|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 07-04 09**  **(v) Provision of Scientific data and Annual Report Part 1** | CCMs shall annually provide to the Commission, in part 1 of their annual reports, all available information on interactions with seabirds, including bycatches and details of species, to enable the Scientific Committee to estimate seabird mortality in all fisheries to which the WCPF Convention applies. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Reporting requirement= Provision in Part 1 of available informaiton on interactions with seabirds, including bycatch and details of species. not area specific (for all fisheries to which the WCPF Convention applies) |  | Information on implementation of CMM 2007-04 provided to WCPFC as part of 2007 Annual Report.   AR Pt 1 2013 pg 13:   Australia implements a mandatory reporting scheme for fisheries interactions with protected species, which includes species of special interest. Interactions with these species are recorded by fishers in their logbooks and are reported to AFMA. These interactions are then forwarded to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities on a quarterly basis. A summary of these interactions is presented in Table 6.  No interactions with seabirds were recorded. Seabird mitigation methods required in the ETBF are shown in Appendix I.    Fisheries interactions with seabirds, marine mammals and sea turtles in the ETBF, as recorded by AFMA observers, are presented in Table 7.  In 2012, three interactions with seabirds, one of which was observed to be dead. More specific seabird interaction information is presented in Table 8 and Table 9. |  |
| Belize |  | As at 19 July 2013: Annual Report Part 1 covering 2012 activities had not been received by the WCPFC Secretariat  *Please find attached Annual Report Part 1 for your kind reference* |  |
| Canada |  | There were no reported interactions or bycatch of pelagic sharks, seabirds, or sea turtles by the Canadian fishery in the WCPFC CA in 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013  pg.3) |  |
| Cook Islands |  | No detail provided in AR Pt 1 (2013) on fishery interactions with seabirds  *CK advised by email: (7 Sept) that there was no record of interactions with seabirds, either from logsheet information or from observer reports.* |  |
| China |  | No information on seabird fishery interactions included in AR Pt 1 2013  *Most Chinese LL operated in the low latitude areas, there are almost no interaction with seabird. China started implementation of LL logbook since 2008, and seabird information, if any, is required to be recorded accordingly. Logbook is collected by Shanghai Ocean University annually for data summarizing and analyze. To date, we have not yet found such interactions with seabirds. Both the vessel masters and the observer(s) have not yet found any seabird mortality during fishing and observer trips . However, we will report so according to the CMM even if there is no such information on seabird interaction.* |  |
| Ecuador |  | No information provided in AR Pt 1 on interactions with seabirds |  |
| Fiji |  | Not applicable as Fiji fishing vessels do not operate in areas S 30 S and N 23 N but Fiji observers report on seabird sighting when such rare incidents occurs.  Fiji Observers are trained in seabird identification and are equipped with SPC seabird identification booklets.   No sea birds have been caught on tuna long lines in the past five years, including in 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.10) |  |
| FSM |  | No information provided in AR Pt 1 on interactions with seabirds |  |
| Indonesia |  | AR Pt1, 2013 states will be provided if data is available. |  |
| Japan |  | AR Pt 1, 2013 Appendix Table 5 (pg. 36) report the effort, observed and estimated seabird captures by fishing gear [S 30 S, N 23 N, or 23 N - 30 S].  Appendix Table 6 reports the number of observed seabird captures in longline fisheries, 2012 by species and area |  |
| Kiribati |  | No detail provided in AR Pt 1 (2013) on fishery interactions with seabirds |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | No information on seabird fishery interactions included in AR Pt 1 2013  *Korean vessels maily operate in the area between North of 15N and South of 15S, where interactions with seabirds rarely occur. Therefore, there is no information collected on the incidents of seabird bycatch.* |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | AR Pt 1 reports seabird interactions in Table 3 |  |
| New Caledonia |  | No New Caledonian vessels fishing south of 30 S or north of 23 N.   During trips observered in 2012, 3 seabirds were incidentally captured (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.4) |  |
| Nauru |  | No information on seabird fishery interactions provided in AR Pt 1 2013 |  |
| Niue |  | There was no fishing in Niue EEZ in 2012.  Niue is not a flag State (AR Pt 1, 2013) |  |
| New Zealand |  | Sea bird captures in surface longline fisehries provided in Figure 7 AR Pt 1, 2013 AR Pt 1 2013: No interactions with non-fish bycatch (e.g. seabirds, turtles, and marine mammals) have been observed in the purse seine fishery. |  |
| French Polynesia |  | AR Pt 1: No accidental catch of bird was reported |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | No information or advice provided in AR Pt 1 2013 in relation to this reporting requirement |  |
| Philippines |  | Philippine flag LL vessels fishing in Kiribati use tori-lines or scare lines to reduce impact of fishing on seabirds. Philippines may not have a specific National plan of action for reducing incidenetal catches for seabirds in LL fisheries but this aspect is included in the Philippine National Tuna Management Plan and PH-LL vessels use tori-lines/scare-lines to reduce impacts of fishing on seabirds (AR Pt 2, 2013)  *PH does not have much information on seabird interaction. PH does not have the capability to differentiate various species of seabirds. PH may need assistance on this aspect to educate fishers and would help improve recording/s of seabirds interaction.* |  |
| Palau |  | No information on interactions with seabirds reported in AR Pt 1 |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | AR Pt 1: report on seabird interactions in table 4 |  |
| El Salvador |  | El Salvador does not have longline vessels in the WCPO (AR Pt 1, 2013)   *El Salvador has mentioned in other reports made to WCPFC that not have Salvadoran longliners vessels in the WCPFC area, and our fishing is done with two (2) purse seiners, therefore, not having interactions with seabirds. In the future, we will make this statement in the required report as well as and other information of bycatch species that need to me reported on.* |  |
| Tokelau |  | *There were no seabird interactions reported for Tokelau in 2012.* |  |
| Tonga |  | No information on seabird provided in Part 1  *There were no interaction with sea birds reported in Tonga's longline fishery.* |  |
| Tuvalu |  | No information on seabird fishery interactions included in AR Pt 1 2013 |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | Observer data showed that 16 seabirds (9 albatrosses nei, 4 great frigate birds and 2 black-footed albatross, 1 other seasbird) were taken and 10 seabirds sighted in 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.5) |  |
| USA |  | Reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 3 (pg.27) |  |
| Vanuatu |  | AR Pt 1, 2013 reported 0 seabird interaction in the purse seine fleet |  |
| Wallis and Futuna |  |  |  |
| Samoa |  | There were no seabird interactions recorded (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg. 11) |  |
| European Union |  | EU-Portugal flagged LL (Attachment 2 to AR Pt 1, 2013) reports mitigation measures for seabirds as well as seabird captures in 2012, by species and area |  |