

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION
COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA DEL ATÚN TROPICAL

PERMANENT WORKING GROUP ON COMPLIANCE

6TH MEETING

LANZAROTE (SPAIN)
12 JUNE 2005

DOCUMENT COM-6-04

COMPLIANCE WITH IATTC MEASURES IN 2004

The information presented in this document relates to some of the issues on the agenda of the 6th Meeting of the IATTC Permanent Working Group on Compliance, to be held in Lanzarote, Spain, on June 12, 2004.

INDEX

1.	Review of relevant Commission resolutions.....	1
2.	Review of possible violations during 2004.....	2
2.1.	Consolidated resolution on bycatch (C-04-05).....	2
2.1.1.	Release requirement.....	2
2.1.2.	Full-retention requirement.....	5
2.2.	Resolution on fish-aggregating devices (FADs) (C-99-07).....	7
2.3.	Resolution on at-sea reporting (C-03-04).....	7
2.4.	Resolution on the conservation of tuna (C-04-09).....	7
2.5.	Resolution on fleet capacity (C-02-03).....	8
2.6.	Resolution on data provision (C-03-05).....	9

All tonnages are in metric tons (t). The following abbreviations are used:

Countries:

BLZ	Belize
BOL	Bolivia
COL	Colombia
CRI	Costa Rica
ECU	Ecuador
ESP	Spain
EUR	European Union
GTM	Guatemala
HND	Honduras
MEX	Mexico
NIC	Nicaragua
SLV	El Salvador
USA	United States of America
VEN	Venezuela
VUT	Vanuatu

Species:

BET	Bigeye tuna (<i>Thunnus obesus</i>)
SKJ	Skipjack tuna (<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>)
YFT	Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)

Miscellaneous

FAD	Fish-aggregating device
EPO	Eastern Pacific Ocean

This report covers all trips initiated in 2004 (2004 trips) covered by the IATTC observer program, and also includes data received from national observer programs. The total number of successful sets¹ in 2004 was 18,279, compared to 21,164 in 2003, or 14% fewer. The number of 2004 trips is as follows:

	Total	IATTC	National
BOL	20	20	-
COL	30	30	-
ECU	234	156	78
ESP	19	10	9
GTM	3	3	-
HND	15	15	-
MEX	212	111	101
NIC	8	8	-
PAN	78	78	-
SLV	17	17	-
USA ²	14	12	-
VEN	92	53	39
VUT	18	18	-
Total	760	531	227

1. REVIEW OF RELEVANT COMMISSION RESOLUTIONS

The IATTC resolutions which were in effect during 2004 and which can be analyzed in terms of compliance are:

	Adopted
C-04-05 <i>Consolidated resolution on bycatch</i>	72 nd Meeting, June 2004
C-99-07 <i>Resolution on fish-aggregating devices</i>	64 th Meeting, July 1999
C-04-09 <i>Resolution for a multi-annual program on the conservation of tuna in the EPO for 2004, 2005 and 2006</i>	72 nd Meeting, June 2004
C-03-04 <i>Resolution on at-sea reporting</i>	70 th Meeting, June 2003
C-02-03 <i>Resolution on the capacity of the tuna fleet operating in the EPO</i>	69 th Meeting, June 2002
C-03-05 <i>Resolution on data provision</i>	70 th Meeting, June 2003

The *Consolidated Resolution on Bycatch* calls for the full retention of all tuna caught by purse-seine vessels and a requirement to release unharmed, to the extent practicable, non-target species, with special requirements for releasing sea turtles.

The *Resolution on Fish-Aggregating Devices* continues the prohibition of transshipment of tuna at sea and of the use of tender vessels.

The *Resolution for a multi-annual program on the conservation of tuna in the EPO for 2004, 2005 and 2006* established a prohibition on any fishing by purse-seine vessels in of the EPO from either (1) 1 August to 11 September; or (2) from 20 November to 31 December.

The *Resolution on At-Sea Reporting* requires all purse-seine vessels which carry an on-board observer to transmit the observer's weekly report to the staff.

The *Resolution on the capacity of the tuna fleet operating in the EPO* establishes rules and procedures governing the entry, transfer and operation of purse-seine vessels in the tuna fisheries of the EPO.

¹ For this report, a successful set is defined as a set in which at least one of the three species covered by the full retention requirement (yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye) is caught.

² The total includes two trips covered by observers from the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) program. The data are pooled with the IATTC program data in the tables.

The *Resolution on data provision* establishes the types and format of fisheries data to be provided to the Director by countries with vessels fishing for tunas in the EPO.

