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## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Tuna and Billfish Assessment Programme (TBAP) has provided technical and financial support for several longline port sampling programmes in South Pacific Commission (SPC) member countries and territories. Sampling programmes are currently operating in Pohnpei and Yap (Federated States of Micronesia), Lami and Levuka (Fiji), Papeete (French Polynesia), Majuro (Marshall Islands), Noumea (New Caledonia) and Koror (Palau). All of the sampling programmes had commenced by early 1992, therefore a full year's data is now available. It was thus considered timely to report on the status of the sampling programmes and to conduct a preliminary examination of coverage and length frequencies.

## LONGLINE PORT SAMPLING PROGRAMMES

## FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA (POHNPEI)

In August 1991, when port sampling in Pohnpei commenced, ten longliners transshipped fish from Pohnpei to Japan via Continental/Air Micronesia and Air Nauru, including seven Taiwanese vessels managed by Union Corporation, two Japanese vessels managed by Okinawa Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association, and one Micronesian vessel owned by the Atoll Fishing Company. Japanese vessels stopped transshipping in Pohnpei in late 1991. Another Taiwanese agent, Ting Hong, began operating on Pohnpei in March 1992, using their own plane to ship fish two to four times a month from Pohnpei to Japan. By April 1992, Korean vessels, managed by Pyungwha, were also transhipping. In January 1993, the number of vessels had increased to 16, including six Taiwanese, six Korean, three Japanese and on Micronesian longliner.

Port sampling in Pohnpei commenced in August 1991. The Micronesian Maritime Authority (MMA) port sampler, Clay Hedson, was originally trained by John Diplock, a former MMA expatriate tuna biologist. Hedson's salary was funded by SPC during September 1991 - August 1992. Thereafter his position has been funded by MMA. Further training of port sampler Hedson in the identification of billfish and other bycatch was conducted by MMA tuna biologist Craig Heberer in late 1992.

Unloading usually takes place about four hours before a flight is scheduled to depart. Thje amount unloaded depends on the amount of space available, which is often limited, therefore partial unloadings are common. The unloading is somewhat different from Koror and Yap in that the packing area is removed from the dockside. The fish are therefore lifted out of the hold by a crane positioned on the dock, five fish at a time, and dropped into a container of ice-water that sits on a palet on a forklift. The forklift then drives the fish across the dock to the packing area, where the fish are hauled out of the container onto metal tables, graded, weighed on a scale and measured by Hedson, then packed in boxes lined with plastic containing a few packs of dry ice.

Hedson has been instructed to measure all fish taken off all boats unloading on Pohnpei; however, while all fish are measured from those unloadings that are sampled, only $60-70$ per cent of unloadings are actually sampled.

Rejects are not taken out of the line, therefore they are measured in the order in which they are unloaded. The fish, however, are not unloaded randomly, with higher-valued fish unloaded before
lower-valued fish, thus it is essential that all fish unloaded from vessels at Pohnpei be sampled, as is currently the case.

Status
Longline port sampling in Pohnpei has been carried out regularly, although the coverage of the unloadings has been less than the original goal of full coverage. All fish are measured during unloading, therefore the non-random order of unloading of the fish, due to limited cargo space available on flights out of Pohnpei, has not been problematic.

## FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA (YAP)

During 1992, according to Ting Hong (Yap), about 50 Taiwanese and several mainland Chinese longliners transshipped $2,100 \mathrm{mt}$ in Yap. Ting Hong operate their own plane, which flies to Japan about ten times each month, with occassional deliveries of fish to Ting Hong offices on Guam and Saipan, for the hotel market. Four Micronesian longliners operated by the National Fishing Corporation also unload in Yap.

Port sampling on Yap was initiated by Clay Hedson, MMA port sampler at Pohnpei, who trained John Tipmai during 4-12 February 1992. Tipmai was employed for the first twelve months with SPC funds; funding of his position was then taken over by MMA. Further training of port sampler Tipmai in the identification of billfish and other bycatch was conducted by MMA tuna biologist Craig Heberer in October 1992. Previously all marlin landed at Yap were classified as black marlin, whereas most are actually blue marlin.

The fish are individually hoisted from the hold directly onto the dock by the tail with an onboard winch. Then it is pulled over to the dock by ropes attached to a hook set in the mouth, while simultaneously the crew handling the winch lets the fish drop. The fish is hauled over rubber mats on the dock to an area where the pectoral fins and tail are lopped off. The fish is then graded and colour-coded slips of paper are slapped onto the fish to indicate the grade. The fish is then sponged. Any excess flesh around the gill opening are trimmed, which gives the fish a cleaner appearance. Then it is thoroughly rinsed, outside and in. Tipmai measures the length with a two-metre long caliper as each fish is dragged up onto a scale sitting a few centimetres above the ground. The scale is only about 30 cm wide, therefore some of the longer fish, particularly marlin, tend to bend over the scale, which can affect the length measurement by about a centimetre. However, most fish are rigid, and when a fish is obviously bent over the scale, one of the Yapese boys on the line will usually, but not always, lift the tail up to straighten the fish. After the scale operator slaps another slip of paper onto the fish with the weight written on it, and after Tipmai has measured the length, a packet of dry ice is placed in the mouth. Then it is hauled over rollers up onto a metal table, where it awaits packing into plastic lined boxes.

Tipmai does a proficient job at measuring the length and recording the species, length and weight. His only problem appears to be measuring rejects, mostly smaller yellowfin and marlin, which are hurriedly weighed after all the other fish have passed over the scale. Tipmai measures them as fast as he can, but he is still the bottleneck in the line when the rejects are being weighed.

Status

Coverage of longline port sampling in Yap appears to be high, with the MMA port sampler, Tipmai, measuring almost all fish coming off almost all vessels. Occasionally Tipmai will miss sampling when unloading takes place at an unusual time, or sometimes a trip will only be partially sampled when unloading begins prior to the scheduled time. Transshipment in Yap during 1993 is expected to increase substantially, however, therefore high coverage may not be maintained.

## FIJI (LAMI)

Longline port sampling commenced in Lami in February 1992, when Faiyaz Sahib was hired by Fiji Fish Company, with SPC funds, to sample all catches unloaded at Fiji Fish. Sahib was trained by the SPC Senior Fisheries Scientist (Albacore), Marc Labelle, and was instructed to obtain length measurements of all yellowfin, bigeye and albacore and, whenever possible, weight measurements as well. Sahib was also assigned responsibility for collecting catch and effort logbooks and forwarding all data to SPC on a monthly basis. Copies of the logbooks are also supplied to the Fisheries Division, Lami.

