

Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna



みなまぐろ保存委員会

Report of the Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee

**14 – 15 October 2007
Canberra, Australia**

Report of the Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee

14-15 October 2007

Canberra, Australia

Agenda Item 1. Opening of meeting

1.1 Welcome

1. The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Compliance Committee, Mr Wood, who welcomed participants.

1.2 Introduction of Member representatives

2. Participants introduced themselves. The list of participants is shown in **Attachment 1**.

1.3 Adoption of agenda

3. The agreed agenda is shown in **Attachment 2**.

1.4 Meeting arrangements

4. The Secretariat announced arrangements for the meeting.
5. Three documents from the draft list of documents (CCSBT-CC/0710/16, 19 and 26) were not admitted to the meeting. The revised document list is shown in **Attachment 3**.

Agenda Item 2. Status of measures

2.1 Report from the Secretariat

6. The Executive Secretary provided a brief report on compliance with measures by Members and Cooperating Non-Members. The Secretariat had no issues of non-compliance to raise in relation to Members, nor in relation to two of the Cooperating Non-Members (South Africa and the Philippines). However, it was noted that the European Community (EC) had:
 - No vessels on the authorised vessel list despite a report from South Africa that an EC vessel had recently requested permission to unload SBT in South Africa;
 - Not responded to any of the quarterly TIS reminders from the Secretariat; and
 - Not provided monthly catch reports in accordance with CCSBT agreements (EC catch reports were provided quarterly, not monthly).

7. The meeting agreed to recommend to the Extended Commission that the Extended Commission should formally write to the EC, advising the EC of its non-compliance and requesting immediate compliance with CCSBT measures.

2.2 Reports from Members and Cooperating Non-Members

8. Japan provided a summary of its report to assist non-Japanese readers to understand the contents of its report. It was assumed that other reports had been read, so no presentations of these reports were made. Instead, Members asked questions of each other in relation to the sub-agenda topics of this item.

2.2.1 Compliance with national quota allocations

Commercial fisheries

9. Japan stated that the Japanese government identified an overcatch of 1,790t for its 2005 season catch and this has been fully paid back through Japan's reduced catch in the 2006 season.
10. In response to questions concerning its quota monitoring system, Japan advised that it obtains preliminary information from its Real Time Monitoring Program (RTMP), which also includes information on the tags placed on each fish. The final information is obtained through inspections of all SBT when the SBT are landed in Japan. Checks are conducted between the landing information and the RTMP information. Not all SBT are landed during the fishing season. For example, in the 2006 season, 5 vessels (out of 133) have yet to land their catch.
11. New Zealand noted that it makes an allowance for all fishing induced mortality within its national allocation and encouraged other Members to estimate mortality induced by their fishing operations.
12. Australia noted that some fish caught on longlines are not retained because they are damaged by sharks and noted that a Japanese study of depredation of longline caught fish discussed at the Workshop on the Depredation in the Tuna Longline Fisheries in the Indian Ocean (9-10 July 2007) had identified fish damage rates as high as 60% associated with swordfish fishing in the central Indian Ocean. Australia further commented that damage to longline caught SBT, particularly by sharks, needed to be quantified and included in assessments as an additional source of fishing mortality.
13. Japan advised that the damaged fish issue was discussed at the IOTC Workshop on the Depredation in the Tuna Longline Fisheries in the Indian Ocean and the CCSBT should not prejudge results of the discussion at the IOTC because the competence of the IOTC (i.e. convention area and species) is different from that of the CCSBT.
14. Taiwan suggested that the Extended Scientific Committee should be given the task of determining the quantity of SBT that were damage by shark during fishing operations. Taiwan also commented that there needed to be consideration of whether SBT damaged by shark could be considered as being natural mortality instead of only considering this as being fishing mortality.

Recreational fisheries

15. Japan commented that New Zealand allocates some of its National allocation for its recreational catch of SBT, and asked for confirmation that Australia had not done this because its recreationally caught SBT were released. Japan also advised that news reports on the internet indicated a 5t recreational SBT catch in Tasmania during 2006 as well as a few tonnes near Port Lincoln.
16. Australia advised that most of its recreationally caught SBT were released, but that a small number were retained. Due to the rarity of SBT being retained such catches, particularly for large SBT, are often reported. Australia noted that media reports could be unreliable and reminded Members of a recent report in Fishing News International which reported that 20,000t of SBT was landed at Yaizu in 2006 by Japanese longline vessels. Australia referred to table 6 of its national report that showed the level of recreational catch for some years prior to 2003. It was noted that the estimates had a large degree of uncertainty and that there was not enough information to provide an estimate in the years since 2003. However, Australia advised that it was looking into ways to estimate the number of recreational SBT retained by recreational fishers.
17. Japan noted that Australia's recreational catch was 85t in 2002 and it was much larger than the 10t quota for the European Community to which the Extended Commission would ask for compliance with CCSBT measures. Japan pointed out that Australia's recreational catch was not managed and that it was not recorded against Australia's national allocation. Japan also pointed out the increased trend of recreational catch from 1999 to 2002 and showed its concern over unreported catch by Australian recreational fisheries from 2003 to 2006.
18. New Zealand confirmed that it has taken account of its recreational SBT fishery within its National allocation. New Zealand had taken this action unilaterally because it made good fisheries management sense to take account of all mortalities caused by fishing. New Zealand was not aware of any Commission agreement on whether recreational fishing should or should not be included within national allocations but believes one is required.

2.2.2 Monthly catch reporting

19. There was no discussion of this item.

2.2.3 Trade Information Scheme

20. There was no discussion of this item.

2.2.4 Authorised vessel list

21. Japan commented that it would like to see an "authorised vessel" type of list applied to farming facilities so that there was a list of authorised farms.

