



Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS)	2
3. TRANSHIPMENT MONITORING PROGRAMME.....	8
4. VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM (VMS).....	10
5. CCSBT IUU VESSEL LIST	10
6. RECORDS OF AUTHORISED VESSELS AND FARMS	11
Attachment A	13

1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides a summary of the operation of the main five CCSBT Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) measures from the Secretariat's perspective:

- 1) The Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS),
- 2) The Transshipment Monitoring Program,
- 3) The Vessel Monitoring System (VMS),
- 4) The CCSBT Illegal Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Vessel List Resolution, and
- 5) Records of Authorised Vessels and Farms.

For each measure, the Secretariat's roles/responsibilities with respect to that measure are outlined. Any issues that the Secretariat is aware of in the operation of the measure, and any recommendations for changes to that measure are also discussed. In addition, a summary of transshipment program data received by the Secretariat are provided at **Attachment A**.

Proposed revisions to some of these measures have been included in separate papers: CCSBT-CC/1610/14 (CDS Resolution) and CC/1610/16 (CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution).

2. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS)

2.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

The Secretariat's roles/responsibilities are:

- receiving and processing¹ all CDS documents;
- checking the completeness and accuracy of these documents;
- conducting reconciliations between the different types of CDS forms and between copies of forms provided by exporters and importers;
- following-up with Members/Cooperating Non-members (CNMs) regarding discrepancies and missing information;
- managing validation details submitted by Members/CNMs;
- producing 6 monthly and annual CDS reports;
- maintaining and enhancing the CDS database;
- coordinating the purchase of centralised tags for use with the CDS;
- noting and considering any implementation issues encountered;
- regularly reviewing the effectiveness of the CDS Resolution as appropriate, and
- responding to ad hoc queries as required.

2.2 CDS OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The following are the main CDS operational issues that the Secretariat has observed since the Tenth meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC10). Many of these issues are the same as in previous years. The Secretariat continues to work with relevant Members/ CNMs to resolve these issues where possible/ practicable.

2.2.1 Timeliness: Submission of CDS Documents

There has been a general improvement in the overall timeliness of CDS submissions this year. Indonesia's 2015 REEF documents for the first three quarters of 2015 were received but submitted either 1.5, 4.5 or 7.5 months later than the data submission guidelines.

2.2.2 Non-Submission of CDS Documents

During 2015 and the first quarter of 2016, no known/confirmed CMFs required to be submitted by the catching Member were missing.

a. Non-submission of REEFs by Exporters

For 2015, the Secretariat has recorded 4 REEFs exported by Indonesia (7.32t), 1 exported by Japan (10t), and 1 exported by Korea (0.18t) that have not yet submitted to the Secretariat. For the first quarter of 2016, there is one REEF missing from Japan (1.3t).

b. Non-submission of CMFs/REEFs by Importers

There are a significant number (163) of importer documents that have not been submitted to the Secretariat by the importer for 2015 and the first quarter of 2016. It is possible that, in some cases, a shipment's actual export destination may change at

¹ Loading all electronic documents received (all Catch Tagging Forms from all Members and all Catch Monitoring Forms & Re-Export/Export after landing of Domestic Product forms from Australia) to the database, and data entry of all paper documents received (all other forms).

shipping time, so that the expected importer may not always be the actual importer. Figures presented in this section should be considered accordingly.

There was a noticeably high percentage/number of import documents (especially for CMFs) not yet submitted by Korea. Korea's National Report (and its 2016 Quality Assurance Review), noted that Korea has put new processes in place to resolve this issue commencing in June 2016 and 1 September 2016.

CMFs

For 2015, the following Members had not submitted the expected importer copies of CMFs to the Secretariat: Japan (29 missing – 354.4t), Korea (25 missing - 53t), and South Africa (2 missing – 7.3t). For the first quarter of 2016, the following Members had not submitted expected importer copies of CMFs to the Secretariat: Japan (15 missing – 15.05t) and Korea (3 missing - 0.12t).²

REEFs

For 2015, the following Members had not submitted importer copies of REEFs to the Secretariat as expected: 4 missing from Japan (3.75t), 73 missing from Korea (124.3t) and 2 missing from New Zealand (0.08t). For the first quarter of 2016, there are 2 import REEFs missing from Japan (0.42t) and 8 missing from Korea (3.1t).²

2.2.3 SBT Caught by Vessels not Authorised During the Month of Catch

There were a few CMFs submitted that included vessels that caught a small number of SBT (4 in total) when they were not included on the CCSBT record of Authorised Vessels. In 2015 this occurred for one Australian vessel (1 CMF), and one New Zealand vessel (2 CMFs). Both Australia and New Zealand advised that that these non-authorisations were caused by administrative oversights.