## Status

Sampling operations during 1992 proceeded smoothly, therefore Sahib's contract was renewed in February 1993, with his salary shared equally between SPC and Fiji Fish.

## FIJI (LEVUKA)

Longline and troller port sampling at Levuka commenced in the fall of 1991, when Ashok Kumar was hired on a full-time basis by Pacific Fishing Company (PAFCO) to record all unloadings, sample albacore catches from trollers and longliners, and collect catch and effort logbooks. When not engaged in sampling operations, Kumar was to assist with other plant duties to be determined by PAFCO. Kumar's salary was funded by SPC for a twelve month period beginning 1 September 1991. Supervision of the Levuka port sampling programme was assigned to Subodh Sharma, A/SFO Stats and Information, Fisheries Division, Lami.

## Status

Sampling during 1991 proceeded smoothly. Initially, all data were forwarded to Sharma, who then forwarded the data to SPC. To reduce delays, Kumar was requested to forward the data directly to SPC. Kumar was re-hired for a second one-year period on 1 September 1992, again funded by SPC.

## FRENCH POLYNESIA (PAPEETE)

Port sampling in Papeete was implemented prior to 1990 by the Etablissement pour la Valorisation des Activités Aquacoles et Maritimes (EVAAM), primarily to monitor the catch composition of trollers and Japanese and Korean longliners unloading at Tahiti Tuna. In order to ensure proper coverage of all commercial unloadings during 1991, SPC provided funds to hire two part-time
samplers to collect catch and effort logbooks and to sample 100 albacore per trip, from trollers and foreign longliners. EVAAM, under biologist Stephen Yen, provided logistic support, administered the funds, and trained and supervised the port samplers. Additional funds were provided by SPC to continue sampling during 1992.

## Status

Port sampling in Papeete has proceeded smoothly. Complete responsibility for funding of sampling during 1993 was met by EVAAM.

## MARSHALL ISLANDS (MAJURO)

Longline transshipment has occurred on Majuro since December 1990. Approximately six Taiwanese longliners transshipped in Majuro in 1991, unloading fish destined for the Japanese and Hawaiian markets. Taiwanese vessels ceased transshipping in Majuro in June 1992. Four other vessels owned or managed by local interests have operated since 1991. In late 1992, four American - Marshall Islands joint-venture vessels began fishing out of Majuro, managed by MMAGG and the Marshall Islands Development Agency (MIDA).

Transshipment in Majuro is conducted by MMAGG Inc., a joint-venture between MMG, Hawaii, and MIDA. In January 1993, transshipment took place twice a week, on Friday and Monday evenings, prior to Air Marshall Islands flights to Honolulu on Saturday and Tuesday mornings. Up to five vessels transshipped during a day, with each vessel unloading for about two hours.

Port sampling was initiated in February 1992 by the SPC Assistant Fisheies Statistician (Peter Williams), who trained the Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority (MIMRA) port sampling officer, Virgil Alfred. Sampling proceeded regularly until January 1993, when MMAGG began transshipping at midnight, rather than in late afternoon. Sampling ceased for a month, until arrangements could be made to replace Alfred, who was not available for late night work. Sampling recommenced in February 1993, with Xavier Myazoe, MIMRA statistican, acting as the head port sampler, and has proceeded regularly since then.

Originally, sampling was conducted on palets onto which the fish were hoisted by a dockside crane, before being taken by a forklift over to the packing area. Since January 1993, sampling has been done at tables in the packing area, rather than on the palets, in order to allow recording of the weights measured on the scale at the packing area, as well as lengths. One problem, however, is that after the length measurement is taken, but prior to weighing, the heads and tails are usually removed, so the fish weights taken in Majuro are not directly comparable with weights recorded at other ports. The samplers have been instructed to write on the form that the weights were headed and tailed, and to note on the form if any fish were measured with heads and/or tails.

Another potential problem concerns the units of weight measurements. Fish bound for Hawaii are measured in pounds, while fish bound for Japan are measured in kilogrammes. Fish unloaded from a single trip are often sent to both destinations. The sampler has been instructed to note the units of each measurement for each fish.

All fish unloaded for a trip are measured, including the rejected tuna and swordfish. Coverage of trips was moderate to high, until January 1993, when sampling temporarily ceased. Sampling recommenced in February 1993.

MIMRA has been consistent in forwarding the port sampling sheets to SPC, where they are processed. MIMRA has also sent transshipment summary forms, detailing the amount unloaded, by species, for each trip, which is obtained from MMAGG.

## Status

With the exception of January 1993, when sampling was interrupted, longline port sampling in Majuro has proceeded regularly since implementation in February 1992. The port sampling data are forwarded to SPC on a regular basis, together with information summarising all transshipments.

## NEW CALEDONIA (NOUMEA)

Sampling of albacore catches landed in Noumea by the Caledonie Toho fleet of longliners began in May 1990, with the objective of collecting length data, gonads and hard parts for biological studies. SPC staff conducted sampling on a weekly basis, meeting vessels entering port to transship yellowfin and bigeye destined for Japan. About 100 albacore were sampled from each unloading. During 1992, yellowfin and bigeye were also sampled. Sampling operations were taken over by the Service Territorial de la Marine Marchande et des Pêches Maritimes, New Caledonia, under the supervision of Régis Etaix-Bonnin, in January 1993. Throughout the port sampling programme, collection of catch and effort logbooks, which are used to identify the time-area fished, has been incomplete.

## Status

Port sampling has been carried out on a regular basis since implementation in 1990. However, the lack of catch and effort logbooks for 78 per cent of trips has resulted in problems determining the time-area fished, thereby reducing the usefulness of the length data collected.

## PALAU (KOROR)

Taiwanese longliners began transshipping at Koror in 1987. During 1992, Japanese longliners began transshipping. Most vessels are 25-49 gross tonnes. The vessels are managed by two companies, Palau International Traders Incorporated (PITI) and Palau Marine Industries Corporation (PMIC). A third company, Palau Freight and Forwarding Service (PFFS), has been involved in transshipment activity in the past, but has not been active since at least 1991. During 1991, PITI managed 40 Taiwanese and 28 mainland Chinese vessels, while PMIC managed 30 Taiwanese and 3 mainland Chinese vessels.

Yellowfin and bigeye make up 95 per cent of the fish sent by air freight to Japan. During 1990, approximately $2,186 \mathrm{mt}$ were sent to Japan; during 1991, 2,781 mt were transshipped. It has been estimated that the amount of other species unloaded, including blue marlin, black marlin, swordfish, mahi mahi and sharks, is on the order of 25-30 per cent of the amount transshipped to Japan.