2. REVIEW OF POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS DURING 2004

2.1. Consolidated resolution on bycatch (C-04-05)

There are two compliance elements to be analyzed from this resolution, the requirements to release all bycatch and to retain all tuna caught.

2.1.1. Release requirement

The resolution calls for fishermen to release unharmed, to the extent practicable, all sea turtles, sharks, billfishes, rays, dorado, and other non-target species, with specific requirements for the release of encircled or entangled sea turtles.

2.1.1.a Sea turtles

With respect to sea turtles, the resolution requires that all sea turtles be released by fishermen on purse-seine vessels. More specifically, the resolution calls for the following:

- 4.a. Require fishermen on vessels targeting species covered by the Convention to promptly release unharmed, to the extent practicable, all sea turtles.
- 4.e. Require specific measures for encircled or entangled sea turtles, as follows:
 - i. Whenever a sea turtle is sighted in the net, all reasonable efforts should be made to rescue the turtle before it becomes entangled in the net, including, if necessary, the deployment of a speedboat.
 - ii. If a turtle is entangled in the net, net roll should stop as soon as the turtle comes out of the water and should not start again until the turtle has been disentangled and released.
 - iii. If a turtle is brought aboard the vessel, all appropriate efforts to assist in the recovery of the turtle should be made before returning it to the water.

During 2004 trips, 1,078 sets were made in which sea turtles were involved, a reduction of 29% compared to the number reported for 2003. A turtle is considered “involved” if it has any interaction with the purse-seine fishing gear, regardless of whether it was encircled in a set. The distribution of these sets by program is shown in Table 2.1, and the fate of these turtles is shown in Table 2.2³.

Program	Number of sets	Number of turtles
IATTC	734	909
ECU	235	263
EUR	50	53
MEX	18	33
VEN	41	41
Total	1,078	1,299

TABLE 2.1. Purse-seine sets involving sea turtles by program, 2004

Clearly, turtles that are consumed or treated as catch constitute a contravention of the resolution; in 2004 there was one case, compared with two cases in 2003. The staff has notified the government of the vessel involved.

³ Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

	IATTC		ECU		EUR		MEX		VEN		Total	
		%		%		%		%		%		%
Released unharmed	800	88	212	90	49	92	33	100	34	83	1,156	89
Escaped	43	5	8	3	1	2	-	-	5	12	57	4
Slightly injured	48	5	13	6	3	6	-	-	1	2	65	5
Severely injured	9	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	12	1
Left entangled	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
Killed	2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0
Consumed	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
Other/Unknown	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0
Total	909		235		53		33		41		1,299	

TABLE 2.2. Fate of sea turtles involved in purse-seine sets, by program, 2004

The number of accidental mortalities of turtles involved in the fisheries was two, compared to five in 2003. These accidental mortalities are included in this report and in the tables. On one occasion, there were no compliance issues associated with the accidental mortality, but in the other case, the staff believes that the mortality was caused by the failure to assist the turtle when it was brought aboard the vessel, and the case has been forwarded to the flag government of the vessel involved for investigation.

Table 2.3 indicates the fate of turtles that passed through the power block in five sets on tuna in 2004. It must be noted that observers make an assessment of the condition of all turtles involved in sets, and specifically those passed through the power block, but do not have the time or specialized knowledge necessary to make a thorough examination. The staff sent letters to the flag states involved for all six of these cases.

Released unharmed	1
Slightly injured	-
Severely injured	2
Killed	-
Consumed	-
Other/Unknown	3
Total	6

None of the national programs reported turtles being passed through the power block.

TABLE 2.3. Fate of sea turtles passed through power block, 2004

As indicated in Table 2.2, observers reported that, of the 1,299 turtles involved in purse-seine sets, 1,156 (89%) were released unharmed or escaped uninjured. Of the remaining 143 turtles, 77 (6%) suffered injuries, 12 severe and 65 slight, and two (<1%) died in the course of the set.

On ten occasions (including the six referred to in Table 2.3) the requirement to stop net roll was not complied with, resulting in 4 injuries, all slight. The national program data do not show any infractions in this category.

Sea turtles can also become entangled in webbing discarded at sea or hung under fish-aggregating devices (FADs). The fate of the 30 turtles that were found entangled alive in a FAD prior to the set (23 sets) is shown in Table 2.4.