2.2.4 Validators not Authorised to Validate on Validation Date

During 2015, there was one instance where an Australian validator had not yet been authorised at the time of validating a REEF. During the first quarter of 2016, there were 38 instances where Japanese REEFs were stamped with the name/ title of an unauthorised validator, and then another unauthorised validator signed on behalf of that person.

2.2.5 Tagging Data Issues

Tagging data mismatch issues continue to be one of the largest discrepancy issues identified during the Secretariat's reconciliation processes. The following are the main tagging issues identified by the Secretariat.

a. Tagging Data Mismatches

Many tagging data mismatches and/or missing sets of tagging data continued to be found during the reconciliation process for both 2015 and 2016 CDS data. As in previous years, mismatches generally occurred due to one of the following three

² Some of these CMFs/REEFs were not exported/re-exported until March 2016, and therefore may not have been received by the importer before 31 March 2016, and therefore may not be due to be submitted to the Secretariat until 30 September 2016

situations:

- i) some tagging data which should have been submitted as part of the Excel spreadsheet quarterly submission of tagging data were missing, or
- ii) an incorrect or incomplete list of Catch Tagging Form (CTF) numbers was recorded on the CMF, or
- iii) the electronically submitted spreadsheets of catch tagging data contained errors such as referencing an incorrect CMF number.

b. Duplicate Tag Numbers

Under the CDS Resolution, tag numbers issued by each Member/CNM must be unique. To assist Members with this task, uniquely pre-numbered tags are produced each year by a Japanese tag manufacturer and can be ordered through the Secretariat. All Members/CNMs except Australia, the EU and South Africa use these pre-numbered tags.

During 2015 and the first quarter of 2016, duplicate tag numbers were submitted by Indonesia (3), New Zealand (389+2) and South Africa (32). Because uniquely coded tags were purchased by Indonesia and New Zealand, it's likely that the duplicate tag numbers submitted to the Secretariat by these Members are a result of recording and/or data entry errors.

2.2.6 Copies of Cancelled CMFs Received Back from Importers

During 2015 the Secretariat received 9 importer copies of Australian export CMFs from Japan where these CMF numbers had already been cancelled by Australia.

In order for the compliance checking process to function appropriately, the Secretariat requests that if an exporter cancels a CMF and replaces it with a newly issued CMF (with a different number), then this replacement CMF must be sent to the importer. In addition, the exporter should provide clear advice to the importer and the Secretariat regarding:

- The original CMF number that was cancelled, and
- The new CMF number that was issued as its replacement.

The importer should then ensure that the replacement CMF number, including its associated import information, is the one submitted to the Secretariat.

Alternatively, the importer could return both the original (cancelled) and replacement CMFs to the Secretariat, and clearly mark which one is the original (cancelled), and which one is the replacement.

2.2.7 CMF Catch/Harvest Weights Differing from Landed Domestic Weights by more than 2.5% (for domestic landings)

In 2015, there was 1 Australian, 6 Japanese and 5 Taiwanese CMFs where the difference between the catch/harvest and the landed domestic weight was greater than 2.5%.

In the first quarter of 2016, there are 2 Taiwanese CMFs (out of a total of 6) where the difference between the catch/harvest and the landed domestic weight was greater than 2.5%.

Japan and Taiwan have generally advised that these differences are due to measurement variations at sea/ landed in port. Taiwan noted that the differences could also be attributed to variation between operators.

2.2.8 Fish Weight/Number Differing Between Exporter and Importer Copies of a CMF

There continues to be a small-scale issue where importers are submitting copies of CMFs which record different weights and/or numbers of SBT than are recorded on the exporter's copy. In these cases, the Secretariat cannot be certain whether the importer did not receive the amended copy or simply submitted the original rather than the amended copy.

For 2015, Australia submitted 4 out of 175 export CMFs where the number differed, and 5 out of 175 export CMFs where the weight differed. Indonesia submitted 1 export CMF (out of 412) where the number of fish and the weights differed on the exporter and importer copies. New Zealand submitted 7 out of 319 export CMFs where the number differed, and 6 out of 319 where the weight differed.

