



CCSBT-EC/0510/15

12. Catch Monitoring System

Purpose

To discuss options for implementing a catch monitoring system.

Discussion

At CCSBT11 it was agreed to discuss options for implementing a CCSBT catch monitoring system at CCSBT12.

A discussion paper was prepared by the Secretariat for the original discussion at CCSBT11. The paper has retained its relevance for discussion at CCSBT12.

A copy of the Secretariat's paper is at Attachment A.

For consideration.

Prepared by the Secretariat

**COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA
CATCH MONITORING SCHEMES
DISCUSSION PAPER**

Introduction

At CCSBT10 the Extended Commission asked the Secretariat to prepare a discussion paper on catch monitoring options. The paper assumes the Extended Commission's decision related to two issues – a more comprehensive documentation scheme and more timely catch reporting arrangement.

The CCSBT maintains a trade monitoring system (the TIS) that is largely effective in monitoring trade in SBT. Because of the structure of the fishery and the market for SBT, most trade is captured by the system. It is not, however, equivalent to a catch monitoring system because domestic consumption is not regarded as trade and not incorporated into the scheme. Compilation of data from TIS documents and distribution to members is often more than 12 months after fish are caught.

Catch is currently monitored in the CCSBT through member fishery reports at each annual meeting and scientific data exchange.

Other regional fisheries bodies have a variety of catch monitoring/documentation arrangements relating to managed fisheries:-

- CCAMLR maintains a catch documentation system for all landings, transshipments and importations of Patagonian Toothfish. For each of these activities, a CCAMLR catch reporting document must be completed with relevant validations. Members provide copies of the documents to the CCAMLR Secretariat for consolidation into a database. CCAMLR also maintains a catch reporting system which requires fishing vessels operating in designated fishing areas to report catch to the CCAMLR Secretariat at five day or monthly intervals. (A more detailed description is set out in a following section).
- NAFO requires members to report catches to the NAFO secretariat at frequencies ranging from daily to monthly intervals depending on species. The Secretariat consolidates the data and reports to members within 10 days of receipt of the data. In addition, fishing vessels entering NAFO's regulatory area must report electronically catch on entry, catch on exit and each transshipment in advance of entering and leaving the regulatory area. A documentation scheme is not incorporated into these arrangements.
- NEAFC requires each member to report catch within 30 days of the end of each month. The NEAFC Secretariat consolidates the data and circulates it to members within 10 days of the data submission deadline. A documentation scheme is not part of these arrangements.

- ICCAT and the IOTC maintain annual catch reporting systems by members. Both organisations also have separate trade documentation schemes.
- IATTC has annual catch reporting by members. However, for purse seiners, which carry an observer on board, a weekly report on catch from the observer to the IATTC Secretariat is required. For vessels without an observer, fishing companies are encouraged to provide the same information. IATTC maintains a separate trade documentation scheme.

National governments of members of the Extended Commission maintain catch monitoring systems for their SBT fisheries.

CCAMLR

CCAMLR has the most comprehensive catch monitoring system and coordinated catch documentation scheme. This section outlines in more detail how the system is managed and the cost of its administration.

The operation of the CCAMLR is described in the Conservation Measure 10-05 (2002) Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichys* spp. Article 2, requires members to authorize each master or another authorized representative of its flag vessels to engage in harvesting of Patagonian Toothfish. These authorised persons are required to complete a catch document on each occasion catch is landed or transhipped.

When a master of a vessel or the master of a vessel to which catch has been transhipped (receiving vessel) complete their landings, they must immediately obtain a signed and stamped copy the catch document from a competent official at port and convey a copy of that catch document to the Flag State that issued the catch document. A copy must also be sent to the CCAMLR Secretariat by the most rapid electronic means available within 48 hours.

In the case of transhipments, the master of a vessel has to confirm the transhipment by obtaining the signature on the catch document of the master of receiving vessel and convey a copy of the document by the most rapid electronic means available to the Flag State of the vessel.

For export and re-export, the system is similar to the CCSBT's TIS scheme.

As with the TIS scheme there can be long time lags between catch and receipt of documentation by the CCAMLR secretariat. CCAMLR therefore operates a catch monitoring system, which runs in parallel with the documentation scheme. When a vessel enters a regulated area it must report catch to the CCAMLR secretariat on a five day cycle (this mainly by e-mail or fax). If a vessel does not report after 10 days of the scheduled reporting time, the vessel must leave the fishery.

The CCAMLR Secretariat reconciles the catch monitoring reports with the catch documentation scheme documents. Because of the time lags in receipt of the

catch documents, this has proved to be a difficult task and is a large part of the resource cost of the CCAMLR system.

