



CCSBT-EC/0310/17

14. Trade Information Scheme Matters

Purpose

To provide an opportunity for the Extended Commission to discuss issues relevant to the operation of the CCSBT Trade Information Scheme (TIS). It is expected that discussion will focus on the draft minimum standards for TIS documents and on other matters that members may raise at the meeting.

Background

At CCSBT9 and the Extended Commission agreed to a number of changes in the TIS, including:

- That minimum standards should be developed on the quality or level of completeness of TIS documents;
- Improved processes for exports and importers for handling TIS forms and that TIS forms should be issued for all exports, including exports to non-members;
- Reconciliation of TIS documents between exporters and importers be conducted by requiring exporters to submit electronic lists of all TIS documents issued.

In relation to the first point, the Secretariat has produced draft minimum standards for the TIS and these are provided at Attachment 1. It is intended that these standards would become Annex 5 of the TIS. The attached standards incorporate comments provided by Japan and New Zealand¹ in relation to an earlier draft, but these changes have yet to be discussed by members. The latest draft attempts to address some common views of both Japan and New Zealand that (1) The exporting country should be responsible for enforcing completion of its TIS form; (2) The importing country should not be responsible for correcting inadequacies in an exporter's TIS documents; and (3) The Secretariat should have the responsibility for follow-ups concerning inadequacies in TIS documents² and reporting compliance problems back to the CCSBT.

The changes relating to the last two points have been implemented and are helping to overcome problems caused by missing or "late" documents and to slightly increase the coverage of SBT trade achieved by the TIS scheme. The Secretariat has also requested exporting non-members to implement these changes in the TIS. To date, the Philippines has advised that it will implement the requested changes and responses from Indonesia and the Seychelles are still pending. The Secretariat has also requested that the U.S.A. (which is one of the largest SBT importers apart from Japan) cooperate with the TIS scheme in the same manner as CCSBT members who import SBT. The U.S.A. has responded, but only to redirect the Secretariat to a more appropriate agency in the U.S.A. administration.

¹ Comments on the minimum standards have not been received from Australia, Korea and Taiwan, although Australia has remarked that it cannot agree to minimum standards until a number of issues it has with the TIS have been discussed at CCSBT10.

² It is worth noting that the Secretariat has already been active in this area and has also contacted non-members to seek a general improvement in the completion of their TIS documents.

In implementing the last two points Australia, with the agreement of other members, changed its TIS form to include the country of destination³. New Zealand proposed that this change also be formally made to the official TIS form in Annex 1 of the SDP. This proposal was supported by Australia, but Japan felt that this formal requirement was an unnecessary restriction of commercial activities⁴ and that exporting countries should be able to choose other means for obtaining information on the export destination. Japan felt that this issue should be discussed at CCSBT 10 if other members wished to discuss the issue further.

Discussion

The Secretariat seeks guidance from the Extended Commission on resolving completion of the minimum standards for TIS documents.

Prepared by the Secretariat

³ So that it could record the destination country and report this in the electronic list submitted to the Secretariat.

⁴ There are cases where SBT intended for one destination are exported to another country as a result of changes in world wide prices.

DRAFT

Minimum Standards for completion of CCSBT Statistical Documents
(to become Annex 5 of the CCSBT Statistical Document Program)

1. Responsibility Exporter and Exporting Country/Fishing Entity

- 1.1. The exporter is responsible for completing the export section of the statistical document (except for item 8 - validation) and the source of the product (captured or farmed).
- 1.2. The exporting country/fishing entity is responsible for enforcing correct completion of each statistical document. The export section (items 1-8), the document number and the source of the product (captured or farmed) of the statistical document must be correctly completed in accordance with the instruction sheet of Annex 1.
- 1.3. The exporting country/fishing entity must ensure that the validator is responsible for checking that the statistical document is fully completed and is correct. The validation section of the statistical document should not be completed and the export should not be approved unless this check has been conducted and the statistical document has been determined to be complete and correct.