Catch rates are low from December through March, 15-20 fish per trip for Taiwanese vessels, compared to 70 fish per trip during the rest of the year. Therefore most Taiwanese vessels stop fishing during late January - early March and return to Taiwan. Japanese vessels operate year round and, when fishing is good, usually transship 100-200 fish.

Sampling was implemented during June-July 1991 by a consultant (Kevin Williams) recruited by SPC and funded by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). An employee of the Marine Resources Division (MRD), Masubed Tkel, was trained and began sampling at the two dock areas, one used by PITI and the other by PMIC. From 1 September 1991 to 30 September 1992, Tkel's salary was funded by SPC.

In August 1991, a data processing system for the length samples was implemented at MRD by the SPC Programmer/Research Officer (Russell Price).

Sampling proceeded regularly until July 1992, when MRD assigned Tkel to other activities. No sampling occurred during August 1992 - January 1993. Sampling activities recommenced in February 1993, shortly after Tkel was transferred to the Palau Maritime Authority (PMA).

PMA has been responsible for management of tuna fisheries, including the collection and processing of cargo manifests, catch and effort logsheets, and packing lists. Processing of the transshipment data, however, has suffered from delays. During early 1993, an attempt was made to clear the substantial backlog of data processing.

Forwarding of the port sampling data to SPC has not been successful. The only data received at SPC to date was hand-carried by Price after his visit in August 1991. The situation was discussed with Tkel, however, in January 1993, and is expected to improve.

During transshipment, fish are hoisted by the tail with a winch from the hold to a ramp; then hauled up the ramp with a gaff; then dragged two metres over the smooth concrete of the dock to where they are sponged down and rinsed; then placed on a metal table a few centimetres off the ground where they are graded; then dragged a metre to the scale sitting on the ground where they are weighed; then lifted by hand to the waist-high metal table, where Tkel measures with his calipers; then slid into the plastic-lined boxes with dry ice. As at PITI, the rejects are put to the side after grading and are not weighed. Tkel has been instructed to measure the rejects as well as the air-freighted fish.

Unlike other ports, where all fish unloaded are measured, the sampling protocol for Taiwanese vessels in Koror is to measure 50 tuna in sequence from whenever measuring begins, or until the vessel ceases unloading. In January 1993, the sampling protocol for Japanese vessels, which unload 100-200 fish per trip, compared to 50-100 fish for Taiwanese vessels, was modified such that 100 fish are measured. The sampling protocol was also modified in January 1993 to include rejects in the 50 or 100 fish sampled. Previously, no rejects had been sampled. The rejected fish appear to be larger on-average than other fish.

Status
During the initial phase of longline port sampling in Koror, July 1991 - July 1992, rejects were not measured, which may have resulted in biased samples. The sample size for Japanese vessels was the same as for Taiwanese vessels, even though the Japanese regularly unload more fish than
the Taiwanese. Both problems, i.e., rejects and the sample size for Japanese vessels, were addressed in January 1993.

The lack of sampling during the latter half of 1992 represents a serious gap in the time series. While it would have been useful to compare length frequencies from Koror to other ports, on a quarterly basis throughout 1992, this is no longer possible.

The lack of full information on the number of unloadings and the total amount unloaded, from sources other than port sampling, such as cargo manifests and packing lists, due to delays in data processing at PMA, makes a detailed analysis of coverage impossible. Full information on the total amounts transshipped, by vessel nationality, will be essential for raising the length frequency samples to represent the total catch of fish transshipped in Koror.

## COVERAGE OF CATCHES BY PORT SAMPLING

Table 1 presents a summary of the number of fish sampled by port of unloading. The sampling effort varied considerably among ports during 1992, from 564 fish sampled in Koror to 26, 182 fish sampled in Yap. A total of 68,723 fish was sampled during 1992.

In order to establish the coverage of unloadings by the port sampling programmes, Table 2 gives summary of unloadings by port, fleet, year and month, for Majuro, Pohnpei and Yap. Unfortunately, unloading data for other ports are currently unavailable. The unloading statistics have been compiled from various sources, including packing lists, cargo manifests and other records provided by vessel agents. According to the data available, 226 mt were transshipped from Majuro during 1992, 774 mt from Pohnpei, and 1,340 mt from Yap.

It would appear that the estimate of unloadings for Yap during $1992,1,400 \mathrm{mt}$, which was determined from data compiled by the Micronesian Maritime Authority (MMA), is under-estimated, since the vessel agent on Yap has indicated that a total of $2,100 \mathrm{mt}$ were transshipped from Yap during 1992. Unloading data for Majuro and Pohnpei have not, as yet, been verified against totals provided by the vessel agents.

Table 3 compares the number of vessels, trips and the total amount transshipped determined from port sampling data to those determined from the available unloading data. In Majuro and Pohnpei, coverage in terms of the amount of fish unloaded appears to be moderate to high, 59-86 per cent in Majuro and 59-74 per cent in Pohnpei. In Yap, the MMA unloading data indicates that coverage is high, 86 per cent for Taiwanese vessels in 1992, although, given the Ting Hong figure of $2,100 \mathrm{mt}$ transshipped during 1992, the actual coverage is probably much less.

## STRATIFICATION OF LONGLINE LENGTH FREQUENCY SAMPLES BY AREA

For purse seiners, the catch location of the fish sampled can often be identified to the nearest minute of longitude and latitude. Samples are taken from the wells where the fish are stored after capture. Usually the catches from only one or a few sets are stored in the same well. The location of the set and the well in which the catch was stored are recorded together on the logsheet, thus enabling identification of the position at which the fish sampled in the well were caught.

In contrast, for longliners, it is not possible to identify the catch location of the fish sampled with such precision. While the set positions are recorded on logsheets, the fish from each set are stored together, making it impossible to identify the set from which the fish were caught. For longliners, the best that can be accomplished is to identify the area fished during the trip. Provision for recording the area fished is made on the sampling forms. However, this information is often not available to the port samplers. In cases for which the area fished has not been recorded on the sampling form, the logsheet data must be cross-referenced to identify the area fished.

Unfortunately, logsheets are not always available. Table 4 shows the proportion of trips sampled for which logsheet data are available (P5) varies among ports. No logsheet data are currently available for vessels unloading in Koror during 1992. Only 25-33 per cent of trips sampled are covered by logsheets for vessels based in Majuro. Logsheets are available for most trips sampled in Yap and Pohnpei.

Even when logsheets are available, however, quite often the catch can still not be allocated to a single area strata (even as large as $10^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}$ ) due to the large area fished during some trips (Table 4, T10, P10).

