



Draft Updated Three-Year Compliance Action Plan (2015 – 2017)

Introduction

The CCSBT Compliance Plan supports the CCSBT Strategic Plan, and consists of five parts:

- Goals and Strategies,
- Compliance Principles,
- Roles and Responsibilities,
- Plan implementation and review, and
- **Three -Year Action Plan** (Appendix).

The current Compliance Three-Year Action Plan specifically addresses areas of priority compliance risk, and covers the period 2012 to 2014. It is provided at **Attachment A** for reference. It now needs to be replaced by a new Plan for the upcoming three year period.

Background

As part of the Eighth Meeting of the Compliance Committee's (CC8's) agreed workplan, it was requested that the Executive Secretary consult with the CC Chair and develop a draft updated three year Compliance Action Plan (CAP) for the period 2015 – 2017 inclusive.

Accordingly, a draft 2015 – 2017 CAP was developed and provided to the Third Meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (CCWG3) for Members' consideration. CCWG3 reviewed each item in this initial draft and agreed a revised draft CAP.

CCWG3 also re-visited current perceived compliance risks. The meeting identified some additional risks, including:

- Information gaps in relation to recreational catch and bycatch particularly as the SBT stock rebuilds under the Management Procedure,
- Cost restraints being experienced by some Members may limit their ability to fund appropriate compliance measures,
- Limitations of developing countries, and
- Members' National Policies.

Revised Draft Compliance Action Plan

The Secretariat has prepared a revised draft CAP for CC9's consideration, and this is provided at **Attachment B**. Note that throughout **Attachments A and B**, references to Members include Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission (CNMs), and any references to the Commission include the Extended Commission (EC).

All modifications made by the Secretariat to the revised draft CAP since CCWG3 are shown either in tracked changes mode or by dark grey shaded action cells. In the revised CAP, shaded cells are used to indicate the years in which actions are proposed to be undertaken. The light grey cells were proposed and discussed at CCWG3, while the dark grey cells have been added by the Secretariat since CCWG3.

The tracked change modifications include:

- The re-insertion of most of the introductory text.
This text is already included in the current CAP but had mostly been deleted from the draft discussed at CCWG3.
- Inclusion of the additional risk items identified by CCWG3 into the introductory text.
- A small number of general editorial corrections or amendments made to the existing CAP as considered appropriate by the Secretariat.
- Addition of new priority action items, or amendments made to existing action items to reflect recommendations made by the 2014 CCSBT Performance Review Panel.

The full list of the Compliance and Enforcement, and International Cooperation recommendations made by the 2014 CCSBT Performance Review Panel is provided at **Attachment C**. Secretariat comments and corresponding CAP item numbers are listed alongside each of these recommendations. This is to assist Members to cross-check each recommendation against any corresponding amendments and/or additions in the revised draft CAP.

Requests from the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC19)

At its recent meeting during September 2014, the ESC made several requests to the Compliance Committee for information on unreported/unaccounted SBT mortalities. These requests are recorded in the following sections of ESC19's report:

- Paragraph 68:
".... A high proportion of the ESC work is dependent on reliable data on actual removals. The ESC requests that the Compliance Committee provide a report back to the ESC on the potential for, and estimates of, unreported catch by members".
- Paragraph 95:
"The ESC is concerned about the implications and impacts of the unaccounted mortality scenarios and requests the Extended Commission and Compliance Committee urgently provide detailed information and data to properly assess impacts of unaccounted mortalities".
- Attachment 5 (provided for reference as Attachment D):
"The ESC requests that the Compliance Committee consider approaches to monitor and review markets in order to provide further information that may inform the ESC considerations".
"The ESC requests the EC and CC consider reviews and analyses that will clarify key assumptions of market monitoring. This should include consideration of:
 - a) a review of the data from Japan's monthly monitoring at Tsukiji since 2008 to verify the assumptions regarding number, weight and source of fish;*
 - b) monthly data on the number, weight and source country of frozen SBT auctioned and not auctioned at Tsukiji; and*
 - c) undertaking independent market reviews at significant markets.**The ESC encourages all countries to make their CDS data and information on market monitoring available to facilitate and improve analyses.*
The ESC requests the Compliance Committee provide the results of these to the ESC for consideration in future assessments of stock status, projects and reviews of the performance of the MP".