	IATTC	ECU	EUR	MEX	VEN	Total		
	Sets	15	8	0	0	0	23	
							No	%
Released unharmed	13	6	-	-	-	19	63	
Released – slight injuries	5	4	-	-	-	9	30	
Released – severe injuries	2	-	-	-	-	2	7	
Left entangled alive	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other/Unknown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	20	10	-	-	-	30		

TABLE 2.4. Fate of sea turtles found entangled alive in webbing in FADs involved in sets, by program, 2004

Observers also record sightings of turtles entangled in netting associated with floating objects on which no set is made. These cases, excluding turtles recorded as previously dead, and the actions the crew took after the sighting, are summarized in Table 2.5.

	IATTC	ECU	EUR	MEX	VEN	Total	
Sightings	80	24	6	0	14	124	
						No	%
Released unharmed	49	15	5	-	12	81	58
Released – slight injuries	16	4	-	-	1	21	15
Released – severe injuries	8	1	1	-	1	11	8
Left entangled alive	16	10	-	-	-	26	19
Other/Unknown	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
Total	89	30	6	-	14	139	

TABLE 2.5. Fate of sea turtles sighted entangled in webbing (no set), by program, 2004

Observers reported a total of 26 turtles left entangled in 124 sightings of FADs that were not set on, as compared to 25 turtles in 183 sightings in 2003.

Table 2.5 does not include sightings of previously dead turtles entangled in floating objects reported by observers, because there are no compliance issues associated with this. Although it cannot be known for certain, it seems likely that these turtles die as a result of becoming entangled and, since FADs are not marked, it is possible that some of these were reported more than once by different observers. It is also possible that additional unobserved mortality of turtles occurs in floating objects.

In terms of compliance, the staff identified three different categories of violations of the sea turtle release requirements which occurred during 2004 trips:

1. Turtles retained on board the vessel;
2. Failure to stop net roll to release turtles;
3. Failure to assist in the recovery of a turtle brought aboard.

Table 2.6 reflects the violations recorded by IATTC observers and reported to the pertinent national authorities.

	Turtle retained aboard	Failure to stop net roll	Failure to assist
BOL		1	
ECU		3	
PAN	1	4	1
VEN		1	
VUT		1	
Total	1	10	1

TABLE 2.6. Violations involving sea turtles reported to national authorities, 2004

With respect to turtles entangled in FADs, the operative part of the resolution reads: “To encourage the release, when practicable, of sea turtles entangled in FADs.” It is thus not necessarily a violation of the resolution not to release an entangled turtle. However, in most cases it is practical for a crewman to release entangled turtles; the fishing is usually stopped, checking the FAD or preparing to set when the observation is made, and it would be relatively easy to deploy a crewmember on a suitable platform to release the turtle. In fact, in some cases reviewed for this report, the observer indicated that equipment on a FAD was changed and no effort to release the turtle was made.

2.1.1.b Sharks

Since August 2004, IATTC observers have been using a new form, the *Registro de Tiburones (Shark Record; RDT)* to collect more detailed data on the interactions of sharks with the tuna purse-seine fishery. The main difference between this form and the *Marine Fauna Record (MFR)*, used for other species, is that on the MFR the observer records only fishing mortality (animals killed by fishing operations), not any animals released alive. On the RDT, the observer records the ‘fate’ (released dead or alive, consumed) of any shark involved in a set on tunas.

The RDT was made available to all national programs, but as far as the staff is aware, was not used by them in 2004.

Observers completed an RDT for 138 trips, in which 755 sets were made that involved nearly 6,500 sharks. The fate of these sharks is shown in Table 2.7.

It should be noted that, as with turtles, the observer makes an estimate of the condition of the shark with very limited time and experience, and those animals reported alive may have injuries that are not obvious to the observer.

	No.	%
Released	206	3
Discarded	4,944	76
Consumed	1,226	19
Other	76	1
Unknown	14	0
Total	6,466	

TABLE 2.7. Fate of sharks involved in purse-seine sets, August-December 2004

It is noteworthy that 1,226 sharks were consumed; this would be a contravention of the resolution if it had been practical to release the shark alive.

2.1.2. Full-retention requirement

Resolution C-04-05 calls for the implementation of programs to require all purse-seine vessels to first retain on board and then land all bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tuna caught, except fish considered unfit for human consumption for reasons other than size, in order to provide a disincentive to the capture of these small fish. Another exception is the final set of a trip, when there may be insufficient well space remaining to accommodate all the tuna caught in that set.

The Commission adopted the full retention requirement in June 2000 for one year, to begin in 2001, and has been extending the requirement on an annual basis since that time. It is now due to expire on January 1, 2006.