The importance of the problem in identifying the catch position of fish sampled will depend in part on the amount of overlap in the areas fished from the different ports. If overlap occurs, it would be necessary to somehow isolate samples from the area of overlap in order to compare and possibly aggregate length frequencies taken from the different ports. Figures $1-6$ present the distribution of yellowfin and bigeye catches during 1992, determined from daily catch and effort logsheets, for each of the major fleets based in Majuro, Pohnpei and Yap. It is noteworthy that the distributions of the catch of both yellowfin and bigeye exhibit little overlap among ports. Unfortunately, logsheet data for 1992 for vessels based in Koror are unavailable at present; these data may possibly show some overlap with vessels based in Yap.

Whereas the areas fished from each port appear not to overlap, the areas fished for each of the fleets based in the same port appear to be identical, except for Pohnpei. The Japanese and Taiwanese vessels based in Pohnpei fished in generally the same area during 1992. However, the Korean fleet fished well apart from the Japanese and Taiwanese fleets, further to the north and to the south.

## VARIATION IN LENGTH FREQUENCIES

Visual inspection of the length frequencies presented in Figures 1-6 indicates that the length frequencies can differ among areas fished and among fleets fishing the same area.

Length frequencies of yellowfin and bigeye landed in 1992 show smaller fish in Majuro than in Yap. For Taiwanese vessels, the mean length of yellowfin landed in Majuro is 115.5 cm compared to 127.9 cm for yellowfin landed in Yap, while the mean length of bigeye landed in Majuro is 126.3 cm compared to 135.9 cm for bigeye landed in Yap.

Length frequencies of fish landed in Pohnpei during 1992 by Japanese and Korean vessels are similar, with similar mean lengths, although the two fleets fished in different areas. Length frequencies for fish landed by the Taiwanese based in Pohnpei, however, are different from those for fish landed by the Japanese and Koreans, with the Taiwanese landing larger fish on average.

Bearing in mind that the Taiwanese and Japanese based in Pohnpei fished in similar areas during 1992, but that the length frequencies are different, either the two fleets are selectively catching different sized fish, or the two fleets are catching similar sized fish but selectively discarding.

Of special interest is the relatively large number of small ( $80-95 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) fish, particularly yellowfin, landed by American vessels in Majuro. The number of similar sized fish landed by the other fleets, regardless of port, is negligible, even though sample sizes in Pohnpei and Yap are large.

## FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The sampling programmes have in general operated smoothly during 1992, with the exception of Koror, where sampling was interrupted during the second half of the year. Sampling has since recommenced in Koror, and it is expected that sampling will continue to proceed smoothly in the other ports during 1993.

The longline sampling form currently used in Mirconesia has recently been revised to account for different methods of length measurement, different units of weight measurement, and other items (attached). The revised form should be introduced to other ports in order to standardise data collection and processing. Correct usage of the revised form should be verified in each port.

Compilation and verification of statistics on the amounts unloaded per trip are necessary to estimate the coverage of the port sampling programmes and to raise the sampled length frequencies to the total catch. Unloadings data should be obtained for Levuka, Lami, Koror, Noumea and Papeete, while data available for Pohnpei, Majuro and Yap, which are compiled from various sources, should be verified against totals provided by the vessel agents.

The inclusion of rejected fish in unloading data should be verified. A longline unloading summary form, which has recently been introduced in several ports, has been modified to include rejected fish explicitly (attached). Correct usage of the revised form should be verified in each port.

Efforts should be made to obtain logsheet data for Koror and to examine logsheet data for vessels unloading in Levuka, Lami, Noumea and Papeete, in order to establish the areas covered by the respective sampling programmes. Further examination of logsheet data for all ports should take into account time strata (month or quarter) to determine differences in areas fished by fleets based at the same ports.

Visual inspection of length frequencies reveals differences between areas fished and fleets fishing similar areas. Further quantitative analyses should be undertaken to explore variation in length frequencies, taking into account area fished and fleet, and also other factors not examined above, such as year, quarter and fishing vessel. The data should be examined to establish the most efficient sampling protocols, in terms of the number of fish sampled per trip and the number of vessels sampled per fleet and port. The analysis should also take into account all ports, including those not examined above, such as Levuka, Lami, Koror, Noumea and Papeete.

Differences in mean lengths between fish transshipped and fish discarded at dockside have not been addressed above. An analysis of mean lengths of rejects should be conducted for each port, in order to determine the importance of sampling rejected fish.

The possibly that fleets are selectively discarding at sea may present a problem in interpreting the length frequency data. Longline observer programmes have indicated that selective discarding occurs. Taiwanese longliners based in Pohnpei are known to discard almost all fish under 90 cm . Discussions with American skippers in Majuro have shown that they keep almost all fish caught, rather than discard on the basis of size, which would explain the large number of small fish landed by American vessels, compared to other fleets. The extent of selective discarding should be determined by comparison with information collected by observers. Where selective discarding is known to occur, the range of sizes over which sampling is unbiased should be determined.

After unloading data have been compiled and verified, the length frequency data should be raised to reflect total catches for appropriate time-area strata. The results should be reported at future meetings of the Standing Committee on Tuna and Billfish, through TBAP publications and to the port samplers.

A workshop for port samplers during 1993 should be considered. The objectives of the workshop could include:

- instruction and standardisation of sampling techniques and compilation of unloading data;
- comparison of experiences in sampling and data compilation;
- providing the context for the work of port samplers through discussion of the results and their use in stock assessment.

It is envisaged that such a workshop would increase the motivation of the port samplers, and thereby increase the quality and coverage of the data collected.