2.2.5 *Scientific observer program*

22. There was no discussion of this item.

2.2.6 *Bird mitigation measures*

23. There was no discussion of this item.

Agenda Item 3. Integrated MCS measures

3.1 CDS

24. Australia recognised the CDS as being a cornerstone for effective management of the SBT fishery. Australia drafted a CDS resolution at the meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (CCWG) in April 2007. The April 2007 meeting agreed that Australia would re-draft its resolution for Members comments. The revised resolution was circulated on 19 June 2007. Few comments were received, but Japan also drafted a CDS which was circulated in July 2007. Attempts were made to organise a second working group meeting, but without success. However, an informal one day meeting was held in Tokyo on 21 September 2007 and representatives of all Members were present. At the end of that meeting comments were sought from CCSBT Members on the Australian and Japanese proposals. Comments were circulated by both Australia and Japan. Australia also provided its view on a CDS to the Joint Technical Working Group of Tuna RFMOs in July 2007 in Raleigh North Carolina, USA. There was brief discussion of the Australian CDS at that meeting and there was support for the proposal from some participants. Australia maintains that its CDS proposal will effectively monitor the catch of SBT. Australia also had the following comments to make on the comments that Japan circulated on Australia's proposal:

- In relation to the comment that the Australian proposal does not adequately monitor farming, Australia stated that its proposal was more rigorous for farming than Japan's proposal and that each fish would be weighed at harvest. This is far in excess of the requirements of ICCAT.
- Australia is happy to address Japan's concern that the proposal was complicated and difficult to understand.
- In relation to the comment that the CCWG suggested that the CDS be developed from the CCSBT TIS, Australia considered that this would be the starting point for a simplistic system but that there would be many loopholes in such a system.
- In relation to the comment that the Australian proposal did not include all catch, namely recreational fisheries, Australia advised that the intention of the proposed CDS was that all fish entering the commercial supply chain would be considered and that recreational catch was not sold or traded.

- Australia acknowledged that its proposal treated the purse seine fishery differently from other fisheries in that it was more onerous for the purse seine sector. The treatment of the purse seine sector was comprehensive and this sector would require more forms to be completed and more information to be provided than any other sector under the Australian CDS proposal.
 - Australia also acknowledged that costs may be higher for the Australian CDS than the Japanese CDS. However, it considered that the Secretariat estimates were very preliminary and Australia did not have confidence in those estimates. Australia also noted that for a fishery like the SBT fishery with a landed value in excess of \$750 million a product tracking cost in the order of a million dollars would not be too high.
25. Japan advised that its CDS proposal was developed in response to New Zealand's and Taiwan's request at the CCWG that a CDS be prepared based on the TIS. Japan considered that there were many conceptual issues with a CDS. It noted that Members are familiar with CCAMLR's CDS which is quite simple and felt that producing a CDS of similar format would help everyone's understanding. Japan also thanked Members for traveling to Tokyo to attend the one day CDS discussion. In response to Australia's comments, Japan advised that:
- Australia commented that its CDS was stringent on farms, but what happens prior to transfer to farming cages could be clarified. In particular how the purse seine catch is measured and recorded at the time of catch.
 - By basing its CDS on the CCSBT TIS, Japan was following the suggestions from some Members at the CCWG meeting.
 - According to paragraph 4(i) of the CDS resolution adopted at CCSBT 13, Japan's proposal covers all SBT catch, including longline, purse seine and recreational fisheries catch.
 - Japan is currently the largest importer of SBT. However the economics of the Japanese SBT market is deteriorating, and Japan believes that there will be an increased shift of SBT exports to other areas such as Europe. Consequently, Japan considered that the responsibility of exporting countries needs to be emphasised in the CDS.
 - The CDS resolution agreed at CCSBT 13 stipulates that "The Scheme shall track the catch, landing and trade flows, including transfer, transshipment, import, export, re-export, and landings of domestic production, of all SBT.". In this context, a CDS to be adopted by the CCSBT should start from purse seine catch and be followed by towing, transfers to farming pens, harvest and export.
 - The estimated setup cost (\$435,000) and annual cost (\$230,000) for the Australian CDS proposal are equivalent to about 30% and 18% of the 2007 CCSBT budget (\$1,378,600).
26. Australia advised that its proposal was designed to cover purse seine catch and it stated that some minor drafting amendments would clarify this for Members.

