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| **From draft CMR\_rev 1 (WCPFC-TCC9-2013-dCMR\_rev1) - posted 14 September 2013** | **Additional Information provided by CCM post-14 September** |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM Paragraph** | **CMR Section** | **CCM Implementation** | **WCPFC Secretariat Evaluation Explanation** |
| CMM 2011-02 9a VMS SSPs 2.8 | (iv) Observer and VMS coverage |  | Requirement = submission of all necessary data incl. VTAF for vessels to which the Commission VMS applies Ideally to evaluate this requirement, this list of VTAFs received should be compared to i) the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels; ii) the list of presently reporting vessels on WCPFC VMS (both vessels reporting directly to WCPFC VMS and through FFA VMS), and a CCMs fished and did not fished report (CMM 2009-01 09). However, at the time of preparing this dCMR, the list of vessels that were reporting to WCPFC VMS through the FFA VMS was not able to be matched with the WCPFC RFV records, this work is ongoing and is presently being worked on between the WCPFC and FFA Secretariats.  WCPFC Secretariat has recently completed a migration of its VTAF records to a new IMS database that provides a direct linkage to the WCPFC RFV.  Given this, the present dCMR evaluation, is made through a simple comparison of the list of vessels on the WCPFC RFV, with the list of vessels that a CCM advised fished (CMM 2009-01 09), and the list of VTAF records the WCPFC has recently received. It should be noted that the list of some VTAFs, may include VTAFs that are not presently activated on WCPFC VMS   As at 26 July 2013: Vessels on the WCPFC RFV = 23 vesselsVTAFs WCPFC has received = 8 vessels. No. of vessels CCM advised fished 2012 = 2 vesselsNo. of vessels reporting to WCPFC VMS through FFA VMS = 0 The list of vessels for each CCM, which were the basis of the above number, will be provided directly to CCMs in an attachment, which the WCPFC Secretariat asks that each CCM might check and advise the WCPFC Secretariat of any errors, gaps or omissions.  **Not all MTUs with the VTAFs submitted by thie CCM were activated due to VMS gateway issues.  The Secreatariat request the CCM provide a list of ALCs approved for use in the Commission VMS (VMS SSPs 7.3.7)**  **Based on this information the evaluation is = Additional information needed** | On 25 September WCPFC received some additional information from Canada as a reply to the draft CMR: “In reviewing the excel document provided, it seems that the VTAF list you have for Canada is inaccurate. Our records indicate that an additional 7 vessels have submitted VTAFs. This list includes the two vessels that we have recorded as fishing inside the Convention Area - “Pacific Adventure” and “Amy Usen”, though we note that their VTAFs were submitted after they had fished in the CA in 2012. Please note that we have informed vessels of the requirement, and as they have since submitted their VTAFs, we see no further action required. and confirmed that an additional VTAFs have been submitted”WCPFC confirms that seven VTAF records have been received related to vessels presently on the RFV. The seven includes the two vessels which the CCM advised had did “fish” in 2012. At the time of providing this document for TCC9, the VMS gateway issues were still be reviewed by the Secretariat in consultation with Canada.  |
| CMM 2011-02 9a VMS SSPs 7.2.4 | (iv) Observer and VMS coverage | Canada does not conduct audit inspections of the VMS units for vessels fishing in the WCPFC convention area. However, Canada ensures that all vessels fishing in the WCPO are on the WCPFC list of registered vessels, and have submitted the WCPFC Vessel Tracking Agreement Form. Canada also ensures that the VMS systems for vessels fishing in the WCPO are operational and we conduct monitoring operations internally to ensure compliance with the international and domestic VMS requirements.  | "Requirement=  conduct periodic audits of a representative sample of installed ALCs to verify SSPs are being complied with and no visible evidence of tampering.  Number of audits is to be planned on an annual basis, and deteremined by cost/benefit, logistical and practical aspects.  CCM is to provide Secretariat for previous calendar year a list of all ALC inspections by flag and vessel type, including a summary of the results of each inspection Section 2, para 13: is to be provided in Part 2 report. CCM had vessels on the WCPFC RFV and reported that some fished during 2012, based on the wording of the requirement in the VMS SSPs the number of audits to be conducted is subject to determination by each CCM. **No details of MTU audit and inspections conducted by this CCM of its flagged vessels in 2012 were provided in AR Pt 2, but CCM confirmed that none were conducted in 2012 – no issues detected** " | On 25 September WCPFC received some additional information from Canada as a reply to the draft CMR: “Here is a link to DFO Approved VMS/ALC units list: http://www.nfl.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/e0011108. This is the most up to date list that we distribute to our fleet.For all tuna vessels that require VMS, including WCPFC, we monitor them using DFO VMS systems throughout the year to ensure that they are transmitting positional data correctly. If we encounter a vessel that is not transmitting properly, then we immediately try to contact the vessel owner in order to rectify the situation immediately (as per their licence conditions). Canada considers this process to be a remote audit to ensure units are operating correctly and do not conduct any physical inspections.” |
| SciData 03 | (v) Provision of Scientific Data | SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013) date of receipt = not received days fished for troll = NO   | Assessment of Operational Level catch and effort data submission for 2012 (based on SPC advice and associated notes as at 17 July 2013) **Were operational level catch and effort data received by the deadline = NO** **days fished for troll = not received**  | On 25 September WCPFC received some additional information from Canada as a reply to the draft CMR: “Please refer to our Part I report which I have attached again. Canada had 2 vessels fishing for a total of 2 vessel days, with <1t caught. If there is additional information required with respect to vessel days and/or vessels fishing both inside vs. outside the WCPFC CA, then please let us know and we will do our best to clarify.” |