Table 1. Summary of longline port sampling data

| PORT | FLAG | YEAR | MON | VESSELS | TRIPS | NUMBER OF FISH SAMPLED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ALB | BET | YFT | BIL | OTH | TOTAL |
| FIJI | FJ | 1991 | OCT | 1 | 1 | 62 | - | - | - | - | 62 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 1 | 1 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 2 | 2 | 162 | - | - | - | - | 162 |
|  |  | 1992 | FEB | 8 | 15 | 604 | 332 | 466 | - | - | 1,402 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 8 | 21 | 594 | 470 | 745 | - | - | 1,809 |
|  |  |  | APR | 8 | 23 | 688 | 517 | 694 | - | - | 1,899 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 8 | 21 | 1,059 | 957 | 337 | - | - | 2,353 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 5 | 13 | 674 | 568 | 258 | - | - | 1,500 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 8 | 17 | 968 | 547 | 166 | - | - | 1,681 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 1 | 1 | 179 | - | - | $\sim$ | - | 179 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 8 | 111 | 4,766 | 3,391 | 2,666 | - | - | 10,823 |
|  | KR | 1991 | SEP | 1 | 1 | 93 | - | - | - | - | 93 |
|  |  | 1992 | FEB | 1 | 1 | 200 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 4 | 4 | 629 | - | - | - | - | 629 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 3 | 3 | 515 | - | - | - | - | 515 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 1 | 1 | 200 | - | _ | - | - | 200 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 1 | 1 | 176 | - | - | - | - | 176 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 10 | 10 | 1,720 | - | - | - | - | 1.720 |
|  | T0 | 1990 | MAR | 1 | 1 | 31 | - | - | - | - | 31 |
|  | TW | 1989 | DEC | 7 | 7 | 277 | - | - | - | - | 277 |
|  |  | 1990 |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  | FEB | 3 | 3 | 91 | - | - | _ | _ | 91 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 1 | 1 | 91 | - | - | - | - | 91 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 8 | 8 | 368 | - | - | - | - | 368 |
|  |  | 1991 | JUL | 1 | 1 | 116 | - | - | - | - | 116 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 1 | 1 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 5 | 8 | 938 | - | - | - | 50 | 988 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 1 | 1 | 136 | - | - | - | - | 136 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 2 | 400 | - | - | - | - | 400 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 9 | 13 | 1,690 | - | - | - | 50 | 1,740 |
|  |  | 1992 |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | 800 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 2 | 2 | 350 | - | - | - | - | 350 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 5 | 5 | 919 | - | 18 | - | - | 937 |
|  |  |  | APR | 3 | 3 | 600 | - | - | - | - | 600 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 1 | 1 | 200 | - | _ | - | - | 200 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 4 | 4 | 793 | - | - | - | - | 793 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 5 | 5 | 1,060 | - | 21 | - | - | 1,081 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 1 | 1 | 200 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 17 | 25 | 4,922 | - | 39 | - | - | 4,961 |
|  | ALL |  |  | 7 | 7 |  | - | - | - | - | 277 |
|  |  | $1990$ |  | 9 | 9 | $399$ | - | - | - | - | 399 |
|  |  | 1991 |  | 12 | 16 | 1,945 | - | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | - | 50 | 1,995 |
|  |  | 1992 |  | 35 | 146 | 11,408 | 3,391 | 2,705 | - | - | 17,504 |

Table 1 (continued)

| PORT | FLAG | YEAR | MON | VESSELS | TRIPS | NUMBER OF FISH SAMPLED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ALB | BET | YFT | BIL | OTH | total |
| KOROR | CH | 1991 | NOV | 1 | 1 | - | 18 | 32 | - | - | 50 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 1 | 1 | - | 32 | 7 | - | - | 39 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 2 | 2 | - | 50 | 39 | - | - | 89 |
|  |  | 1992 | JAN | 1 | 1 | - | 19 | 10 | - | - | 29 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 1 | 1 | - | 7 | 6 | - | - | 13 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 2 | - |  | 3 | - | - | 45 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 3 | 4 | - | 68 | 19 | - | - | 87 |
|  | JP | 1992 | JAN | 1 | 2 | - | 25 | 40 | - | - | 65 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 1 | 1 | - | 20 | 13 | _ | - | 33 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 1 | 1 | - | 153 | , | - | - | 153 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 3 | 4 | - | 198 | 53 | - | - | 251 |
|  | TW | 1991 | JUL | 2 | 2 | - | 41 | 59 | - | - | 100 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 8 | 8 | - | 157 | 205 | - | - | 362 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 3 | 3 | - | 44 | 81 | - | - | 125 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 2 | 2 | - | 30 | 41 | - | - | 71 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 14 | 15 | - | 272 | 386 | - | - | 658 |
|  |  | 1992 |  |  |  |  | 153 |  | - | - |  |
|  |  |  | FEB | 1 | 1 | - | 20 | 8 | - | - | 28 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 2 | - | 19 | 8 | - | - | 27 |
|  |  |  | 101 | 4 | 5 | - | 192 | 34 | - | - | 226 |
|  | ALL | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \\ & 1992 \end{aligned}$ |  | 16 | 17 | - | 322 | 425 | - | - | 747 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 | 13 | - | 458 | 106 | - | - | 564 |
| MAJURO | MI | 1992 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | - | 24 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 1 | 1 | - | 49 | 11 | - | - | 60 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 1 | 1 | - | 33 | 19 | - | - | 52 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 1 | 1 | - | 10 | 11 | - | - | 21 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 3 | - | 40 | 47 | - | - | 87 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 2 | 6 | - | 132 | 106 | 6 | - | 244 |
|  | TW | 1992 |  |  |  | - |  | 6 | - | - | 50 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 3 | - | 179 | 46 | - | - | 225 |
|  |  |  | APR | 2 | 4 | - | 186 | 63 | - | - | 249 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 1 | 1 | - | 82 | 6 | - | - | 88 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 1 | 3 | - | 70 | 143 | - | - | 213 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 2 | 10 | - | 561 | 264 | - | - | 825 |
|  | US | 1992 | FEB | 1 | 1 | - | 40 | 10 | - | - | 50 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 3 | - | 276 | 62 | - | - | 338 |
|  |  |  | APR | 2 | 2 | - | 114 | 36 | - | - | 150 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 2 | 4 | - | 319 | 587 | 1 | - | 907 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 1 | 2 | - | 54 | 456 | 7 | - | 517 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 1 | 1 | - | 49 | 81 | - | - | 130 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 1 | 3 | - | 65 | 229 | - | - | 294 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 1 | 1 | - | 17 | 31 | 2 | - | 50 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 4 | - | 73 | 182 | 12 | - | 267 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 4 | - | 187 | 455 | 50 | - | 692 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 4 | 4 | - | 72 | 163 | - | - | 235 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 5 | 21 | - | 1,266 | 2,292 | 72 | - | 3,630 |
|  |  | 1993 | JAN | 1 | 1 | - | 35 | 15 | - | - | 50 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 2 | 3 | - | 117 | 103 | - | - | 220 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 3 | - | 83 | 37 | - | - | 120 |
|  |  |  | APR | 1 | 1 | - | 14 | 17 | 14 | - | 45 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 4 | 8 | - | 249 | 172 | 14 | - | 435 |