2.2.9 Multiple Preceding Document Numbers Associated with a Single REEF

Since the CDS commenced in 2010, REEFs have been issued which are associated with more than one preceding CDS document. In these cases, it is not possible to accurately conduct REEF discrepancy analyses to check for over-utilisation of CMFs in subsequent exports/re-exports. This issue is being considered as part of the review of the CDS Resolution (refer to paper CCSBT-CC/1610/14).

For 2015 and 2016, only Japan has issued REEFs with multiple preceding document numbers as follows: 36.2% of 2015 REEFs, and 29% of 2016 REEFs received to date.

2.2.10 Information Gap with Respect to Exports/ Re-exports to Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs)

CDS data indicate that there are significant exports of SBT to Non-Cooperating Non-Member (NCNM) States/Entities. A major gap in the CDS is that whenever SBT is traded with a NCNM, generally no information has been received back from these NCNMs to allow cross-checking and verification of the imports, which means that no independent verification of CDS exports to these States/entities can be conducted.

However, through continued communication and cooperation with the USA, the Secretariat received its first data submission (2015 import information) from the USA in April 2016, with a second submission being received for the first quarter of 2016 on 1 July 2016.

2.3 CDS: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SBT WEIGHTS RECORDED AT SEA AND SBT WEIGHTS RECORDED IN THE IMPORT SECTION OF CMFS

Following CCSBT 21, Japan, Korea and Taiwan discussed acceptable discrepancies between weights measured at-sea and landing weights recorded in the import section of the then newly revised CDS Catch Monitoring Form³. The agreed outcome from this discussion was as follows⁴:

“Korea, Japan and Taiwan agreed to allow 5% of discrepancies on the catch/harvest weights and import weights on the Catch Document Form for trading of SBT. An allowable range would be reviewed and reconsidered in the future for effective monitoring of SBT trade based on analysis by the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat hoped to conduct a preliminary data analysis of differences between the weights of SBT in these two CMF sections for CC10 in order to help to determine whether this 5% discrepancy is appropriate. However, because virtually no data had been received before CC10, the analysis was delayed until 2016, and the results to date are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Weight Differences Between SBT Weights Recorded in the Catch/Harvest Section of CMFs Versus and Import Section of CMFs⁵ (for Korea and Taiwan)

Member	Number of CMFs Analysed	Number of CMFs with a Greater than 5% Weight Difference	Weight Difference - Percentage (%) (over all CMFs analysed)			Weight Difference - Actual (kg) (over all CMFs analysed) ⁶		
			Median	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Korea	12	0	0.7%	0.07%	3.76%	-516.55	+48.8	-3,575.00
Taiwan	83	6	0.94%	0.00%	8.60%	-26.90	0.00	-1,028.80

2.4 CDS: DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXPORT WEIGHTS REPORTED BASED ON CDS SUBMISSIONS VERSUS EXPORT WEIGHTS REPORTED IN MEMBERS' NATIONAL REPORTS

CC10 requested that the Secretariat and Members conduct investigations into apparent discrepancies between export and import quantities submitted in Members' and CNMs' National Reports to the Compliance Committee, versus the export/ import quantities derived from Members' CDS submissions. CC10 also requested that the Secretariat provide a recommendation regarding future standardised reporting formats for export and import information.

The Secretariat has not completed a detailed analysis of the export/import figures available but has instead provided a very brief table (Table 2) summarising the export/import information available for the most recent calendar year/ season from Members' National Reports and the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures paper (CCSBT-CC/1610/07). This table highlights some of the current difficulties associated with trying to compare the various sets of export figures.

³ See paragraph 42 of the CCSBT 21 Report.

⁴ Refer to Circulars #2015/004 and 009

⁵ Table 1 presents results for all CMFs received to date where there is both a catch/harvest weight and a landed weight provided by the importer

⁶ A positive value means that the weight recorded in the importer section was greater than the weight recorded in the catch/ harvest section, and a negative value means that the weight recorded in the importer section was less than the weight recorded in the catch/harvest section

For example the Secretariat’s paper CCSBT-CC/1610/07 reports export/import figures by *calendar year*⁷ (separately for CMFs/REEFs), whereas in the template for annual reporting to the CC and EC Members are requested to report export figures by *fishing season*. In addition, the annual reporting template does not specify whether export figures should be provided as net weights or estimated whole weights. Therefore, the units of the reported weights are uncertain, although it is standard practice to report exports/imports as net weight.