When considering the revised draft CAP, Members should consider if any additional action items need to be added to the draft in order to address ESC19's requests.

Appendix 1. Three-Year Action Plan (2012-2014)

This Appendix sets out actions under each Goal and Strategy over the next three years. Numbers shown in blue are the numbers used for the strategies as set out in the CCSBT Strategic Plan.

In October 2010 the Extended Commission (EC) agreed that the Compliance Plan should place special emphasis on managing specific compliance risks identified by the Compliance Committee on the basis of a risk assessment. The specific compliance risks are listed below.

- Effective implementation of the CDS, with special emphasis on physical validation and appropriate verification.
- Improvement to the transshipment monitoring program, including prior notification of SBT transshipments with observer deployment requests and training of all observers to enable detection of SBT transshipments even when SBT is not declared.
- SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species.
- Expansion of markets for SBT.
- Monitoring of catches from the farm sector.
- Non-reporting of bycatch and discards against national allocations.
- Better systems to provide information to port States to assist port States to provide improved monitoring of SBT activities.

Based on Members' feedback in August 2011, the specific compliance risks have been prioritised. In the first period (2012 to 2014) the Action Plan focuses on the following priorities:

- compliance with national allocations
- implementing the CDS
- IUU fishing
- transshipment at sea.

Actions which are not directly related to current priorities show no activity in the current period.

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance				
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.				
Strategy	Priority Actions	2012	2013	2014
8.1 Implementing agreed MCS measures 8.1 (i)	8.1.1 Develop and maintain an agreed list of conservation and management measures			
	8.1.2 Develop and adopt minimum performance requirements			
	- Compliance with national allocations			
	- CDS implementation			
	- Transhipments			
	8.1.3 Develop a revised and consolidated template for Members to report their performance against the obligations and agreed minimum performance requirements			
	8.1.4 Performance reporting system in place, including consideration of Members’ performance reports and Secretariat’s variance report			
8.2 Develop and implement MCS strategy 8.1 (ii)	8.2.1 Develop a compliance risk assessment framework to facilitate a consistent and coordinated approach to compliance/MCS planning and prioritisation by Members and Compliance Committee			
	8.2.2 Review and rationalise measures and obligations to eliminate unnecessary compliance costs			
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services) 8.1 (iii)	8.3.1 Explore costs and benefits of: common IUU vessel list with other RFMOs			
	- rationalisation of VMS among Members and RFMOs			
	- sharing common vessel registries with RFMOs			
	- rationalising CDS with other RFMOs			
	8.3.2 Evaluate ways to effectively implement Port State obligations			
	8.3.3 Build on existing bilateral arrangements and international networks (such as International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network) to enable Members to better monitor their fleet performance and any IUU fishing, and investigate non-compliance			
8.4 Monitoring expansion of	8.4.1. Implement systematic monitoring regime for emerging SBT markets			

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance			
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.			
SBT markets	8.4.2. Review SBT trade data		
8.1 (iv)	8.4.3. Implement systematic monitoring and surveillance regimes for IUU SBT fishing		
8.5 Sharing compliance data	8.5.1. Determine standardised MCS information to share with Members and Port States		
8.6 Secretariat MCS Services	8.6.1. Analyse MCS data and report on trends (annually)		
8.1 (vi)	8.6.2. Assess effectiveness of MCS measures based on data submitted		
	8.6.3. Ensure all transshipment observers are trained in CCSBT obligations (in case SBT is found)		
	8.6.4. Trend analysis of publicly available market data		
8.7 Research & development	8.7.1. R & D on new technologies & tools to aid observers, certifiers, and validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed)		

Goal 9— Members' obligations				
All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.				
Strategy	Priority Actions	2012	2013	2014
9.1 Auditing Members' systems and processes 9.1 (i)	9.1.1 Subject to funding in the CCSBT budget, appoint CCSBT auditor to conduct voluntary trial			
	9.1.2 Complete audit trial			
	9.1.3 Receive audit reports, consider findings, and take appropriate action			
9.2 Corrective action and remedies 9.1 (ii)	9.2.1. Develop procedure for investigation of alleged non-compliance			
	9.2.2. Investigate allegations as needed			

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries				
Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission's management measures and other requirements.				
Strategy	Priority Actions	2012	2013	2014
10.1 Compliance assistance 10.1 (i)	10.1.1 Provide a programme of MCS assistance to Indonesia			
	10.1.2 Ongoing Identification and sharing of best practice for MCS systems			

Goal 11: Participation in the CCSBT				
Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements				
Strategy	Priority Actions	2012	2013	2014
11.1 Inclusive cooperation 11.2	11.1.1 Identify non-member port and market states whose cooperation should be sought			
	11.1.2 Nominate such States to the Commission			

Draft Three-Year Compliance Action Plan (2015 – 2017)

This Plan sets out actions under each Compliance Goal and Strategy for the period 2015 – 2017.