Table 1 (continued)

| PORT | flag | YEAR | MON | VESSELS | TRIPS | NUMBER OF FISH SAMPLED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ALB | BET | YFT | BIL | OTH | total |
|  | ALL | $\begin{aligned} & 1992 \\ & 1993 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{array}{r} 1,959 \\ 249 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,662 \\ 172 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4,699 \\ 435 \end{array}$ |
| NOUMEA | NC | 1990 | MAY | 1 | 3 | 143 | - | - | - | - | 143 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 2 | 5 | 277 | - | _ | - | - | 277 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 2 | 6 | 354 | - | - | - | - | 354 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 1 | 2 | 216 | - | - | - | - | 216 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 2 | 5 | 391 | - | - | - | - | 391 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 7 | 506 | - | - | - | - | 506 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 3 | 5 | 236 | - | - | - | - | 236 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 2 | 3 | 200 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 3 | 36 | 2,323 | - | - | - | - | 2,323 |
|  |  | 1991 | JAN | 2 | 4 | 217 | - | - | - | - | 217 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 3 | 4 | 327 | - | - | - | - | 327 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 2 | 3 | 174 | - | - | - | - | 174 |
|  |  |  | APR | 3 | 10 | 382 | - | - | - | - | 382 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 3 | 5 | 291 | - | - | - | - | 291 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 2 | 3 | 167 | - | - | - | - | 167 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 2 | 6 | 540 | - | - | - | - | 540 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 2 | 4 | 403 | - | - | - | - | 403 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 2 | 5 | 363 | - | - | - | - | 363 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 6 | 365 | - | - | - | - | 365 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 3 | 201 | - | - | - | - | 201 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 4 | 53 | 3,430 | - | - | - | - | 3,430 |
|  |  | 1992 |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | 203 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 2 | 3 | 92 | 4 | 182 | - | - | 278 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 2 | 2 | 211 | 22 | 34 | - | - | 267 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 2 | 6 | 291 | 36 | 43 | - | - | 370 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 2 | 4 | 130 | 9 | 14 | - | - | 153 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 2 | 4 | 305 | 1 | 29 | - | - | 335 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 3 | 6 | 318 | 2 | 50 | - | - | 370 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 5 | 284 | 9 | 52 | - | - | 345 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 8 | 346 | 17 | 109 | - | - | 472 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 3 | 40 | 2,180 | 100 | 513 | - | - | 2,793 |
|  | ALL | 1990 |  | 3 | 36 | 2,323 | - | - | - | - | 2,323 |
|  | ALL | 1991 |  | 4 | 53 | 3,430 | - | - | - | - | 3,430 |
|  |  | 1992 |  | 3 | 40 | 2,180 | 100 | 513 | - | - | 2,793 |
| PAPEETE | PF | 1992 |  | 8 | 16 | 77 | 25 | 389 | - | - | 491 |
|  |  |  | APR | 7 | 8 | 63 | 40 | 193 | - | - | 296 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 8 | 12 | 252 | 22 | 27 | - | - | 301 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 6 | 10 | 166 | 44 | 9 | - | - | 219 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 8 | 14 | 190 | 42 | 11 | - | - | 243 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 2 | 123 | 5 | 47 | - | - | 175 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 5 | 9 | 78 | 12 | 6 | - | - | 96 |
|  | ALL | 1992 |  | 16 | 71 | 949 | 190 | 682 | - | - | 1,821 |



Table 1 (continued)

| PORT | FLAG | YEAR | MON | VESSELS | TRIPS | NUMBER OF FISH SAMPLED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ALB | BET | YFT | BIL | OTH | total |
| YAP | CH | 1992 | JUN | 4 | 8 | - | 283 | 183 | 93 | 16 | 575 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 7 | 9 | - | 252 | 394 | 20 | 3 | 669 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 11 | 17 | - | 418 | 539 | 91 | 27 | 1,075 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 11 | 22 | - | 621 | 850 | 36 | 9 | 1,516 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 12 | 26 | - | 640 | 867 | 149 | 35 | 1,691 |
|  |  |  | NOV |  |  | - | $128$ | 207 | 48 | 17 | 400 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 13 | 91 | - | 2,342 | 3,040 | 437 | 107 | 5,926 |
|  | FM | 1992 | APR | 2 | 2 | - | 5 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 17 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 2 | 2 | - | 29 | 25 | - | - | 54 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 2 | 4 | - | 54 | 30 | 11 | 1 | 96 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 3 | 3 | - | 21 | 51 | 4 | - | 76 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 2 | 2 | - | 14 | 49 | - | - | 63 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 3 | 3 | - | 83 | 101 | 4 | 2 | 190 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 4 | 13 | - | 206 | 258 | 28 | 4 | 496 |
|  | TW | 1992 |  |  |  | - |  |  | 1 | - | 446 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 9 | 11 | - | 679 | 283 | 23 | - | 985 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 6 | 6 | - | 392 | 159 | - | - | 551 |
|  |  |  | APR | 8 | 13 | - | 918 | 870 | - | - | 1.788 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 5 | 7 | - | 355 | 369 | 28 | 1 | 753 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 9 | 16 | - | 752 | 602 | 44 | 7 | 1,405 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 19 | 21 | - | 1,069 | 1,643 | 28 | 15 | 2,755 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 22 | 36 | - | 1,429 | 1,687 | 86 | 13 | 3,215 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 25 | 33 | - | 1,408 | 1,285 | 3 | 9 | 2,705 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 21 | 32 | - | 1,308 | 1,583 | 7 | - | 2,898 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 20 | 23 | - | 1,273 | 962 | 24 | - | 2,259 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 57 | 199 | - | 9,896 | 9,575 | 244 | 45 | 19,760 |
|  | ALL | 1992 |  | 74 | 303 | - | 12,444 | 12,873 | 709 | 156 | 26,182 |


Table 2. Summary of unloading data

Table 2 (continued)