27. New Zealand noted that it considered that Japan's interpretation of paragraph 4(i) of the CDS resolution adopted at CCSBT 13 did not reflect the understanding of the parties at the time.
28. Taiwan thanked Australia and Japan for their proposals. Taiwan's position in relation to the CDS proposals is:
 - The CDS is only one of an integrated package of MCS measures. It should be mutually complementary with other MCS measures. For effective operation of the CDS, industry's cooperation is required. Therefore the system should be designed as simply as possible, otherwise it will be difficult for industry to cooperate with government.
 - The purpose of CDS is to distinguish between legal and illegal fish. For that purpose, Taiwan believed that a tag with a CCSBT logo would be sufficient.
 - The time required for inspections at the point of landing should be reduced so as not to impact on the quality of landed fish. Taiwan does not believe that customs officers should be required to inspect every fish. This would be heavy burden on importing countries.
 - The costs estimated by the Secretariat for the setup phase of Australia's proposal were extremely high and this would result in significant cost increases for Members. Even though Australia thought the costs would be lower than the Secretariat's estimate, Taiwan still believed that an accurate costing would still reveal a cost that would be a significant burden on Members.
 - The price of fuel is increasing each year. If the Australian proposal was adopted, it would be very difficult to fund the proposal. Taiwan prefers a simpler CDS proposal.
29. New Zealand, like Australia considered the CDS to be the cornerstone of the CCSBT MCS regime. New Zealand believed that the CDS needed to be integrated with other MCS measures and was concerned that it be cost effective. New Zealand believed that a tagging system would have long term benefits in identifying legal and illegal fish. It also believed that there was benefit in capturing fish length information at the time of capture. New Zealand was open to considerations of transitional measures, but it did not want to reach a hiatus in progress to the end point. New Zealand considered that both a process and timeframe need to be identified for reaching that endpoint.
30. It was noted that there was a common understanding that in the CDS, fish would be tagged and measured (weight and length) at the time of kill.
31. Australia remarked that the two CDS proposals had different timeframes for reporting to the Secretariat. It believed that the frequency of reporting needed to be relatively high. Its proposal requires forms to be completed within 18 hours of kill and to be sent to the flag State/Fishing Entity within 10 days. The documents are then required to be sent to the Secretariat within another 5 working days. Australia stated that in Japan's proposal the CDS reporting is less frequent than in the CCSBT TIS.
32. Japan noted that the CCSBT TIS and CDS have different purposes. The TIS is aimed at monitoring the trade flow of fish and the CDS is aiming at restricting catch

and trade of illegal fish. Also, the CDS is aimed at tracking movement of fish from catch accurately. In this case, accuracy is more important than speed. Furthermore, the reporting frequency of Japan's CDS proposal is exactly the same to that of the CCSBT TIS as Japan's CDS proposal is based in the TIS.

33. Taiwan believed that the position of vessels should be tracked in real-time, which is why we have a VMS. However, it did not consider that tracking of catch was required in real time. Each Member should monitor its own catch within the one year quota period, but high frequency report of catch to the CCSBT is not required.
34. New Zealand noted that its domestic reporting is a monthly period and that CCSBT also requires catches to be reported on a monthly basis. So there is a standard for reporting of catch and New Zealand thought this could act as a basis for the timeframe for CDS reporting.
35. Australia noted that CCAMLR has a requirement for its CDS where States must forward CDS documents to the Secretariat within 2 working days. So Australia's proposal is less stringent than CCAMLR, which Japan noted was a good system.
36. Japan did not consider it sensible to compare completely different fisheries that operate in completely different areas. The objective of CCSBT is to prevent the landing of illegal catch of Members or Non-Members, and Japan did not see any priority in short reporting period because it is possible with CDS to control and stop illegal SBT at the time of landing, exporting and importing.
37. Australia commented that the CCSBT does not have a good understanding of how the fish and fish product moves through this fishery and this has created tremendous problems in monitoring the fishery. Without such details it is difficult to understand how quarterly reporting would help because activities could be occurring more frequently than such a CDS is capable of monitoring.
38. Japan responded that the CDS it proposed would capture the activities of transshipment. Regardless of whether the information was reported quickly, the information would be recorded and reported.
39. After a long period of discussion of the Australian and Japanese draft CDS papers, it was summarised that:
 - There was no agreement between Members on whether CDS should cover all SBT catch or commercial SBT catch only.
 - It was agreed that Australia would provide additional wording for its CDS proposal to reflect existing Australian requirements for reporting of the estimated weight of purse seine catches at the time of catch.
 - Some Members lacked confidence in the 40 fish sample used to estimate the average weight of fish caught in Australian surface fisheries for farming operations.
 - There was concern over the costs of the Australian CDS proposal in comparison with the Japanese proposal, but it was noted that the costs provided were, according to the Secretariat document (CCSBT-CC/0710/Info01), "guesses".

- There were concerns about the costs and logistics (i.e. distribution of tags) of a central tagging system and the cost of this versus a decentralised system.
 - There was disagreement on whether there should be a centralised reporting system.
40. At the completion of these discussions
- Australia stated that it will work to implement its proposed CDS in full on a trial basis and will provide to the Extended Commission data as required under the system that is ultimately agreed by the CCSBT Members. Australia invited other like minded Members to also trial the Australian proposed CDS. Australia also offered to agree to a compromise in the short term, based on an extension of the CCSBT's current TIS.
 - Japan stated that Japan will implement its CDS proposal on a trial basis and report the results at CCSBT 15.
41. New Zealand offered to take the two current CDS draft resolutions, the identified points of difference, and issues discussed, to create a new draft Resolution.
42. Australia noted that there was a question over whether the Japanese Draft resolution required all catch documents to be provided to Secretariat. Japan responded that in Japan's draft CDS all catch documents would be provided to the Secretariat.
43. Australia noted that it wished New Zealand to use the current TIS as a base to develop new paper.
44. Japan appreciated New Zealand's effort and Japan also pointed out that implementation trials were also constructive at this stage.

3.2 VMS

45. Members finalised the VMS resolution. The agreed resolution is at **Attachment 4**.
46. Japan asked for clarification of the size of SBT vessel that New Zealand requires to report to its VMS when operating in its EEZ. New Zealand responded that, as reported in the New Zealand national report, the size is 28m and over, but that this is to be reviewed over the next two years for SBT fishing.