2. Responsibility of Importer and Importing Country/Fishing Entity

- 2.1. The importer is responsible for completing the import section of the statistical document.
- 2.2. The importing country/fishing entity is responsible for enforcing correct completion of the import section of each statistical document. The import section must be correctly completed in accordance with the instruction sheet of Annex 1.
- 2.3. The importing country/fishing entity will also check that the following items of information are present, legible and correct¹ on each statistical document:
 - Flag country/fishing entity of capture vessel;
 - Net weight;
 - Exporter certification (including a clearly identifiable exporter name);
 - Official validation seal or stamp.
- 2.4. If any information specified in 2.2 is missing, illegible or incorrect, the importing country/fishing entity should hold the product until the missing information is provided. The importing country should request the Executive Secretary to obtain the missing information from the exporter. However, to minimize delays in marketing the product, the importer can choose to contact the exporter directly to obtain this information.

3. Responsibility of the Executive Secretary

- 3.1. The Executive Secretary will monitor the accuracy and completeness of all statistical documents received.

¹ For some items of information, the check for correctness will often be limited to confirming that an item is not obviously incorrect.

- 3.2. When information on SDP documents is found to be missing or inaccurate, the Executive Secretary will write to the countries/fishing entities involved² to advise them of what they are required to provide and to request that the missing/inaccurate information be provided or corrected³. If the requested information is not supplied within an appropriate time frame, or if information is repeatedly omitted by a country/fishing entity, the Executive Secretary will refer the matter to the Compliance Committee for consideration.

² This will be the export country/fishing entity for all items of information except the import section, which will be the import country.

³ It is expected that the exporting country/fishing entity would take appropriate action against the exporting company/validators if information is repeatedly omitted.

Compliance with the Statistical Document Program

In previous years, the Secretariat has provided a summary of compliance with relevant sections of the TIS scheme. A similar summary, updated for 2002/03 is provided here for member's information.

A. Information Required (Section 2 of SDP)

In accordance with Section 2.2 (d) and (e) members shall maintain aggregated information on their tuna farms and submit such information to the Secretariat every six months on average. Australia submitted aggregated information on tuna farms to the Secretariat during February and September 2003.

B. Exchange of Information (Section 4 of SDP)

Members who modify the Standard SDP form are required to provide a copy of such form to the Executive Secretary. Australia now requires its exporters to record the destination country on the TIS form and modified instructions for Australia's TIS form have been provided to the Secretariat. Australia has yet to modify its actual TIS form.

The following updates on validation have been provided by members in the past 12 months.

- Australia provided an update during October 2002 of its list of validators (names and signatures) for Port Lincoln and the Sydney airport together with the validation seals used at these locations;
- Taiwan provided an update during January 2003 that specified its single validator, along with that validator's signature stamp and the validation seal;
- Japan provided an update during July 2003 of its list of validators (names, and the signatures for names that have changed);
- Korea provided an update during August 2003 of all its authorised validation seals;
- New Zealand provided an update during September 2003 of its validation authority and all its validators (names, stamps and signatures).

C. Record and Report (Section 5 of SDP)

Japan provided the Secretariat with TIS documents for the period of October-December 2002 in late February¹ and late March 2003 and documents for the period of January-March in late June 2003 in accordance with Section 5.1. Documents for the period of April to June 2003 are expected in late September 2003. No TIS documents have been received from other members for SBT imports since October 2002.

The Secretariat has complied with the reporting timeframes of Section 5.3 and provided reports for the export periods of January-June 2002 and July-December 2002 on 28 November 2002 and 30 May 2003 respectively².

Members complied with the new requirement in Section 5.8 to provide an electronic record of exports for the period July-December 2002 and Section 5.10 to resolve discrepancies identified by the Executive Secretary in the reconciliation of import and export documents. Some missing TIS documents have yet to be located by Japan.

¹ This was an early submission of Indonesian TIS forms for compilation for the Indonesian Catch Monitoring Workshop held in early April 2003.

² The required dates for these reports were 1 December 2002 and 1 June 2003 respectively.

D. Re-export (Section 6 of SDP)

One re-export form for a Japanese export to Korea was submitted for the Secretariat to report against in accordance with Section 6.4. This form was received from Korea in July 2003 for a re-export in Mar 2003.