The cost of managing the CCAMLR system was estimated by the CCAMLR Secretariat at \$AUS230,000 in 2002 and 2003.

Options

The Secretariat has developed five options for consideration based on the systems maintained by other regional fisheries bodies and the specific circumstances of the CCSBT.

Option 1. Retain existing system of monitoring catch through annual catch reporting by members with a separate trade documentation scheme.

Under this option, annual catch would continue to be reported to the Extended Commission with a lag of about 9 months (higher resolution tentative catch data is available about 5 months after the end of a calendar year for scientific purposes). The trade documentation scheme, which is targeted at preventing IUU fishing, would continue to report only on traded SBT.

There would be no additional cost to the Extended Commission.

The issue in relation to retaining the existing arrangements is whether management of the fishery would be improved if new systems were introduced.

Option 2. Replace the TIS with a comprehensive system along the lines of the CCAMLR documentation scheme.

Replication of the CCAMLR scheme should not be intrinsically difficult for the CCSBT. Members are already involved in the CCAMLR system and only one species is involved. An entirely new scheme would not have to be developed as it should be possible to adapt the CCAMLR scheme. However, CCSBT members do not have large fleets involved in the toothfish fishery and the volume of documentation would be substantially higher for their involvement in the SBT fishery.

It might also be possible to adapt CCAMLR's software but this cannot be determined until a thorough analysis is conducted.

Adoption of the scheme would give comprehensive coverage of catch and trade, and would have a documentation trail.

Production of catch and trade data from the system would have time lags associated with the return of documentation to the CCSBT Secretariat. Using the CCAMLR system as an example, the time lags from the time of catch to the time a document is received by the Secretariat for processing can be as long as 12 months.

There would be additional costs for the Secretariat in developing and managing the scheme. It is difficult to quantify the costs at this stage but the CCAMLR

scheme is reported to cost about \$230,000 per annum to maintain. The CCSBT Secretariat believes it could develop and maintain a scheme for considerably less than the current cost of the CCAMLR scheme.

Option 3. Retain existing systems but increase catch reporting frequency from members (not fishing vessels) to a monthly basis

This option would be similar to the reporting requirements of NAFO and NEAFC and members who are members of those organisations have direct experience of reporting at this frequency. Also, CCSBT members now maintain some form of continuous domestic catch reporting systems for SBT, which might be adapted to provide the information to the CCSBT Secretariat.

The reported catch would be submitted electronically to the CCSBT Secretariat which would compile and report to members 30 days after the end of a reporting period. A reporting timeline of 10 days would be more desirable, but the Secretariat could not meet this schedule when staff were involved in preparation for and attendance at meetings.

This option would improve the timeliness in reporting catch. However, the time lags in the existing TIS arrangements would continue.

The TIS would continue to act as a control over IUU fishing and provide comprehensive data on international trade in SBT.

There would be small additional costs in the Secretariat as additional resources would be required for managing the system.

Option 4. Amend the TIS scheme to require internal domestic trade as well as international trade to be documented.

Under this option, members that catch SBT for domestic consumption would need to complete a modified TIS document when the fish was committed to the domestic market. The documents would be sent to the CCSBT Secretariat for incorporation into the TIS database using the existing TIS document management arrangements.

Given the structure of the SBT fishery, this amendment to the TIS would provide a system similar to that of CCAMLR but without the need to build an entirely new system. Members that consume catch domestically would have to develop new domestic systems.

The IUU prevention purpose of the TIS would be retained.

The cost to the CCSBT to modify the TIS could be managed using existing Secretariat resources. On-going expenses for data entry should not exceed \$15,000.

Indonesia might have difficulty in participating in this system. Currently, only 4-6% of the Indonesian catch, which is monitored, is SBT and of this only 15% is

estimated to be exported and require the completion of a TIS form. The adoption of a CCAMLR like system would face the same difficulty.

Option 5. Adopt the catch documentation proposal in Option 4 and increase catch reporting to a monthly frequency.

The amendments to the TIS scheme outlined in Option 4 would not result in any change to the current time lag between catch and return of the documentation to the Secretariat for processing. If the timeliness of catch reporting was also important to members, the concurrent introduction of an increase in the frequency of catch reporting to a monthly basis as described in option 3, could be considered.

The Secretariat estimates the cost of managing this arrangement would be no more than \$20,000 per annum for data entry and management expenses.

Implementation

This paper has provided only broad generic options for catch monitoring to identify the potential scope for change.

If the Extended Commission decided to proceed with one of the options or another option not discussed in this paper, it is suggested details be the subject of a special workshop to be conducted some time prior to CCSBT13.

Prepared by the Secretariat