2.1.2.a. Data collected by observers

In this report, the information provided to the Working Group in June 2004 is compared with the information collected by observers on trips that started in 2004.

Observers make an estimate of the tonnage of tuna, by species, discarded at sea, and code the reason for discarding it as follows:

Code	
1	Unmarketable tuna size
2	Unmarketable tuna condition
4	All vessel wells are full
5	No wells are ready to receive tuna
6	Other reason / Reason unknown

For this analysis, discards coded 2, 4 or 5 were considered to be covered by the exemptions specified in the resolution, so only discards coded 1 and 6 were considered to contravene the full retention requirement. All the data on discards presented in this report correspond only to discards with these two codes.

Tables 2.8a-c show, for each program, the number of successful sets in the EPO, the number of such sets with discards of tunas, and the estimated tonnage of tunas discarded, during 2003 and 2004.

	IATTC	ECU	EUR	MEX	VEN	ALL
2003	14,146	1,392	251	3,248	2,127	21,164
2004	12,793	1,335	195	2,785	1,171	18,279
% change	-10	-4	-22	-14	-45	-14

TABLE 2.8a. Number of successful sets

	IATTC	ECU	EUR	MEX	VEN	ALL
2003	1,681	721	86	75	20	2,583
2004	1,134	354	51	14	18	1,571
% change	-33	-51	-41	-81	-10	-39

TABLE 2.8b. Sets with discards of tuna (YFT, SKJ, BET) coded 1 or 6

	IATTC	ECU	EUR	MEX	VEN	ALL
2003	13,370	2,378	539	613	299	17,199
2004	10,846	2,859	366	260	134	14,465
% change	-19	20	-32	-58	-55	-16

TABLE 2.8c. Estimated tonnage of tunas (YFT, SKJ, BET) discarded

The 39% reduction in the number of sets with illegal discards (Table 2.8b) must be seen in the context of a 14% reduction in the number of successful sets, which is almost the same as the 16% reduction in the amount of tuna discarded (Table 2.8c). The average tonnage discarded per set increased considerably in 2004. Table 2.9 shows the average tonnage discarded in sets with illegal discards during the three-year periods before and after the resolution and during 2004. In the first two periods it was virtually the same, while 2004 shows an increase of 35-40%.

1998-2000	2001-2003	2004
6.7	6.9	9.4

TABLE 2.9. Average tonnage discarded in sets with discards (IATTC data)

The proportion of discards prohibited by the resolution as a percentage of total catch reported by IATTC observers in 2004 is virtually the same as in 2003 (Table 2.10), and in both years is greater than the 2001-2002 average (2.4%).

(t)	2003			2004		
	Catch	Discards	%	Catch	Discards	%
Total	460,634	13,370	2.9	362,369	10,846	3.0

TABLE 2.10. Discards as proportions of total observed catch (IATTC data)

2.1.2.b. Discards recorded by vessel personnel

The resolution, and the procedures approved by the Parties in November 2000, require that, if yellowfin, skipjack, or bigeye tuna is discarded because it is unfit for human consumption, the captain and the chief engineer document the reasons in writing. *Tuna Discard Records* (TDR) are made available to all captains for this purpose, and the forms are collected at the end of each trip.

An analysis was made of the 1,358 trips made since 2001 in which IATTC observers recorded any

discards for any reason of the three species covered by the resolution. Completed TDRs were available for 767 of these trips. Of these, 120 (9%) indicated that there were no discards, contradicting the observer's report.

These TDRs covered only 1,762 (14%) of the 12,205 sets with discards reported by observers. In 52% of the cases, the TDR indicated that the fish was discarded because it was too small or had no commercial value, or gave no reason, none of which are acceptable under the resolution. In only 845 (6.9%) of the 12,205 sets were the discards recorded on the TDR allowed under the resolution.

	Sets with discards observed	Sets included on TDRs	%	Sets on TDRs with illegal discards	%
2001	3,406	369	11	123	33
2002	2,855	453	16	159	35
2003	3,751	631	17	425	67
2004	2,193	309	14	210	68
Total	12,205	1,762	14	917	52

TABLE 2.13. Discards reported by observers and on TDRs

2.2. Resolution on fish-aggregating devices (FADs) (C-99-07)

There are two elements of this resolution which need to be considered in terms of compliance: the prohibition of transshipment of tuna at sea by purse-seine vessels fishing for tuna in the EPO, and the prohibition on the use of tender vessels operating in support of vessels fishing on FADs in the EPO.