In October 2010 the Extended Commission (EC) agreed that the Compliance Plan should place special emphasis on managing specific compliance risks identified by the Compliance Committee on the basis of a risk assessment. The specific compliance risks identified are listed below:

- Effective implementation of the CDS, with special emphasis on physical validation and appropriate verification,
- Improvement to the transshipment monitoring program, including prior notification of SBT transshipments with observer deployment requests and training of all observers to enable detection of SBT transshipments even when SBT is not declared,
- SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species,
- Expansion of markets for SBT,
- Monitoring of catches from the farm sector,
- Non-reporting of bycatch and discards against national allocations,
- Better systems to provide information to Port States to assist Port States to provide improved monitoring of SBT activities.

Based on Members' feedback at CCWG in April 2014, the following additional compliance risks were identified:

- Information gaps in relation to recreational catch and bycatch particularly as the SBT stock rebuilds under the Management Procedure,
- Cost restraints being experienced by some Members that may limit their ability to fund appropriate compliance measures,
- Limitations of developing countries, and
- Members' National Policies.

The shaded cells in the table represent the year(s) in which the actions are planned to be undertaken.

Note: A “?” is used to denote uncertainty as to whether the planned action will be undertaken in the year indicated.

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance								
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.								
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017		
8.1 (i)	8.1 Implementing agreed MCS measures	8.1.1	Maintain and enhance:					
			a) the agreed list of conservation and management measures					
			b) the already developed Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs), in particular the Routine Reporting Measures					
					c) the associated consolidated national report template in which Members report their performance against the obligations and agreed MPRs			
		8.1.2	Develop and adopt additional minimum performance requirements as required:					
			a) Transhipments	?	?			
			b) Authorisation Measures - 2.1 Record of Authorised Farms, 2.2 Record of Authorised Vessels, 2.3 Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels					
			c) MCS Measures - CCSBT IUU Vessel List					
			d) MCS Measures - Port State Measures		?	?		
			e) Science Measures - 4.1 Scientific Observer Program Standards					
f) Measures relating to ERS - 5.2 Recommendation on ERS								
	g) MCS Measures - 3.2 VMS							
	8.1.3	Performance reporting system in place (the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures and Operation of CCSBT Measures reports), including consideration of Members’ performance reports						

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
8.1 (ii)	8.2 Develop and implement MCS strategy	8.2.1	Identify areas of greatest compliance risk in order to facilitate a consistent and coordinated approach to compliance/MCS planning and prioritisation by Members and Compliance Committee	?		
		8.2.2	Review and rationalise measures and obligations to eliminate unnecessary compliance costs to the catching sector and administrative costs to Governments (should follow and/or compliment work described under item 8.2.1, 8.3.1 and 8.3.3)			
		8.2.3	Review all CCSBT Compliance Resolutions, decisions and recommendations and identify any that have become obsolete/outdated. Take appropriate actions to amend any issues identified, e.g. the Compliance Action Plan Resolution and some reporting obligations			

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
8.1 (iii)	8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	8.3.1	<p>Explore the costs and benefits of:</p> <p>a) i) <u>Explore the costs and benefits of/ test the utilisation of electronic observation technologies as an alternative to supplement traditional human observer coverage programmes.</u></p> <p><u>ii) Depending on the results of the analyses in a) i), implement electronic observation technologies</u></p> <p>b) Conduct a study to examine systems/ processes to better integrate and/or improve the efficiency of the collection and management of data/information submitted in accordance with CCSBT’s Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS), VMS, Observer and Transshipment Measures, particularly focusing on collecting the data/information once and as close to its original source as possible. <u>Seek to harmonise these with other RFMOs’ systems and processes wherever possible</u></p>			
		8.3.2	Develop and implement agreed minimum catch monitoring requirements for each fishing sector, for example commercial (EEZ longline, High Seas longline, purse seine, other) and non-commercial (artisanal, recreational, other)			