3.3 Transshipment

47. Members noted the Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels that was adopted at CCSBT 13.
48. Taiwan presented its paper that described the experience in implementation of the ICCAT at-sea transshipment Program (CCSBT-EC/0710/27). Taiwan explained some of the implementation difficulties and issues that CCSBT need to consider in advance of its implementation of a regional observer program for at-sea transshipments. Specifically:
- If CCSBT follows the precedent of ICCAT by making a contract with an observer agency for training, deployment and management of observers, or if the

- Secretariat of CCSBT implements the program by itself, the Secretariat should assess the manpower and cost needed. The advantage and disadvantage of both options should also be considered.
- A decision is required concerning cost-sharing formulation by Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission participating in the program.
 - A mechanism should be established in relation to maintaining the confidentiality of data collection provided by the observer.
 - In light of the small amount of SBT catch compared with other tuna and tuna-like species, such as Bigeye Tuna, Yellowfin Tuna etc., the Extended Commission should consider establishing cooperative mechanisms with other RFMOs including ICCAT and IOTC etc.
49. Australia thanked Taiwan for its paper and for raising issues with implementation. Australia stated that transshipment was a key critical issue for MCS and its role in IUU fishing was well recognised. This was why nearly all tuna RFMOs have measures for transshipment in place. Further IUU fishing in the IOTC was at 10% while in CCSBT it was 35%. While some may seek to ban transshipment Australia recognised that it was an important economic measure and should be allowed to continue only if it is well regulated and monitored.
50. The Chair summarised a wide ranging discussion on the resolution adopted at CCSBT 13 and noted that there were two themes raised:
- Members acknowledged that a resolution had been passed at CCSBT 13 in respect of transshipment.
 - It was noted that there would be difficulties arising from the implementation of the resolution and Australia proposed that assistance be sought from the Technical Working Group of the joint tuna RFMOs to consider the harmonisation of the measure with other RFMOs.
51. Further discussion covered the implementation dates in the adopted resolution. Some Members expressed concern with their ability to meet the dates specified. Other Members confirmed their concern for the early implementation of important MCS measures. Japan advised its intention to facilitate coordination of an informal meeting among high seas longlining Members.

3.4 SBT farm compliance

52. Australia presented a report on its world class monitoring of SBT farms in Port Lincoln. Australia believes its farms are better regulated than tuna farms in the Mediterranean and Mexico, where there is a substantial Japanese commercial interest. Australia was also committed to continual improvement program in the management of the farms.
53. Australia provided information on MCS for Australian SBT farming representing a paper previously presented to the SC 12 (CCSBT-ESC/0709/Rep11). In summary

the fishery is licensed through transferable statutory fishing rights worth in total \$1 billion. Rights can be forfeited if serious offences are committed.

54. Australia detailed the SBT Farming MCS included VMS, logbooks, mortality control, daily reporting, handling quota recording, fish sampling, video transfer method, verified paper trail, comprehensive auditing, annual compliance plan, international observers and audits of government agents (counts are accurate to within 0.02%). Australia noted that they spend more than \$1 million on compliance or 1% of the value of SBT at export.
55. Japan asked for details of the penalties available for offences and penalties and Australia offered to provide a copy of the Australian Fisheries Act 1991 and examples of recent penalties for fisheries offences.
56. Australia asked for information on penalties issued to Japan's 12 operators found with significant over catch in previous years.
57. Japan asked if stereo video was in use and Australia explained that as previously advised this was still in development and would probably not be fully implemented for 2-3 years.
58. Japan was interested in the activities of observers on purse seine vessels and towing vessels, not observer coverage itself. Australia noted that its target for observing is 10% of catching and towing vessels which is reported to the Extended Scientific Committee.
59. Japan referred to Attachment 4 of this year's Extended Scientific Committee report and stated that observers on purse seine vessels and towing vessels did not collect any data and information although the CCSBT had agreed the Scientific Observer Program Standards.
60. Australia stated that it collects comprehensive data in its observer program and offered to provide copies of Observer Manuals which set out requirements for data collection. Australia also collects comprehensive data from non Members for the benefit of the Commission at its own expense.
61. Australia commented that CCSBT should have agreed standards for observers in the SBT fishery and supported the proposal that CCSBT should work to develop a regional observer program like other RFMOs to ensure effective observers.

Draft Resolution on establishment of the CCSBT record of Farming Facilities

62. Japan introduced its Draft Resolution on establishment of the CCSBT record of Farming Facilities (CCSBT –CC/0710/18).
63. Japan argued that since CCSBT has a Positive list to stop IUU CCSBT needs the proposed new Resolution to close a significant loophole. Japan noted that without the proposed resolution non-Members farmed fish cannot be stopped from entering into the markets of CCSBT Members including Japan. ICCAT has such a list for its tuna farms.

64. Australia suggested that the draft resolution requires exporters to be listed and Australia believes that there is a need for importers to be similarly listed to ensure the product was tracked through the supply chain.
65. Japan noted that the draft resolution was intended to cover farming facilities similar to the positive list resolution which covers fishing vessels only.
66. Australia agreed to provide further advice on the draft. Australia stated that they already collect the information required by the resolution. They stated that they were largely agreeable with the resolution however paragraph 6 of the draft resolution refers to a CCSBT CDS but no such CDS exists at this time. Therefore, this part of the draft resolution will need to be altered before it can be agreed.

Draft Resolution on Southern Bluefin Tuna Farming

67. Japan tabled its draft resolution on SBT farming (CCSBT-CC/0710/17).
68. Australia has offered to provide advice on the draft resolution at a later date.