The staff has received no reports of transshipments at sea. The last definitive report to the staff of a tender vessel in the EPO was on June 17, 2000.

2.3. Resolution on at-sea reporting (C-03-04)

At its 70th meeting, in June 2003, the Commission adopted a modification to the resolution adopted in June 2001 regarding reporting information of fishing activities while the vessel is at sea. The operative change in the new resolution is that the vessel personnel are responsible for transmitting the observer's weekly report of catches (and dolphin mortalities, if applicable) to the staff; previously, the vessel personnel had merely been requested to allow the observer to transmit the report. The intention of the change was to improve the low percentage of reports received (48% and 51% in 2001 and 2002, respectively). During 2003, a marked increase in compliance was observed: during the second semester, when the new resolution was in effect, the reporting rate increased to 70%. For trips that started in 2004, this rate increased to 73%, as shown in the table.

2.4. Resolution on the conservation of tuna (C-04-09)

The 2004 Resolution for a multi-annual program on the conservation of tuna in the EPO for 2004, 2005 and 2006 established a prohibition on any fishing by purse-seine vessels in of the EPO from either (1) 1 August to 11 September; or (2) 20 November to 31 December.

Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, and Peru implemented the closure during August-September;

	Program	Weeks	Reports	%
BOL	IATTC	197	44	22
COL	IATTC	235	14	6
ECU	IATTC	895	634	71
	National	455	293	64
EUR	IATTC	71	71	100
	National	74	74	100
GTM	IATTC	26	26	100
HND	IATTC	90	79	88
MEX	IATTC	623	517	83
	National	644	454	70
NIC	IATTC	56	56	100
PAN	IATTC	530	442	83
SLV	IATTC	108	98	91
USA	IATTC	109	107	98
	FFA	6	6	100
VEN	IATTC	378	327	87
	National	302	262	87
VUT	IATTC	138	122	88
Total		4,937	3,626	73

TABLE 2.14. Percentages of at-sea reports received. 2004

Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain, United States, Vanuatu, and Venezuela implemented the closure during November-December.

Colombia did not choose either of the two closure periods, but implemented its own unilateral measures.

During the first closure period, the staff identified four Bolivian vessels (*Amanda S*, *Cabo de Hornos*, *Gold Coast* and *Nazca*) fishing in violation of the closure. During the same period six Colombian vessels (*American Eagle*, *El Rey*, *Enterprise*, *Grenadier*, *Marta Lucía R.* and *Sandra C*) fished in the EPO. The total recorded catch by these vessels during the closure period was 4,067 tons in 135 sets.

The staff did not identify violations of the closure by any vessel of the 8 countries that chose the second closure period, but five Colombian vessels (*American Eagle*, *El Rey*, *Grenadier*, *Marta Lucía R* and *Sandra C*) fished in the in the EPO during that period. The total recorded catch by these vessels during the closure period was 4,010 t in 103 sets.

[Resolution C-04-09](#) prohibits landings, transshipments, and commercial transactions in tuna or tuna products that have been positively identified as originating from fishing activities that contravene the resolution. The staff sent weekly reports to all Parties of any fishing activities during the closure to assist in the implementation of this provision of the Resolution. However, the staff is not aware that any fish taken illegally during the closures was actually the subject of any such prohibitions.

It would appear that this provision of the resolution, while an important step forward, is not likely to be effective due to practical considerations, mainly because of timing: by the time governments become aware of a possible violation, it is likely that the fish in question will already have been landed. There may also be other issues associated with the implementation of this provision of the Resolution, and the Working Group may wish to address strengthening the Resolution in this area.

[Resolution C-04-09](#) establishes catch limits for bigeye taken by longline for China, Chinese Taipei, Japan and Korea, and requires other CPCs⁴ to “take measures necessary to ensure their total annual longline catch of bigeye tuna in the EPO during 2004, 2005, and 2006 does not exceed their respective catch levels in 2001.” Table 2.15 shows the reported catches of CPCs and other countries that have reported longline catches in 2004, and the limit established or their reported 2001 catch.