Table 2 Summary of Recent Export/Import Data Provided in National Reports/ Derived from the CDS

Member	CC11 National Report Reporting Season	Export Weight (t) Reported in CC11 National Report ⁸	Export/Import Net Weight (t) for the 2015 Calendar Year (2015) from CDS (CMF/REEF) Data ⁹
Australia	Dec 2014 - Nov 2015	8.8	8.8
EU	Jan - Dec 2015	0.2	0
Indonesia	Jan - Dec 2015	463.2 ¹⁰	477.4
Japan	Apr 2015 - Mar 2016	276.9	660.6
Korea	Apr 2015 - Mar 2016	936.3	954.1
New Zealand	Oct 2014 - Sep 2015	769.7	770
South Africa	Jan - Dec 2015	53.6 ¹¹	37
Taiwan	Apr 2015 - Mar 2016	858.5	919.3
Philippines	Jan - Dec 2015	Not provided	0

In order to make export figures more easily comparable for future analyses, it is suggested that consideration be given to:

- Amending the annual CC/EC reporting template to specify that export figures (net weight in tonnes) are provided by the calendar year of the (re-)exported date;
- Amending the annual CC/EC reporting template to clarify that exports include both direct exports and any re-exports.

In addition, the Secretariat will provide combined CMF/REEF calendar year export/import totals at Attachment C (Characterisation of global fisheries) of the Compliance with Measures paper in future.

⁷ The calendar year of the (re-)export certification/ validation date

⁸ It is not specified by Members if the weight provided is a net weight or a whole weight

⁹ CMF and REEF export/import weights (for the 2015 calendar year) are reported in two separate tables in Attachment C of the Secretariat’s paper CCSBT-CC/1610/07

¹⁰ Export figures appear to have been provided in whole weights rather than net weights, however this has not yet been confirmed with the Member

¹¹ Export figures may have been provided as whole weights, but clarification needs to be sought from the Member

3. TRANSHIPMENT MONITORING PROGRAMME

3.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels

The Secretariat maintains a Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels (CVs), and upon receipt of new or amended information, it updates both its internal database and the CCSBT web site.

Effective from 1 January 2015, CCSBT21 agreed a modified Transshipment Resolution that included a requirement to provide Lloyds/ IMO Number (if available) as part of Members'/CNMs' CCSBT authorised CV submissions. The provision of IMO numbers has improved. In September 2016, 100% of all CCSBT CV authorisations were for CVs greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had been provided for 100% of these CVs.

Transshipment Documents

In addition to the Record of Authorised CVs, for all (in-port and at-sea) transshipments involving SBT, the Secretariat receives and maintains transshipment declarations.

For all *at-sea* transshipments involving SBT (which are required to be observed), the Secretariat also received and maintains the following documents:

- observer deployment requests, and
- observer reports.

All of these documents are a key part of the effective operation of the transshipment programme, and it is important that they are submitted as required.

Transshipment documents are received from either the IOTC or ICCAT Secretariats, or may also be submitted directly to the CCSBT Secretariat. The Secretariat then stores and maintains them on its internal database and filing systems.

Revisions to the Transshipment Resolution

There were no revisions to the Transshipment Resolution adopted by CCSBT 22.

Request to Approach WCPFC Regarding Development of a Transshipment MOU

At CC9 and CC10, Japan requested that the Secretariat approach the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) to ascertain the possibility of implementing a transshipment Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the CCSBT and the WCPFC for at-sea transshipments involving SBT within the WCPFC Convention Area.

Further information on this item, including a proposed Transshipment Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC), between the CCSBT and the WCPFC are discussed and provided in paper CCSBT-CC/1610/15.

3.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The Secretariat has observed the same main issue with operation of the Transshipment Resolution as has occurred in previous years – the difficulty of identifying SBT during multi-species transshipments. As noted last year, the Secretariat has also identified another issue – the difficulty of ascertaining tuna species based on transshipment observer photographs alone.

- a. Transshipment observers are often unable to separate species during transshipments. This is usually due to the fish being transhipped in frozen ‘strings’ containing a mix of species and also due to the speed of these transfers. These two factors often result in the observer report recording ‘Mixed Tuna Species’. Where observers can separate SBT, they most commonly use one of two methods to identify SBT and estimate weights. Both of these methods rely on information provided by the fishing vessel:
 - Identify SBT by the presence of CCSBT tags that have been inserted by the fishing vessel;
 - Where SBT can be visibly identified in a transfer (often using the above method), observers commonly use an average weight, multiplied by the estimated number, to calculate a total weight. The average weight is generally calculated using weights and numbers of fish provided by the fishing vessel.