Agenda Item 4. Other measures

4.1 Port State measures

69. New Zealand identified the features of its paper on Port State measures (CCSBT-CC/0710/4) and emphasized the importance of Port State Measures.
70. New Zealand offered, in consultation with other Members, to develop a Draft Resolution for CCSBT 15.
71. Japan expressed the view that many issues are with countries that are not Members of the Extended Commission such as South Africa and Indonesia.
72. Australia thanked New Zealand and noted that many of the issues have been simply dealt with in CCAMLR.
73. Australia requested the Chair of the Extended Commission send a letter to potential SBT trading States to make them aware of CCSBT and its current TIS scheme and seeking their assistance as Port States.
74. Taiwan considered that it is premature to discuss this issue at this stage because the COFI meeting is going to do a thorough study on this issue next year. We should wait for the result as a guideline for further consideration.
75. There was no consensus to New Zealand's proposal for a way forward on Port State measures and the associated time frame.

4.2 Independent observers

76. There was no time for discussion of this item.

4.3 Boarding and inspection

77. There was no time for discussion of this item.

4.4 Vessel register

78. There was no time for discussion of this item.

4.5 Other measures

79. There was no time for discussion of this item.

Agenda Item 5. Australian SBT Farming Study

80. Japan stated that the work Australia did in 2007 was just a feasibility experiment on stereo video technique itself and was not a significant study, despite Australian delegation's assurance at the 2006 Extended Scientific Committee for their commitment for the implementation of the stereo video camera. Furthermore, the work Australia did in 2007 was inconsistent with last year's agreement at the Extended Commission. Japan strongly requested the immediate implementation of the study in the commercial farming in any technique for confirming the actual catch level. Japan further stated that it was feasible for an acoustic camera to implement the Australian Farming Study, and the acoustic camera could provide results of the study promptly. It is much more important to introduce feasible measurement technique on commercial farming operations rather than continuation of the study for study. Japan may support RMA request only under the conditions that Australia will examine growth rate during farming with its requested RMA and Australia will monitor transfer from purse seine to towing cages and from towing cages to farming pens by the acoustic camera and stereo-video camera simultaneously with the requested RMA.

81. Australia advised that its paper on assessing the feasibility of the stereo video technique had been provided to Members. It is a state of the art system with measurement errors in the order of a few millimetres only. Furthermore, by measuring live fish Australia is doing it before the shrinkage that occurs after fish die. Therefore these measurements may be more accurate than when measuring dead fish as is often done with other fisheries. The shrinkage of dead fish has been identified as potentially significant. The Australian system exceeds any of the standards for farms in the Mediterranean and off Mexico, where Pacific and Atlantic bluefin tuna are farmed and these farms often involve Japanese companies. Those methods involve visual estimates of the bluefin size by divers and this is less precise and accurate than Australia's system.

Agenda Item 6. Future work program

82. There was no time for discussion of this item.

Agenda Item 7. Other business

83. There was no time for discussion of this item.

Agenda Item 8. Recommendations to the Extended Commission

84. The meeting recommended that the Extended Commission note the report of the Compliance Committee.

Agenda Item 9. Conclusion

9.1 Adoption of meeting report

85. The report was adopted.

9.2 Recommendation of timing of next meeting

86. Members believed that the Compliance Committee requires two days of meeting to meet its obligations in respect of regular reporting and assessment of compliance, and it should occur immediately prior to the annual meeting of the Extended Commission.

87. During the period of development of comprehensive MCS measures, some Members believed that the Committee needs additional meeting time in the foreseeable future. However, no consensus was reached on this point.

9.3 Close of meeting

88. The meeting closed at 8:00pm on 15 October 2007.

List of Attachments

Attachment

- 1 List of Participants
- 2 Agenda
- 3 List of Documents
- 4 Resolution on establishing the CCSBT Vessel Monitoring System

Agenda
Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee
14-15 October 2007
Canberra, Australia

1. Opening of meeting
 - 1.1. Welcome
 - 1.2. Introduction of Member Representatives
 - 1.3. Adoption of Agenda
 - 1.4. Meeting Arrangements

2. Status of Measures
 - 2.1. Report from Secretariat
 - 2.2. Reports from Members and Cooperating Non-members (Reports on compliance related issues from National Reports), and assessment of compliance with measures, including:
 - 2.2.1. Compliance with National Quota Allocations
 - 2.2.1.1. Commercial fisheries
 - 2.2.1.2. Recreational fisheries
 - 2.2.2. Monthly Catch Reporting
 - 2.2.3. Trade Information Scheme
 - 2.2.4. Authorised Vessel List
 - 2.2.5. Scientific Observer Program
 - 2.2.6. Bird Mitigation Measures

3. Integrated MCS Measures
 - 3.1. CDS
 - 3.2. VMS
 - 3.3. Transshipment
 - 3.4. SBT Farm Compliance

4. Other Measures
 - 4.1. Port State Measures
 - 4.2. Independent Observers
 - 4.3. Boarding and Inspection
 - 4.4. Vessel register
 - 4.5. Other measures

5. Australian SBT Farming Study
 - 5.1 Examination of 2006/2007 Results
 - 5.2 Comment on Australian SBT Farming Study

6. Future work program

7. Other business

8. Recommendations to the Extended Commission

9. Conclusion
 - 9.1. Adoption of meeting report
 - 9.2. Recommendation of timing of next meeting
 - 9.3. Close of meeting

List of Participants
Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee
14 - 15 October 2007
Canberra, Australia

CHAIR

Mr David WOOD
Chief Fishery Officer
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 1020 GBL House, 256 Lambton Quay
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Phone: +64 4 819 4664
Fax: +64 4 819 4360
Email: dave.wood@fish.govt.nz

Mr Toshi KAWAGUCHI
Legal Officer
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
R G Casey Building, John McEwen Crescent
Barton ACT 0221
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6261 2245
Email: Toshi.Kawaguchi@dfat.gov.au

AUSTRALIA

Dr John KALISH
General Manager
Fisheries & Aquaculture
Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6272 4045
Fax: +61 2 6272 4875
Email: John.Kalish@daff.gov.au