8.1 (iii): Continued	8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services): Continued	8.3.3	a) Conduct an independent performance review of the CCSBT CDS, including consideration of alternate technologies			
			b) Depending on the outcomes/ recommendations of the CCSBT CDS review, and taking into consideration the goals of trying to rationalise CDS systems with other RFMOs and to improve the effectiveness of landing inspections, etc, develop a proposal on how best to progress and improve the existing CCSBT CDS into the future			
		8.3.4	a) Complete and implement CCSBT Port State Measures	?	?	
			b) Complete and implement the revised Transhipment Measure	?	?	
		8.3.5	<u>Review and revise the CCSBT VMS Resolution (2008) for example to include specific baseline operational VMS standards for SBT vessels regardless of their area of operation, such as reporting frequencies, recipients and use of VMS data</u>			
		8.3.6	<u>Develop standards and protocols for a High Seas boarding and inspection scheme for SBT vessels and harmonise this with other RFMOs' schemes wherever possible</u>			
		8.3.75	Maintain and strengthen relationships with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and international networks (such as the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network) to enable Members to better monitor their fleet performance and any IUU fishing, and investigate non-compliance			
		8.3.86	Review existing MOUs with IOTC and ICCAT with reference to any changes in the Transhipment Resolution, and develop an in-port transhipment MOU with WCPFC		?	
		8.3.9	<u>Liaise with the other tuna RFMOs in relation to the formats they use for assessing compliance with data reporting requirements, adopt useful aspects of these, and give consideration to a harmonised format</u>			

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
8.1 (iv)	8.4 Monitoring expansion of SBT markets	8.4.1	Regular monitoring for emerging SBT markets, including reviews of SBT trade data <u>and exploration of any available options for tracking the trade of SBT between those States that are not Members or CNMs of the CCSBT and/or may not be included in the Secretariat’s GTA subscription</u>			
8.1 (v)	8.5 Sharing compliance data		No current work scheduled			
8.1 (vi)	8.6 Secretariat MCS Services	8.6.1	Analyse MCS data and report on trends (annually), as well as assessing the effectiveness of MCS measures based on the data submitted			
		8.6.2	Ensure all transshipment observers are trained in CCSBT obligations (in case SBT is found)			
		8.6.3	Trend analysis of publicly available market data			
	8.7 Research & development	8.7.1	Regular report-backs on R and D on new technologies & tools to aid observers, certifiers, and validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed) to be provided by Members			
8.7.2		Review: <u>i)a)</u> The costs/ benefits of using Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tagging and other electronic tagging technologies, etc for tagging SBT and/or SBT product cartons in future in association with an electronic CDS (eCDS), and <u>ii)b)</u> Enhancements such as developing and implementing an electronic inventory system that details how many SBT are on board authorised CCSBT fishing or carrier vessels at any point in time	Timeframe to be considered at CC9 following consideration of priorities and budgetary constraints			

Goal 9— Members' obligations						
All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
9.1 (i)	9.1 Auditing Members' systems and processes	9.1.1	Develop and implement an integrated programme for conducting regular Quality Assessment Reviews (QARs) for each Member every 3 - 4 years (for example, 2 QARs in total to be conducted each year), as well as conducting ad hoc targeted QARs based on risk assessment advice. At least 1 QAR is to be completed each year			
		9.1.2	Receive audit reports, consider findings, and follow-up with individual Members to check whether QAR recommendations have been addressed			
9.1 (ii)	9.2 Corrective action and remedies	9.2.1	No current work scheduled			
			<u>Continue to refine the Corrective Actions Policy and provide guidelines for standard implementation, for example:</u>			
			<u>a) Develop and maintain a record of any instances of non-compliance identified, and the corrective action that was taken in response to that non-compliance</u>			
			<u>b) consider whether Members should be able to participate in decision-making on corrective actions that pertain to themselves</u>			