The 5th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC5) requested that, in order to assist observers with identification, SBT be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species where possible.

- b. Transshipment observers are sometimes reporting that some fish declared/recorded as SBT may not be SBT, and are then submitting photographs of these fish for more detailed examination to try to ascertain the tuna species. While it is essential to have these photographs on record, it appears almost impossible to positively identify a SBT with absolute certainty based on photographs alone.

3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretariat recommends that:

- Members take note of CC5’s request that where possible, SBT should be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species, in order to assist observers with identification; and
- Members and the Secretariat should monitor developments in the effectiveness and availability of practical on-site genetic testing kits (for tuna species identification) so that any such tools developed can be considered for use by transshipment observers in the future.

3.4 SUMMARY OF TRANSHIPMENT DATA RECEIVED

A summary of transshipment data provided to the Secretariat on transshipment declarations and/or observer reports for 2015 and the first half of 2016 (aggregated by flag and product type) is provided at **Attachment A** (Tables 1 - 5).

Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide information for all *at-sea* transshipment declarations and observer reports received. Tables 4 and 5 provide information about *in-port* transshipments that took place during 2015 and the first half of 2016 where this information has been submitted to the Secretariat.

In many cases Tables 1 and 2 apparently show large discrepancies between transshipment declaration weights of SBT versus observer reported weights. The reason for these discrepancies is because, to date, many observer reports have often not included the weight of SBT transhipped for each individual vessel (it has been requested they do so), but only the overall weight of all SBT over a series of transshipments. In such situations the Secretariat

cannot accurately estimate the weight of SBT transhipped per vessel. This area of uncertainty is still being addressed.

The following summarises the information received by the Secretariat:

- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT were to be transhipped were received for 91.8% of all known SBT transhipments at sea during 2015.
- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT were to be transhipped have so far been received for 75% of all known SBT transhipments at sea during the first half of 2016.
- The Secretariat received 85 transhipment declarations for transhipments at sea totalling 2,176.4t during 2015, and has so far received 8 transhipment declarations totalling 79.2t for the first half of 2016.
- The Secretariat received 19 transhipment declarations for in-port transhipments totalling 537.7t during 2015, and to date has not received any transhipment declarations for in-port transhipments during the first half of 2016. It is not possible to check whether any are expected yet because CMFs for the 2nd quarter of 2016 are not due to be submitted to the Secretariat until 30 September 2016.
- Observer reports have been received for 100% of all known 2015 transhipments. Of the observer reports received, 32.9% contained observer estimates of the weights of SBT transhipped, while the remaining 67.1% did not provide specific information on SBT weights.
- Table 3 of **Attachment A** provides a summary of transhipment weights according to transhipment declarations, observer reports, and CDS information. To enable valid comparisons to be made, this table presents data for only those transhipments for which the Secretariat has received both transhipment declarations and observer reports, and has been able to match these transhipments with CDS documents. When summed, the weights of transhipped SBT reported on transhipment declarations versus CDS documents differed from each other by less than 0.001%.

4. VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM (VMS)

4.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

The Secretariat has no interaction with Members' Vessel Monitoring Systems.

However, the Secretariat advises Members that it has received some transhipment observer reports that indicate that some VMS monitoring devices either did not have the power light illuminated and/or were not switched on at the time of inspection by the transhipment observer.

5. CCSBT IUU VESSEL LIST

5.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

In June 2016 (in Circular #2015/026) the Secretariat sent a reminder to Members and CNMs to provide information about vessels presumed to be carrying out SBT IUU fishing activities during the current and/or previous year, accompanied by the suitably documented supporting evidence. No information was submitted to the Secretariat in response to that reminder. In

addition, the CCSBT is not currently cross-listing its IUU vessel list with other tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (tRFMOs) and relevant organisations. Therefore, there are currently no vessels to consider listing on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List.

5.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES/ RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretariat noted that there are currently no prohibited or non-compliant fishing gears included as part of the IUU Vessel List Resolution (pursuant to paragraph 3c), and has proposed adding a new Annex to list any such gear types. The details of this proposal are presented in paper CCSBT-CC/1610/16.