| PORT | FLAG | YEAR | MON | VESSELS | TRIPS | TRANSHIPMENTS (MT) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ALB | BET | YFT | BIL | OTH | total |
|  | KR | 1992 | APR | 1 | 1 | - | 15.138 | - | - | - | 15.138 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 6 | 10 | - | 60.232 | 10.361 | . 895 | - | 71.488 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 6 | 10 | - | 76.024 | 17.098 | . 506 | - | 93.628 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 6 | 11 | - | 56.515 | 10.977 | . 406 | - | 67.898 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 5 | 6 | - | 75.922 | 8.715 | 1.333 | - | 85.970 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 5 | 5 | - | 31.131 | 4.760 | - | - | 35.891 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 6 | 6 | - | 26.074 | 5.287 | - | - | 31.361 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 5 | 8 | - | 42.969 | 5.855 | . 999 | - | 49.823 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 7 | 57 | - | 384.005 | 63.053 | 4.139 | - | 451.197 |
| POHNPEI | KR | 1993 | JAN | 5 | 5 | - | 23.406 | 3.633 | . 485 | - | 27.524 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 3 | 3 | - | 6.534 | 1.561 | . 245 | - | 8.340 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 6 | 8 | - | 29.940 | 5.194 | . 730 | - | 35.864 |
|  | TW | 1991 | APR | 2 | 4 | - | 6.310 | 1.036 | 1.749 | - | 9.095 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 4 | 7 | - | 8.343 | 6.565 | 1.515 | - | 16.423 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 2 | 5 | - | 7.662 | 5.308 | . 524 | . 040 | 13.534 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 3 | 6 | - | 8.128 | 9.550 | . 344 | . 025 | 18.047 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 3 | 5 | - | 8.921 | 7.987 | - | - | 16.908 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 3 | 5 | - | 6.317 | 8.539 | . 076 | - | 14.932 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 1 | 4 | - | 5.208 | 6.182 | . 156 | - | 11.546 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 2 | 2 | - | 1.945 | 2.371 | - | - | 4.316 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 4 | 7 | - | 15.768 | 8.871 | 1.198 | - | 25.837 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 8 | 44 | - | 68.602 | 56.409 | 5.562 | . 065 | 130.638 |
|  |  | 1992 | JAN | 4 | 7 | - | 9.312 | 4.608 | . 952 | - | 14.872 |
|  |  |  | FEB | 7 | 9 | - | 21.629 | 4.060 | 1.100 | - | 26.789 |
|  |  |  | MAR | 3 | 4 | - | 2.936 | 1.392 | . 163 | - | 4.491 |
|  |  |  | APR | 6 | 9 | - | 13.712 | 6.729 | 1.835 | - | 22.276 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 4 | 7 | - | 10.681 | 7.867 | 4.758 | - | 23.306 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 4 | 7 | - | 10.841 | 6.160 | 2.005 | - | 19.006 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 4 | 10 | - | 11.531 | 15.214 | 1.252 | -- | 27.997 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 4 | 7 | - | 12.992 | 12.064 | 1.520 | . 072 | 26.648 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 4 | 9 | - | 17.244 | 13.986 | . 656 | . | 31.886 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 5 | 8 | - | 14.797 | 10.045 | 1.718 | - | 26.560 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 4 | 6 | - | 13.346 | 6.781 | . 356 | - | 20.483 |
|  |  |  | DEC | 6 | 9 | - | 13.136 | 5.799 | . 479 | - | 19.414 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 14 | 90 | - | 152.157 | 94.705 | 16.794 | . 072 | 263.728 |
|  |  | 1993 |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  | FEB | 8 | 17 | - | 45.342 | 20.852 | . 931 | - | $67.125$ |
|  |  |  | MAR | 9 | 12 | - | 27.552 | 5.028 | 2.610 | - | 35.190 |
|  |  |  | APR | 9 | 17 | - | 33.707 | $10.171$ | 2.416 | - | 46.294 |
|  |  |  | MAY | 5 | 5 | - | 10.091 | 2.138 | 1.451 | - | 13.680 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 12 | 58 | - | 127.821 | 46.134 | 7.588 | - | 181.543 |
|  | ALL | 1991 |  | 14 25 | 89 161 | - | $\begin{aligned} & 159.087 \\ & 573.942 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 139.586 \\ & 178.474 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.077 \\ & 21.108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .159 \\ & .072 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 310.909 \\ & 773.596 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 1993 |  | 21 | 75 | - | 183.327 | 63.153 | 9.042 | -072 | 255.522 |
| YAP | CH | 1992 | FEB | 1 | 1 | - | 14 320 | . 098 | - | 036 | . 0.098 |
|  |  |  | JUN | 4 | 8 | - | 14.320 | 6.018 | - | . 036 | 20.374 |
|  |  |  | JUL | 13 | 24 | - | 36.492 | 30.988 | $\overline{-}$ | - | 67.480 |
|  |  |  | AUG | 11 | 20 | - | 29.564 | 24.846 | . 245 | - | 54.655 |
|  |  |  | SEP | 12 | 24 | - | 37.137 | 31.755 | . 238 | . 024 | 69.154 |
|  |  |  | OCT | 12 | 21 | - | 38.825 | 31.201 | . 428 | - | 70.454 |
|  |  |  | NOV | 10 | 12 | - | 10.002 | 7.479 | . | - | 17.481 |
|  |  |  | TOT | 13 | 110 | - | 166.340 | 132.385 | . 911 | . 060 | 299.696 |

Table 2 (continued)


Table 3. Coverage of longline port sampling data compared to unloading data

| PORT | FLAG | YEAR | VESSELS Transhipments- TOTAL |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \quad \text { Port Sampling } \\ \text { VESSELS TOTAL } & \\ \text { TRIPS } \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Coverage \% } \\ & \text { VESSELS TRIPS TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJURO | MI | 1992 | 4 | 10 | 13.817 | 2 | 6 | 9.909 | 50 | 60 | 72 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 9 | 22 | 59.180 | 2 | 10 | 34.788 | 22 | 45 | 59 |
|  | US | 1992 | 6 | 46 | 153.652 | 5 | 21 | 131.813 | 83 | 46 | 86 |
|  | US | 1993 | - | - | - | 4 | 8 | 18.147 | - | - | - |
| POHNPEI | FM | 1991 | - | - | - | 1 | 7 | 2.847 | - | - | - |
|  | FM | 1992 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | . 068 | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | - | - |
|  | JP | 1991 | 6 | 45 | 180.271 | 3 | 11 | 39.003 | 50 | 24 | 22 |
|  | JP | 1992 | 4 | 14 | 58.671 | 5 | 8 | 41.544 | 125 | 57 | 71 |
|  | JP | 1993 | 3 | 9 | 38.115 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | KR | 1992 | 7 | 57 | 451.197 | 7 | 32 | 267.532 | 100 | 56 | 59 |
|  | KR | 1993 | 6 | 8 | 35.864 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | TW | 1991 | 8 | 44 | 130.638 | 8 | 16 | 41.579 | 100 | 36 | 32 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 14 | 90 | 263.728 | 12 | 65 | 194.841 | 86 | 72 | 74 |
|  | TW | 1993 | 12 | 58 | 181.543 | 2 | 2 | 5.319 | 17 | 3 | 3 |
|  | TW | 1999 | 2 | 2 | 1.749 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YAP | CH | 1992 | 13 | 110 | 299.696 | 13 | 91 | 259.414 | 100 | 83 | 87 |
|  | FM | 1992 | 4 | 22 | 27.276 | 4 | 13 | 18.365 | 100 | 59 | 67 |
|  | JP | 1992 | 3 | 14 | 22.133 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | KR | 1992 | 2 | 2 | 6.971 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | TW | 1992 | 71 | 240 | 1,043.771 | 57 | 199 | 894.335 | 80 | 83 | 86 |
|  | TW | 1993 | 8 | 8 | 41.708 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 4. Coverage of port sampling data compared to catch logsheet data