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries						
Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission's management measures and other requirements.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
10.1 (i)	10.1 Compliance assistance	10.1.1	Use the output from QARs to identify areas where targeted assistance to Indonesia could best be provided, then provide MCS assistance in the areas identified			
		10.1.2	-Ongoing identification and sharing of best practice for MCS systems <u>through targeted analysis of capacity building needs and Compliance "missions" to assist developing State Members</u>			

Goal 11: Participation in the CCSBT						
Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements.						
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Compliance Plan Strategy No.		Priority Actions	2015	2016	2017
11.2	11.1 Inclusive cooperation	11.1.1	Identify (using trade and market analyses as well as any information supplied by Members) non-member port and market states whose cooperation should be sought			
		11.1.2	Nominate such States to the Commission			
		11.1.3	Research, develop and potentially implement systematic monitoring and surveillance regimes for IUU SBT fishing			

CCSBT Performance Review Panel 2014 Recommendations Regarding Compliance & Enforcement and International Cooperation

The following table lists the CCSBT Performance Review Panel Recommendations for 2014 in the areas of Compliance and Enforcement, and International Cooperation. The Secretariat has made a comment regarding if and how each of these recommendations has been addressed in the revised Compliance Action Plan (CAP), as well as recording the relevant CAP action item number where appropriate.

A. Compliance and Enforcement

Review Panel Recommendation Number	Performance Review Panel Recommendation	Secretariat Comment	Revised Action Plan Reference No.
PR-2014-42	The CCSBT should continue to ensure compliance by all possible means, including through continued, and full implementation of the enhanced Compliance Committee process, QAR program and compliance action plans and policies. Any additional recommendations on compliance that stem from these new processes should be specific and lead to action by the CCSBT in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Compliance Committee and related Compliance Action Plan and tools. No additional recommendations are necessary.	No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall revised CAP.	-
PR-20014-41 ¹	The CCSBT should accelerate its progress in developing a Resolution on Port State Measures consistent with the 2009 FAO Port States Agreement.	This is specified to occur in 2015 and 2016 in the revised CAP.	8.3.4 a)
PR-2014-43	Considering that both technology and sister RFMOs programmes keep evolving, the CCSBT should continue to improve its MCS measures and scheme, and take additional steps to harmonize its MCS measures with other RFMOs.	8.3.1 b) has been amended in the revised CAP to add some additional text regarding harmonising with other RFMOs' systems and processes.	8.3.1 b)

¹ The numbering in the Performance Review document is not consistent/ consecutive for this recommendation. There are 2 recommendation 41s, and only this recommendation with the "PR-20014" prefix.

PR-2014-44	<p>The CCSBT should accelerate its efforts to strengthen its Scientific Observer Standards and ensure they are harmonized with those of neighboring RFMOs with respect to ERS observer data.</p> <p>The CCSBT should also give serious consideration to the development of a ROP, perhaps through forging a relationship with the WCPFC to allow for mutual recognition or cross endorsement of observers, as the WCPFC and IATTC have done.</p>	<p>Not added to the revised CAP because work is already in progress on this item within the ERSWG community. A joint tRFMO technical bycatch working group meeting on longline observer bycatch data is scheduled for January 2015. The results of this meeting are expected to be considered at ERSWG 11 in March 2015.</p> <p>Not added to revised CAP due to the difficulty Members have had on agreeing to a ROP. However, Members should discuss whether they wish to reconsider this issue as suggested by the recommendation.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p>
PR-2014-45	<p>The CCSBT should trigger paragraph 5 of its 2008 CCSBT Resolution and goal 8.3 of its Compliance Action Plan, and review and revise the Resolution to include specific baseline operational VMS standards for SBT vessels regardless of their area of operation, such as reporting frequencies, recipients and use of VMS data (such as by the CCSBT Secretariat, SC/ESC, and ERSWG and Compliance Committees (other than summary reports currently required under the 2008 Resolution).</p> <p>For instance, CCSBT members and CNMs could agree that their SBT vessels operating in other RFMO Convention Areas would transmit the VMS reports sent under those VMS programs to the CCSBT Secretariat.</p>	<p>Added a new item to the revised CAP.</p> <p>Not added to revised CAP. The main RFMO of relevance (IOTC) with respect to the quantity of SBT caught, does not have VMS transmissions sent to the Secretariat.</p>	<p>8.3.5</p> <p>-</p>