6. RECORDS OF AUTHORISED VESSELS AND FARMS

6.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

Authorised Farm and Vessel Records

The Secretariat receives authorised farm and vessel updates approximately twice a week, with vessel updates containing up to one hundred vessels. Upon receipt of this information, the Secretariat updates its authorised vessels/farms database as well as the CCSBT web site. Updated information is also shared with the joint tuna RFMOs' Consolidated List of Authorised Vessels (CLAV). Automated updates to the CLAV from all tRFMOs occur daily.

Revisions to the Authorised Vessel Resolution

In October 2014, CCSBT21 adopted an amendment to the CCSBT's 'Resolution on amendment of the Resolution on "Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU) and Establishment of a CCSBT Record of Vessels over 24 meters Authorized to Fish for Southern Bluefin Tuna'¹², that requires the Lloyds/ IMO Number (if available) to be provided as part of Members'/CNMs CCSBT authorised vessels submissions. In October 2015, the Authorised Vessel Resolution was further revised to require that all CCSBT-authorized fishing vessels (except wooden and fibreglass vessels) of at least 100GT/GRT have IMO numbers issued to them effective from 1 January 2017.

Provision of IMO numbers by Members/CNMs has been steadily improving since. In March 2015, 56.2% of all CCSBT authorised fishing vessels were greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had only been provided for 12.0% of these vessels. In September 2016, 61.9% of all CCSBT authorised fishing vessels were greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had been provided for 76.3% of these vessels.

Possibility of Obtaining UVI Numbers for Non-Steel Hulled/ Smaller Vessels

The Secretariat has learned that it is now possible for Unique Vessel Identification (UVI) Numbers to be formally issued for vessels greater than 100GT of non-steel construction, for example wooden and fibreglass vessels, by making a request to IHS Maritime and Trade (IHSM&T). In addition, IHSM&T may also be able to provide UVIs for all motorised inboard fishing vessels of less than 100GT down to a size limit of 12m LOA that are authorised to operate outside areas under national jurisdiction upon request.

¹² Hereafter referred to as the Authorised Vessel Resolution

6.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The following item continues to be the main issue with the operation of the Authorised Vessel/farm Resolutions:

- There remain a small number of cases where vessels caught SBT and were not authorised at the time. Refer to section 2.2.4 and paper CCSBT-CC/1610/07 for further details.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretariat requests that:

- Members submit vessel authorisation renewals prior to current authorisations expiring, and
- Members provide retrospective updates where appropriate if non-authorisations were a result of administrative issues.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Attachment A

Table 1: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the 2015 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	37	1,558,489	GG	37	1,009,524
	2	18,312	GGT	2	0
Korea	3	130,744	GG	3	0
Taiwan	26	273,365	GG	26	29,067
	17	195,477	GGT	17	0
TOTAL	85	2,176,387		85	1,038,591

Table 2: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the first half of the 2016 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	3	51,609	GG	3	5,120
Taiwan	5	27,609	GG	5	12,370
TOTAL	8	79,218		8	17,490

Table 3: Summary of Transhipments at sea versus CDS Forms versus Observer Reports for the 2015 Calendar Year¹³

Fishing Vessel Flag	Comment	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) from Transhipment Declaration	Total Net Weight (kg) from CDS	Total Net Weight (kg) from Observer Report
Japan	Observer provided SBT weights	23	1,011,935	1,011,935	1,006,056
Taiwan	Observer provided SBT weights	4	27,500	27,500	29,067
Japan	Observer provided no SBT weights	15	561,423	561,407	Weight not provided
Taiwan	Observer provided no SBT weights	39	441,342	441,342	Weight not provided
Korea	Observer provided no SBT weights	3	130,744	130,744	Weight not provided
TOTAL		84	2,172,944	2,172,928	

¹³ This report is limited to transhipments where observer reports have been provided, and where the Secretariat has been able to match CDS information

Attachment A

Table 4: Summary of Transhipments that occurred in port during the 2015 Calendar Year¹⁴

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From CDS		
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type
JP	4	49,873	GG	4	49,832	GGT
KR	4	344,712	GG	4	344,712	GGT
TW	11	143,161	GG	11	143,161	GGT
TOTAL	19	537,746		19	537,705	

Table 5: Summary of Transhipments that occurred in port during the first half of the 2016 Calendar Year¹⁴

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From CDS		
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type
	0	0	-	Not due to be submitted to the Secretariat until 30/09/16		

¹⁴ Transhipments conducted in port are not part of the CCSBT Transhipment Regional Observer Program, and therefore no observer deployment requests nor observer reports are required to be submitted for these transhipments. Only Transhipment Declarations are required to be submitted.