Ms Anagha JOSHI
Legal Officer
Office of International Law
Attorney-General's Department
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6250 6254
Email: Anagha.Joshi@ag.gov.au

Mr Allen GRANT
Executive Manager
Fisheries & Forestry
Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6272 5777
Fax: +61 2 6272 4875
Email: Allen.Grant@daff.gov.au

Ms Trysh STONE
Senior Manager
Tuna & International
Australia Fisheries Management Authority
PO Box 7051
Canberra Mail Centre ACT 2610
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6225 5311
Email: Trysh.Stone@afma.gov.au

Mr Stephen ROWCLIFFE
International Fisheries
Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6272 3871
Fax: +61 2 6272 4875
Email: Stephen.Rowcliffe@daff.gov.au

Mr Ryan MURPHY
Manager
Southern Bluefin Tuna
Australia Fisheries Management Authority
PO Box 7051
Canberra Mail Centre ACT 2610
AUSTRALIA
Phone: +61 2 6225 5304
Email: Ryan.Murphy@afma.gov.au

Mr Malcolm SOUTHWELL
Senior Manager
Licensing & Compliance
Australia Fisheries Management Authority
PO Box 7051
Canberra Mail Centre ACT 2610
AUSTRALIA
Phone:+61 2 6225 5308
Email: Malcolm.Southwell@afma.gov.au

Mrs. Shiu-Ling LIN
Specialist
Deep Sea Fisheries Division
Fisheries Agency
No.2, Chaochow St. Taipei
TAIWAN 100
Phone:+886 2 33436129
Fax: +886 2 33436268
Email: shiuling@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Mr Brian JEFFRIESS
CEO
Australian SBT Industry Association
PO Box 416
Fullarton SA 5063
AUSTRALIA
Phone:+61 8 8373 2507
Fax: +61 8 8373 2508
Email: austuna@bigpond.com

Mr. Yu SHANG
Second Secretary on Home Assignment
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2, Kaitakelan Blvd., Taipei
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 2 23482527
Fax: +886 2 23617694
Email: yshang@mofa.gov.tw

Mr Richard LINDSAY
AFE Sarin Group
1/6 Phipps Close, Deakin ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA
Phone:+61 438 687 001
Email: richard@afe.net.au

Mr. Ching-Lin TSUEI
First Secretary on Home Assignment
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2, Kaitakelan Blvd., Taipei
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 2 23482517
Fax: +886 2 23121161
Email: cltsuei@mofa.gov.tw

Mr Andrew WILKINSON
General Manager
Tony's Tuna International P/L
Pine Freezer Rd
Port Lincoln 5606 SA
AUSTRALIA
Phone:+61 8 8682 2266
Fax: +61 8 8683 0646
Email: andrew@tonystuna.com.au

Mr. Yin-Ho LIU
Chairman
Indian Ocean Operating Committee
of Taiwan Tuna Association
3F-2, NO.2, Yu Kang Middle 1st RD, Kaohsiung
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 7 8419606
Fax: +886 7 8313304

FISHING ENTITY OF TAIWAN

Mr. Hong-Yen HUANG
Deputy Director
Deep Sea Fisheries Division
Fisheries Agency
No.2, Chaochow St. Taipei
TAIWAN 100
Phone:+886 2 33436111
Fax: +886 2 33436268
Email: hangyen@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Mr. Wen-Jung HSIEH
Advisor
Taiwan Deep Sea Tuna Boat-Owners
and Exporters Association
3F-2, No.2, Yu-Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 7 8419606
Fax: +886 7 8313304
Email: siunion-fishery@msa.hinet.net

Mr. Kuan-Ting LEE
Secretary
Taiwan Deep Sea Tuna Boat-Owners
and Exporters Association
3F-2, No.2, Yu-Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 7 8419606
Fax: +886 7 8313304
Email: simon@tuna.org.tw

Mr Takuya TANIMOTO
Fishery Division
Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8919
JAPAN
Phone:+81-3-5501- 8000(ext. 3665)
Fax: +81 3 5501 8332
Email: takuya.tanimoto@mofa.go.jp

Mr. Hsin-Wei KO
Secretary
Overseas Fisheries Development Council
of the Republic of China
No.19, Lane 113, Sec. 4, Roosevelt Rd.
Da-an District, Taipei City 106
TAIWAN
Phone:+886 2 27381522 ext. 139
Fax: +886 2 27384329
Email: hsinwei@ofdc.org.tw

Mr Kazuaki HASHIZUME
Assistant Director
Agricultural and Marine Products Office
Trade and Economic Cooperation Bureau
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8901, JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 3501 0532
Fax: +81 3 3501 6006
Email: hashizume-kazuaki@meti.go.jp

JAPAN

Mr Kiyoshi KATSUYAMA
Director for international negotiation
International Affairs Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8907
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 3502 8459
Fax: +81 3 3502 0571

Dr Tomoyuki ITO
National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries
5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu
Shizuoka 424-8633
JAPAN
Phone:+81 543 36 6033
Fax: +81 543 35 9642
Email: itou@affrc.go.jp

Mr Takaaki SAKAMOTO
Assistant Director
International Affairs Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8907
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 3502 8459
Fax: +81 3 3502 0571
Email: takaaki_sakamoto@nm.maff.go.jp

Mr Masamichi MOTOYAMA
National Ocean Tuna Fisheries Association
Coop Bldg 7F
1-1-12 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo 101-8503
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 3294 9633
Fax: +81 3 3296 1397