PR-2014-46	<p>The CCSBT should accelerate its progress in reviewing its Transshipment Program for tuna longline vessels in conjunction with the development of a Port State measures resolution that is consistent with the 2009 FAO Port States Agreement.</p> <p>The CCSBT should also be prepared to develop rules to govern at sea transshipment involving purse seine vessels that are consistent with those adopted by the WCPFC, if at-sea transshipment activities involving such vessels begins to be utilized in the future.</p>	<p>This is specified to occur in 2015 in the revised CAP.</p> <p>Not included in CAP as there is no transshipment at sea from purse seine vessels. This will be revised according to the recommendation if considered likely to occur in the future.</p>	<p>8.3.4 b)</p> <p>-</p>
PR-2014-47	CCSBT should therefore develop as a matter of priority procedures for high seas boarding and inspection of SBT vessels.	Added item to revised CAP for 2016 - 2017.	8.3.6
PR-2014-48	The CCSBT has taken steps since 2008 to considerably strengthen its compliance assessment processes and tools, including a framework for applying a range of penalties for instances of Member and CNM non-compliance with CCSBT measures. CCSBT should continue to refine these tools and ensure they are transparently and fairly implemented when necessary to ensure legitimacy and integrity in its system, thereby creating an incentive for compliance among members and CNMs.	Added an item to the revised CAP, in particular to address the transparency point.	9.2.1 a)
PR-2014-49	The CCSBT has taken steps since 2008 to considerably strengthen its compliance assessment processes and tools, including reworking its Compliance Committee terms of reference, giving the Committee adequate time to meet, and adopting an IUU Vessel List measure. Members and CNMs are cooperating with the process, providing their national reports on time and submitting themselves to a multilateral review of their compliance in the Compliance Committee. The CCSBT should continue implement these tools fully and ensure non-compliance is transparently and fairly assessed, thereby creating an incentive for compliance among members and CNMs. The CCSBT	Added items to the revised CAP, in particular to address the transparency and decision-making points.	9.2.1 a), b)

	should also consider mandating that a member who is being considered for a sanction under its policies may not participate in the decision-making on that issue.		
PR-2014-50	The initial recommendations are already fairly well implemented. CCSBT should explore all available options for tracking the trade of SBT between those States that are not members or CNMs, and continue to engage in outreach (both from the Secretariat and individually as CCSBT members or CNMs, such as through diplomatic channels and in bilateral contacts) to those non-member nations to encourage their participation in and implementation of the CCSBT CDS.	These recommendations are already covered in the existing CAP but the Secretariat has added additional wording to 8.4.1 to take reflect the emphasis on tracking SBT trade of non-Members/ CNMs.	8.4.1, 11.1.1

B. International Cooperation

PR-2014-54	CCSBT has given particular attention to the subject of non-members with a view to facilitate their participation in the governance process. No particular recommendation is therefore needed except to continue paying attention to the issue and pursue its efforts towards the remaining non-members and potential newcomers in the fishery.	No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall CAP.	-
PR-2014-55	CCSBT has given particular attention also to the subject of noncooperating non-members with a view to deter the activities of their vessels. CCSBT should continue its efforts to improve collaboration with all the actors in the fishery to continue to strengthen its efforts in combating IUU fishing activities and ensure the effective implementation of its measures and programs. In addition, the development of port State measures in line with the FAO Port States Agreement (as is discussed in section 4.2.2) could greatly assist in this area.	No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall CAP.	-