## LEGEMD

```
1 - No. trips where transhipment data collected
2 - No. transhipments where logsheets available
3 - No. trips where samples were taken
    - No. trips sampled where positions are available
    - No. trips sampled where logsheets are available
    - No. trips where Fishing occured in 5x5 square (fixed)
    - No. trips where Fishing occured in 5x10 square (fixed)
    - No. trips where Fishing occured in 10x10 square (fixed)
    - No. trips where Fishing occured in 5x20 square (fixed)
10 - No. trips where Fishing occured in 10x20 square (fixed)
T11 - No. trips where Fishing occured in 5x5 square (variable)
T12 - No. trips where Fishing occured in 5\times10 square (variable)
P2 - No. transhipments where logsheets available (\% of T1)
P5 - No. trips sampled where logsheets are available (\% of T4)
P6 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(5 \times 5\) square (fixed; \% of T4)
P7 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(5 \times 10\) square (fixed; \% of T4)
P8 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(10 \times 10\) square (fixed; \% of T4)
P9 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(5 \times 20\) square (fixed; \% of T4)
P10 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(10 \times 20\) square (fixed; \% of T4)
P11 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(5 \times 5\) square (variable; \% of T4)
P12 - No. trips where Fishing occured in \(5 \times 10\) square (variable; \% of T4)
```

| PORT | FL | YEAR | T1 | T2 | T3 | 14 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | T9 | T10 | T11 | T12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KOROR | CH | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | JP | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | TW | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| MAJURO | MI | 1992 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 21 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
|  | US | 1992 | 41 | 6 | 21 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|  |  | 1993 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| POHNPEI | FM | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | JP | 1991 | 46 | 37 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
|  |  | 1992 | 14 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  | KR | 1992 | 55 | 35 | 32 | 26 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 26 |
|  | TW | 1991 | 39 | 32 | 17 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 |
|  |  | 1992 | 89 | 58 | 65 | 56 | 56 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 36 | 36 | 53 | 56 |
|  |  | 1993 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YAP | CH | 1992 | 107 | 100 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 71 | 71 | 91 | 91 |
|  | FM | 1992 | 22 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 9 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 234 | 154 | 199 | 176 | 174 | 54 | 58 | 58 | 70 | 75 | 160 | 169 |


| PORT | FL | YEAR | T1 | P2 | T3 | T4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KOROR | CH | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | JP | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | TW | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 45 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 82 | 82 | 82 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| MAJURO | MI | 1992 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 21 | 29 | 10 | 9 | 33 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 11 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | US | 1992 | 41 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 88 | 94 |
|  |  | 1993 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 75 | 75 |
| POHNPEI | FM | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 83 | 100 | 100 |
|  |  | 1992 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | JP | 1991 | 46 | 80 | 11 | 11 | 100 | 55 | 82 | 82 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  |  | 1992 | 14 | 36 | 8 | 5 | 100 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
|  |  | 1992 | 55 | 64 | 32 | 26 | 100 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 92 | 100 |
|  | TW | 1991 | 39 | 82 | 17 | 10 | 110 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 80 | 100 | 100 |
|  |  | 1992 | 89 | 65 | 65 | 56 | 100 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 64 | 64 | 95 | 100 |
|  |  | 1993 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YAP | CH | 1992 | 107 | 93 | 91 | 91 | 100 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 78 | 78 | 100 | 100 |
|  | FM | 1992 | 22 | 68 | 13 | 10 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 50 | 50 | 80 | 90 |
|  | TW | 1992 | 234 | 66 | 199 | 176 | 99 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 40 | 43 | 91 | 96 |

Figure 1. Distribution of yellowfin catch during 1992 and yellowfin length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Majuro



American fleet




Figure 2. Distribution of yellowfin catch during 1992 and yellowfin length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Pohnpei







Figure 3. Distribution of yellowfin catch during 1992 and yellowfin length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Yap






Figure 4. Distribution of bigeye catch during 1992 and bigeye length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Majuro
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Figure 5. Distribution of bigeye catch during 1992 and bigeye length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Pohnpei







Figure 6. Distribution of bigeye catch during 1992 and bigeye length (cm) frequencies for vessels unloading in Yap
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$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Block 1: General and operational details


Block 2: Total sampling details by species

| Number |  | YFT | BET | ALB | BFT | BLZ | BLM | MLS | SWO | SBS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | OTH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Sigma$ lengths |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Sigma$ weights |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Block 3: Sampling data

| No | Species | Length | Weight | Rej | No | Species | Length | Weight | Rej |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | 29 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  | 37 |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  | 46 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ MONTH $\qquad$

| day | VESSEL / REGISTRATION | flag | T/R | Yft | bet | ALB | bet | BLZ | BLM | MLS | swo | SAI | SHK | отн | total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## INSTRUCTIONS

| PORT | Transhipment port, e.g. Pohnpei |
| :--- | :--- |
| MONTH | e.g., January |
| YEAR | e.g., 1992 |
| Page | Page number for that month. |
| DAY |  |
|  | The first day of transshipment, e.g., 27 (for 27 January 1992). |
| VESSEL / | e.g., Amber Dawn |
| REGISTRATION | e.g. CT3-2346. This field must be filled in for Taiwanese vessels. |
|  |  |
| FLAG | Vessel nationality, e.g., Federated States of Micronesia |
|  |  |
| T/R | T - Transhipped amounts |
|  | R - Rejected amounts |
| YFT | Yellowfin |
| BET | Bigeye |
| ALB | Albacore |
| BFT | Bluefin |
| BLZ | Blue marlin |
| BLM | Black marlin |
| MLS | Striped marlin |
| SWO | Swordfish |
| SAI | Sailfish |
| SHK | Shark |
| OTH | Other species |
| TOTAL | Total amount unloaded |

Each two line group represents one port of call by a vessel. If a vessel transships during more than one day during a port of call, the amounts recorded on the form should represent all days on which transshipment occurred during the port of call. The amounts unloaded should be recorded in kilogrammes. There is provision to enter the total of each species transhipped and the total of each species rejected from a vessels unloading. The form should contain all transshipments during the month. If a vessel is known to have transshipped, but the amounts are not available, the date, the vessel name and the vessel nationality should still be entered. If there is not enough space on the form for all transhipments during the month, they should be continued on a second page and so on.

The form should then be sent by fax each month to the Fisheries Statistician, South Pacific Commission - fax number (687) 26.38.18.