Mr Yukito NARISAWA
Planner
Far Seas Fisheries Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8907
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 6744 2364
Fax: +81 3 3595 7332
Email: yukito_narisawa@nm.maff.go.jp

Mr Toshiaki KANAZAWA
National Ocean Tuna Fisheries Association
Coop Bldg 7F
1-1-12 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo 101-8503
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 3294 9633
Fax: +81 3 3296 1397

Mr Masahiro ISHIKAWA
President
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association
31-1 Eitai 2-chome, Koutou-ku,
Tokyo 135-0034
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 5646 2382
Fax: +81 3 5646 2652

Ms Stephanie HILL
Fisheries Advisor (HMS)
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 19747, Auckland
NEW ZEALAND
Phone:+64 9 820 7686
Fax: +64 9 820 1990
Email: stephanie.hill@fish.govt.nz

Mr Nozomu MIURA
Manager
International Division
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association
31-1 Eitai 2-chome, Koutou-ku,
Tokyo 135-0034
JAPAN
Phone:+81 3 5646 2382
Fax: +81 3 5646 2652
Email: miura@japantuna.or.jp

Mr Shaun DRISCOLL
Manager Investigation Services
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 1020, Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Phone:+64 4 819 4204
Fax: +64 4 819 4644
Email: shaun.driscoll@fish.govt.nz

Mr Kimio NISHIKAWA
Advisor
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association
31-1 Eitai 2-chome, Koutou-ku
Tokyo 135-0034
JAPAN
Phone:+82 3 5646 2382
Fax: +82 3 5646 2652

Ms Eidre SHARP
Manager Compliance Advice
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 1020, Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Phone:+64 4 819 4623
Fax: +64 4 819 4632
Email: eidre.sharp@fish.govt.nz

Mr Hiroshi HANEDA
Advisor
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative
Association
31-1 Eitai 2-chome, Koutou-ku,
Tokyo 135-0034
JAPAN
Phone:+83 3 5646 2382
Fax: +83 3 5646 2652

Mr Andrew JENKS
Deputy Director Legal
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
NEW ZEALAND
Phone:+64 4 439 8595
Email: Andrew.Jenks@mfat.govt.nz

NEW ZEALAND

Mr Arthur HORE
HMS and RFMO Manager
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 19747, Auckland
NEW ZEALAND
Phone:+64 9 820 7686
Fax: +64 9 820 1990
Email: arthur.hore@fish.govt

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Dr Kyu-jin SEOK
Counsellor
International Cooperation
Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
140-2 Jongno-Gu, Gye-Dong, Seoul
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Phone:+82 2 3674 6995
Fax: +82 2 3674 6996
Email: icdmomaf@chol.com
pisces@momaf.go.kr

Mr Jin-Young SON
Managing Director
Sajo Industries Co. Ltd.
Seoul, KOREA
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Phone:+82 2 3277 1706
Fax: +82 2 365 6079, 313 8079
Email: sonjiny@sajo.co.kr

CCSBT SECRETARIAT

PO Box 37, Deakin West ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA
Phone:+61 2 6282 8396
Fax: +61 2 6282 8407

Mr Neil HERMES
Executive Secretary
Email: nhermes@ccsbt.org

Mr Kiichiro MIYAZAWA
Deputy Executive Secretary
Email: kmiyazawa@ccsbt.org

Mr Robert KENNEDY
Database Manager
Email: rkennedy@ccsbt.org

INTERPRETERS

Ms Saemi BABA

Ms Kumi KOIKE

Ms Yuki TAKANO

**EXTENDED COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN
BLUEFIN TUNA**

SECOND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

List of Documents

(CCSBT-CC/0710/)

01. Draft Agenda
02. List of Participants
03. Draft List of Documents
04. (Secretariat) Compliance Committee Management Measures
05. (New Zealand) Port state measures; a way forward
07. (Australia) Australia's proposal for a CCSBT Catch Documentation Scheme
09. (Australia) Centralised Vessel Monitoring System for the CCSBT
11. (Australia) Implementation of CCSBT Independent Observer Programme
12. (Australia) Illegal Unreported, Unregulated Vessel Register
13. (Australia) Implementation of boarding and inspection regimes for the CCSBT
17. (Japan) Draft Resolution on Southern Bluefin Tuna Farming
18. (Japan) Draft resolution on establishment of the CCSBT record of farming facilities
20. (Japan) Possibility of use of acoustic camera system for counting and measuring captured Southern Bluefin Tuna for the farming
21. (Japan) March 2007 Australian (Port Lincoln Site Visit) Southern Bluefin Tuna Farming Operations Actual Conditions Observation Visit Report
22. (Japan) Japan's proposal on CDS
23. (Japan) Comparison of Australian and Japanese CDS proposals
24. (Japan) Domestic management of SBT fisheries in Japan
25. (Australia) Report of the Joint RFMO Technical Working Group meeting (July 2007)
27. (Taiwan) The Experience of the Implementation of ICCAT at-Sea Transshipment Programme for CCSBT Reference

(CCSBT-CC/0710/SBT Fisheries-)

New Zealand - New Zealand SBT Fisheries Review

Australia - Australia's Annual Review of the Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery

Japan - Japanese national report

Taiwan - Review of Taiwan's SBT Fishery of 2005/2006

Korea - Review of Korean SBT Fishery of 2005/2006

(CCSBT-CC/0710/BGD)

01. (Australia) Tuna farm monitoring: Mediterranean, Mexico and Australia (Originally CCSBT-ESC/0709/24)
02. (Australia) Assessing operational feasibility of stereo video and Evaluating monitoring options for the SBTF Farm Sector (Originally CCSBT-ESC/0709/28)