PR-2014-56	<p>Given the reliance of the CCSBT, in many ways, on cooperative relationships with other RFMOs for “harmonizing” with (and using directly) a number of those neighbouring RFMOs’ measures, the work called for by the Kobe process and its 2010 workshops is particularly relevant. The CCSBT should look seriously for opportunities to re-invigorate discussions among its neighbouring RFMOs to work more closely to implement the Kobe recommendations. Key areas of collaboration include: more systematic exchange of data and information (interoperable databases); additional harmonization of measures; conducting more joint scientific workshops; increasing coordination of compliance work, particularly to combat IUU fishing and conserve and manage ERS; large-scale tagging programmes; ecosystem approach implementation; large scale ecosystem-based modelling; Management Strategy Evaluation;</p> <p>... harmonisation of MCS systems; common formats for assessing compliance (with data reporting; infringements, etc.); capacity-building (e.g. training courses); and development of common positions at IUCN, CITES, CBD, and the UNGA.</p>	<p>This is a wide ranging recommendation that covers many aspects of the CCSBT’s operation, not just those covered by the Compliance Committee (CC). Aspects under the CC’s jurisdiction are highlighted. The harmonisation and capacity building components of this highlighted text are already covered in the revised CAP, so no additional changes were required to address those.</p> <p>Added a new item to the revised CAP.</p>	<p>8.3.1 b), 8.3.3 b), 8.3.6, 8.3.7</p> <p>8.3.9</p>
PR-2014-57	<p>As is noted in the Strategic Plan, the CCSBT should develop a more comprehensive strategy for addressing the capacity building needs, particularly with regard to compliance with CCSBT obligations, programs, and implementing the CDS, of developing State members/CNMs. One model to consider is that of the IOTC, which conducts compliance “missions” in country to assist developing State members in identifying areas of deficiency and in developing an action plan to improve.</p>	<p>The revised CAP has been amended to add some additional text regarding capacity building and compliance ‘missions’.</p>	<p>10.1.2</p>

Report of ESC19 (Attachment 5)

Unaccounted mortality

The possibility of unaccounted for mortality raises important issues for the rebuilding of the stock and the success of the management procedure. The current MP was tuned assuming that future catches equaled the amount indicated by the procedure. In addition a series of robustness trials have been run to show performance for some other possible levels of historic and future unaccounted mortality, as well as anomalies in inputs to the MP. Unfortunately, estimates of unaccounted for mortality are either incomplete, unreliable or disputed, or they do not exist. This Attachment summarizes (1) the possible sources of unaccounted mortality, (2) what data currently exist that could be used to estimate unaccounted catch, (3) what data could be collected that would improve understanding of unaccounted catch, and (4) what analytic procedures could be used to calculate unaccounted catch.

The following potential types of unaccounted for catch have been identified

Source of unaccounted catch	
Unreported or uncertainty in retained catch by Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Fish Surface fishery • Artisanal catch • Large fish: members exceeding catch allowance
Mortality from releases and/or discards	Small fish Discarded catch Large fish: discarded catch
Recreational fisheries	All sizes: recreational catch
Catches by non-Members	Large fish: Non-member catch
Research Mortality Allowance	No additional -already included
Other sources of mortality	Possible depredation

Small fish: Surface fishery

Existing data and analysis

Data are needed on the number, size, age and weight at transfer into grow-out cages.

Number at transfer is measured by counting fish as they are transferred from tow cages to rearing cages. Observers record mortality during the towing process.

Size and weight at the time of introduction into rearing cages is measured by the 40 (prior to 2013) or 100 (since 2013) fish samples, adding to a total sample of about 3,000 SBT per season. SBT under 10kg are not included in the samples. Australia applies the mean weight in the samples to the number of fish captured (number transferred from the towing cage plus number of fish that die during catching, towing and transfers) to

estimate the total weight of fish captured. The exclusion of fish less than 10kg from the estimate of mean weight tends to positively bias the estimate of catch weight.

Japan has used mixed normal modal analysis to estimate the age composition of farmed fish sold into Japan using length frequency data of imports. The source of the length frequency data is considered confidential by Japan. The estimated age composition of imports is used to impute the weight of catch using information on length at age of wild fish and a weight-length function. Such estimates of catch have been challenged by some members because of concerns about the source and representativeness of length frequency data and other assumptions. This approach could be improved by using CDS data (length and weight at time of harvest), which are held by CCSBT but are, at present, not available to members. There are modes in length representing ages in the 40/100 fish sampling data and length frequency data of imports reported by Japan, in some years. If these modes are identified in the CDS data, modal analysis could be used to estimate catch and possible bias in catch reports resulting from the 40/100 fish samples.

Other data that exists and would need to be taken into account to assess results.

- (1) Data on when fish are put into farms and how long fish are held in the farms
- (2) Growth rate data from fish in farms compared to wild fish (other studies not CCSBT)
- (3) Growth rates of tagged fish from SRP that are subsequently harvested in farms
- (4) Feed conversion ratios for the farms
- (5) Differences in growth rates of each age group
- (6) Current wild growth rates

New data sources and analysis

Uncertainty in the surface fishery catch may be reduced by the use of a stereo video system to address estimates of Australian catch by the surface fishery. Australia has demonstrated the potential utility of this method which it had planned to use to replace 100 fish samples. However, the method has not been made operational to date.