	Limit/2001 catch	2004 catch		Limit/2001 catch	2004 catch
BLZ ⁵	1987	120	MEX	1	0
CHN	2639	2602	NIC	< 3	-
CRI	-	-	PAN	80	-
ECU	-	-	PER	-	-
ESP	-	5	SLV	< 3	-
FRA	684	-	TWN	7953	7384
GTM	0	-	USA	118	-
HND	-	-	VEN	-	-
JPN	34,076	18,485	VUT	3277	1225 ⁶
KOR	12,576	10,729			

TABLE 2.14. Longline catches of bigeye

2.5. Resolution on fleet capacity ([C-02-03](#))

In June 2002, the Commission adopted a resolution on the capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet operating in the EPO. The resolution is somewhat complex, and no attempt will be made here to fully describe it. However, there is one compliance issue associated with the resolution which needs to be addressed. On a

⁴ IATTC Party, cooperating non-party, fishing entity or regional economic integration organization

⁵ Not a CPC during 2004

⁶ Known to be incomplete

positive note, it is worth noting that, after nearly three years with the resolution in force, this is the only clear case of a compliance problem.

The capacity management system established by the resolution does not include the concept of national capacity allocations or limits; instead, fleet capacity limitations are essentially determined by the Regional Vessel Register. Therefore, the key elements of the resolution address how vessels may be added to or removed from the Register. The participating governments have agreed to use the Register as the definitive list of purse-seine vessels authorized by the participants to fish for tunas in the EPO. According to the resolution, any purse-seine vessel fishing for tunas in the EPO that is not on the Register would be considered to be undermining IATTC management measures.

The resolution prohibits the entry of new vessels, defined as those not included on the Register, to the EPO purse-seine fleet, except to replace vessels removed from the Register. There are some limited and specific exceptions to this rule for five countries, and these are elaborated in the resolution. Thus, a country cannot add a purse-seine vessel to its fleet unless it is a replacement or the country is allowed an exception.

The compliance problem that needs to be addressed is that a newly-built purse-seine vessel, the *Marta Lucia R*, entered the fishery on February 22, 2004, under Colombian flag, and has been fishing for tuna in the EPO. This vessel is not on the Register, and would not be eligible for inclusion even if Colombia requested it, because the terms of the resolution have not been met: it is not replacing another vessel, and Colombia is not one of the five countries allowed an exception by the resolution.

2.6. Resolution on data provision ([C-03-05](#))

At its 70th meeting in June 2003, the Commission adopted Resolution [C-03-05](#) on data provision, which makes mandatory the provision of specified fisheries data to the Director, on an annual basis, for all vessels fishing for species under the purview of the Commission.

The nature and format of the data to be provided is spelled out in detail in the resolution. The aggregated data required for each year is to be provided by 30 June of the following year.

Certain exceptions are established by the resolution, the most important of which is that, for vessels of less than 24 meters overall length, the data requirements will not enter into force until 1 January 2007.

All of the countries with purse-seine vessels fishing in the EPO are meeting the requirements of the resolution. However, information for 2003 has not yet been received from the following countries with longline vessels: Bolivia, Cambodia, Colombia, France (French Polynesia), Georgia, and Indonesia. The data for EU (Spain) longline vessels include only catch, effort and length-frequency data for swordfish and total catch of bigeye tuna. The staff does not have details of the sizes of vessels from Cambodia, Indonesia, and Georgia that are reported to be operating in the eastern Pacific, and so it is not certain that these vessels are longer than 24 m.

Chinese Taipei, the EU (Spain) and Japan have provided the length-frequency data for 2003 that are required to be provided “whenever possible”. No doubt it would have been possible for other CPCs to have provided such data.

The issue of data from coastal longline vessels greater than 24 meters in length overall is a more difficult matter. The fisheries information the staff receives from these fleets has improved in recent years, but it is far from complete, and often only the most basic data are available. The staff has obtained much of the required information from most of the fleets, but improvements are clearly needed.

Another issue related to catch reporting is the requirement in [Resolution C-04-09](#) regarding the provision of monthly reports to the Director during 2004 on the catches of bigeye tuna. The resolution requires each CPC with large (>24 meters) longline vessels to provide monthly reports. Six governments reported their monthly longline catches during 2004: China, European Union, Japan, Korea, Vanuatu, and Chinese Taipei. The four governments with flag vessels that make the largest catches of bigeye and are

specifically mentioned in the resolution (China, Chinese Taipei, Japan, and Korea) all reported their catches for each month during 2004. The European Union reported catch for Spain in January and February and Vanuatu for the months of January–April. Other countries with large longline vessels (Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France (French Polynesia), Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, and the United States) did not make any monthly catch reports of bigeye tuna in 2004, nor did they report any annual catches of bigeye tuna for 2004. El Salvador and Nicaragua do not report any longline vessels longer than 24 meters, so were not required to make monthly reports, but do have vessels equal to or smaller than 24 meters, and did not report any bigeye catch for 2004.