<b><i>CMM 2010-01: North Pacific Striped Marlin</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (5)</i>	Japan, Korea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States	China	
<b><i>CMM 2010-02: Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Cook Islands, El Salvador, European Union, Japan, Kiribati, Korea	China, Fiji, Panama, Chinese Taipei, United States, Vanuatu	
<i>Paragraph (6)</i>	Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Chinese Taipei, United States,		

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Vanuatu		
<b><i>CMM 2010-04: Pacific Bluefin Tuna</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (2)</i>	Japan, Korea, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, United States		
<b><i>CMM 2010-05: South Pacific Albacore</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (1)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, European Union, Korea, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei, United States	China	China [3]
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	Australia, Belize, Cook Islands, European Union, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Tonga, United States	Solomon Islands, Vanuatu	
<b><i>CMM 2010-07: Sharks</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon		

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu, Wallis & Futuna		
<i>Paragraph (7)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tonga, United States, Vanuatu	Federated States of Micronesia, Tuvalu	
<b><i>CMM 2011-02: Vessel Monitoring System</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (4)</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, St. Kitts and Nevis, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Tuvalu, United		

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	States, Vanuatu, Vietnam		
<i>Paragraph (9)(a)</i>	Australia, Canada, China, Cook Islands, European Union, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, St. Kitts and Nevis, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, United States, Vanuatu, Vietnam	Belize, Ecuador, Indonesia, Philippines, Tuvalu	
<i>Paragraph (9)(a) – VMS SSPs paragraph 2.8</i>	Australia, Belize, China, Cook Islands, European Union, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, St. Kitts and Nevis, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, United States, Vietnam	Canada, Ecuador, Indonesia, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Panama, Philippines, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	
<i>Paragraph (9)(a) – VMS SSPs paragraph 7.2.4</i>	Australia, Belize, Canada, China, Cook Islands, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Philippines, Chinese Taipei,	Ecuador, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Panama, Papua New Guinea, St. Kitts and Nevis, Tuvalu	Kiribati [3]

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Thailand, United States, Vanuatu		
<b><i>CMM 2011-05: Charter Notification Scheme</i></b>			
<i>Paragraph (3)</i>	Fiji, Kiribati, Korea, New Zealand, Solomon Islands		
<b><i>Scientific Data<sup>2</sup></i></b>			
<i>Section 01 – Estimates of Annual Catches</i>	Australia, Canada, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Belize, European Union, Indonesia	Indonesia [2]
<i>Section 02 – Number of Active Vessels</i>	Australia, Canada, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New	Belize	

<sup>2</sup> These references are to the following document: Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission



	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		
<i>Section 03 – Operational Level Catch and Effort Data</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	Belize, Canada, China, Ecuador, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Chinese Taipei, United States	Indonesia [2]
<i>Section 04 – Catch and Effort Data Aggregated By Time Period and Geographic Area</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu	Belize, Canada, China, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Chinese Taipei	Indonesia [2]
<i>Section 05 – Size Composition</i>	Australia, Cook Islands, China, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Indonesia, Japan,	Belize, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Philippines, Chinese Taipei	El Salvador [2], Indonesia [2]

	Compliance or Implementation Status		
CMM/Data Provision	Compliant	Potential Compliance Issue	2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year with a Potential Compliance Issue
	Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States, Vanuatu		