Experimental trials comparing stereo video to the 100 fish sample could be used to investigate the accuracy of 100 fish sample.

Another approach would be to take a 100 fish sample just prior to harvesting all the fish in pens. The estimated weight from the 100 sample could be compared to the calculated weight of harvested fish using their length frequency and a weight-length relationship or the sum of the weight of harvested fish.

Process aspects

The ESC encourages all countries to make their CDS data available to facilitate and improve analyses.

Small Fish: Release and discard mortality:

Japan reports releases during its RTMP programme. At present there are observer estimates of the number of small fish released or discarded from some other fleets. These numbers could be evaluated under a range of estimated/assumed release mortality to estimate the mortality from release and discard.

Japan put forward a methodology and an associated estimate of 9% for release mortality. Other members noted that some studies of other tuna species suggest that this may be an underestimate. Some suggested that bounds on release mortality be 9% to 100%, given uncertainty on mortality rates. The same approach could be applied to other fleets.

Small and Large fish Catch by non members

At the meeting of the Operating Model and Management Procedure Working Group (OMMP5) in Seattle in July the working group discussed the request from the Extended Commission and noted that the working group did not have the information required to estimate all unaccounted mortalities. The working group summarised the methods and sources of information required to better inform unaccounted mortality scenarios (Attachment 5, OMMP5 report), and encouraged the ESC, Compliance Committee and Extended Commission to work towards filling the gaps in the information base.

The working group proposed that scenarios could be developed by applying SBT bycatch rates in longline fleets to the effort by non-Members in the same areas and months. The meeting agreed that Members should evaluate the SBT by-catch rate of their own longline fleets which target other species to inform this analysis (CCSBT 2014). These approaches are documented in WP 13. It is noted that these methods will not provide any estimates of IUU catch, where there is no effort reported to the relevant RFMOs.

The ESC requests that the Compliance Committee consider approaches to monitor and review markets in order to provide further information that may inform the ESC considerations.

Reported catch exceeding current allowances

Over the last few years members reported catch has been very close to the catch allocations.

Indonesia has reported that their catch exceeded their allowance for a total of 1074 t. over the four years 2010 to 2013.

Unreported catch by members

Member countries report effort to CCSBT for all targeted SBT fishing. Although, there is some additional fishing effort by some member countries in areas where SBT are known to occur, such bycatches are expected to be included in the SBT catches reported.

Australia presented a paper (ESC/1409/12) suggesting there may be discrepancies in the market data and there may be unreported catch. This is based on the assumptions in the Japan Market Review, agreed by the CCSBT, on fish reported to be domestic, imported wild caught from foreign fleets and farmed. Japan suggested that these imbalances are due to the difference between fish that go through the auction and those that are traded only on paper. Actually resolving this issue is beyond the scope of the ESC, but it is a very important issue for the reliability of the stock assessment and performance of the OMP. A high proportion of the ESC work is dependent on reliable data on actual removals.

New data sources and analysis

Other data and analyses exist that would assist in resolving this uncertainty. Given the scientific technical expertise of the ESC, further consideration of market monitoring is more appropriately considered by the Compliance Committee. The ESC requests the EC and CC consider reviews and analyses that will clarify key assumptions of market monitoring. This should include consideration of:

- a) a review of the data from Japan's monthly monitoring at Tsukiji since 2008 to verify the assumptions regarding number, weight and source of fish;
- b) monthly data on the number, weight and source country of frozen SBT auctioned and not auctioned at Tsukiji; and
- c) undertaking independent market reviews at significant markets.

The ESC encourages all countries to make their CDS data and information on market monitoring available to facilitate and improve analyses.

The ESC requests the Compliance Committee provide the results of these to the ESC for consideration in future assessments of stock status, projects and reviews of the performance of the MP.

Recreational fishing

Australia makes some estimates of their recreational catch but is currently in the final year of a project to develop a better methodology.

Other Sources

Marine mammal depredation was raised as a possible other source of unaccounted catch. This could be considered a source of background natural mortality, but if the rate of depredation has been rising (for instance due to increasing marine mammal populations and learning by these animals) then it is a potential concern.