(CCSBT-CC/0710/Info)

01. (Secretariat) Administrative Comments and Sample Costs of CDS Proposals
02. (Secretariat) CCSBT-CC/0704/04 - Initial CDS Considerations (Draft 2)
03. (New Zealand) Promoting Responsible Ports-High Seas Task Force Final Report

(CCSBT-CC/0710/Rep)

01. Report of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2005)
02. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (February 2006)
03. Report of the Special Meeting of the Commission (July 2006)
04. Report of the Seventh Stock Assessment Group Meeting (September 2006)
05. Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2006)
06. Report of the First Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2006)
07. Report of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2006)
08. Report of the First Meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (April 2007)
09. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (July 2007)
10. Report of the Eighth Stock Assessment Group Meeting (September 2007)
11. Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2007)

Resolution on establishing the CCSBT Vessel Monitoring System

The Extended Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT),

Recalling that, at its thirteenth annual meeting, the Extended Commission Members and Cooperating Non-Members agreed to develop and implement their Vessel Monitoring Systems (the 2006 VMS resolution);

Recognising the need for monitoring, control and surveillance measures to apply to all sectors of the global southern bluefin tuna fishery;

Recognising the importance of these Vessel Monitoring Systems as an integral part of an effective monitoring, control and surveillance regime for the southern bluefin tuna fishery, in particular to ensure the long-term sustainability of the stock;

Mindful that a vessel monitoring system was identified as one of the important monitoring, control and surveillance measures to deter illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the Course of Actions adopted at the Kobe Joint Meeting of Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations from 22 – 26 January 2007;

Recognising the need to stipulate minimum standards for the Vessel Monitoring Systems;

Aware that some Members and other regional fisheries management organizations have established Vessel Monitoring Systems and that the experiences of such Members and organizations may be useful in developing and implementing a Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna Vessel Monitoring System;

Agrees, in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of Article 8 of the Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna, that:

1. The Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission shall adopt and implement satellite-linked Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) for vessels fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna on the following basis:
 - a. for such vessels fishing in the IOTC Area, in accordance with IOTC Resolution 06/03 On Establishing a Vessel Monitoring System Programme (including Annex 1 to that Resolution);
 - b. for such vessels fishing in the WCPFC Area, in accordance with WCPFC Conservation and Management Measure 2006-06 “Commission Vessel Monitoring System” (including Annex 1 to that Measure);
 - c. for such vessels fishing in the CCAMLR Area, in accordance with CCAMLR Conservation Measure 10-04 (2006) “Automated Satellite-

Linked Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)” (including Annex 10-04/A and Annex 10-04/B to that Measure);

- d. for such vessels fishing in the ICCAT Area, in accordance with ICCAT Recommendation 03-14 “Recommendation by ICCAT concerning Minimum Standards for the Establishment of a Vessel Monitoring System in the ICCAT Convention Area”; and
 - e. for such vessels fishing in any other high seas area where there is no VMS, in accordance with IOTC Resolution 06/03 On Establishing a Vessel Monitoring System Programme (including Annex 1 to that Resolution).
2. The application of the VMS provided for in paragraph 1(a-e) shall be consistent with any modifications to those VMS that may be adopted by those respective Commissions from time to time.
 3.
 - a. The Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission shall provide VMS summary reports annually in advance of the Compliance Committee meeting and in the format recommended by the Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee.
 - b. In relation to incidents concerning specific vessel(s) when the vessel(s) are suspected to have operated in contravention of CCSBT conservation and management measures, Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission may request another Member and Cooperating Non-Member of the Extended Commission which is the flag state/fishing entity of the vessel(s) to provide VMS data on the vessel(s) on a case by case basis. The Member and Cooperating Non-Member which receives such request shall:
 - (i) investigate the incidents and provide details of the investigation to the Member or Cooperating Non-Member which requested VMS data; or
 - (ii) provide VMS data on the vessel(s) to the requesting Member or Cooperating Non-Member, which will inform the results of its investigation to the Members or Cooperating Non-Member which is the flag state/fishing entity of the vessel(s).
 4. The Extended Commission agrees to adopt the confidentiality and security provisions attached in Annex I in relation to the information provided pursuant to paragraph 3(b).
 5. With the assistance of the Secretariat the Compliance Committee shall review and report to the Compliance Committee in 2009 on the implementation of this resolution and any possible measures to improve its effectiveness as a component of the monitoring, control and surveillance regime for the SBT fishery. Such review shall take account of any developments by other RFMOs, including development of a harmonised VMS across tuna RFMOs

6. This resolution does not supersede the 2006 VMS resolution adopted at CCSBT 13.

Annex I – Confidentiality, Use and Security of VMS Data

Confidentiality and use of VMS Data

1. VMS data shall be confidential and may only be provided or used as permitted by this resolution.
2. Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission which receive VMS data from another Member or Cooperating Non-Member of the Extended Commission shall maintain the confidentiality of those data and shall not use the data except as specified in the resolution. In particular, Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission which receive VMS data may only provide those data to representatives and officials of the Member or Cooperating Non-Member for the purposes outlined in paragraph 3 of this Annex.
3. Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission may only use those VMS data to monitor compliance with CCSBT conservation and management measures.

Information technology security

4. Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission which receive VMS data shall adopt secure information technology systems to ensure that the confidentiality of VMS data is maintained.

VMS Data Confidentiality Policies

5. Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission which propose to request VMS data shall prepare a VMS Data Confidentiality Policy and provide that Policy to the Secretariat and all other Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission. The VMS Data Confidentiality Policy shall outline all measures which the Member and Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission proposes to implement to ensure it complies with the requirements in Annex I of this resolution.