

Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna



みなまぐろ保存委員会

Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee

**6-8 October 2016
Kaohsiung, Taiwan**

Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee

6-8 October 2016

Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Agenda Item 1. Opening of meeting

1.1. Welcome

1. The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Compliance Committee (CC), Mr Frank Meere, who welcomed participants and thanked Taiwan for its hospitality.
2. Members and observers introduced their delegations to the meeting. The list of participants is shown at **Attachment 1**.

1.2. Adoption of agenda

3. The agenda was adopted and is provided at **Attachment 2**.
4. The list of documents for the meeting is shown at **Attachment 3**.

1.3. Meeting arrangements

5. The Executive Secretary announced the main arrangements for the meeting.

Agenda Item 2. Compliance with CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures

2.1. Reports from Members and Cooperating Non-Members

2.1.1. Annual Reports

6. Members summarised their Annual Reports to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission (EC). Members provided highlights from their reports, including improvements to management systems, recent catches, observer coverage, progress on implementing the common definition of attributable catch and other issues of significance.
7. Discussions, including questions of clarification were held in relation to the contents of Annual Reports that were submitted to the meeting. Important aspects of reported matters and associated discussions are described below.
8. Australia clarified that it expects to begin accounting for recreational catch of SBT in its allocation from the 2017/18 fishing season, and it will report on the treatment of the recreational catch component at the 2018 meeting.
9. Australia advised that a report on its research project in relation to automation of stereo video measurements was not yet available, but it hoped to provide a report before the end of 2016.

10. Korea clarified that it has changed how it calculates discards and now uses observer data as well as vessel data, calculating an average discard rate over time which is higher than the rate reported by fishing vessel crew.
11. Korea advised that it has been conducting sea trials of video monitoring on longline and purse seine vessels in the Indian Ocean, and it plans to expand on this over the next few years.
12. Indonesia reported that the substantial decline of catch by its larger vessels (>30 GT) is due to a change in the operation of those vessels, due to quota allocations.
13. Indonesia clarified that its national quota is distributed to fishing associations who distribute this to companies, so the catch is controlled on a company basis, not by vessel.
14. Indonesia advised that SBT has only been landed in Bali in 2015, and was certain of this since it monitors other ports where catch is landed. Vessels' fishing licenses require them to land catch in ports where government enumerators are monitoring landings.
15. South Africa reported that it is not considering switching from the quota system to the olympic system.
16. South Africa advised that it is planning to enhance its observer program soon and is aiming for 100% observer coverage for the foreign fishing vessel fleet and 30% coverage for the domestic fishing fleet.
17. The European Union advised that the revision of its 2015 catch from 648kg to 0kg was due to misreporting of the species from a trawler. The European Union also advised that it has three longline fleets operating near the zone where SBT encounters could occur with overall observer coverage still increasing and aiming for a global coverage close to 10%. The observers have not reported any SBT encounters.
18. New Zealand advised that its instances of catch by an unauthorised vessel were due to the fact that any New Zealand fishing vessel can legally catch SBT, but it chooses to only include those vessels most likely to catch SBT on the authorised vessel list rather than including all vessels.
19. New Zealand clarified that its recreational catch estimates were taken from its amateur charter vessel fleet data, surveys, and gamefish tagging data. It uses these data to generate precautionary allocation figures, rather than actual catch estimates, and it assumes the worst case scenario with its allocation and deducts the maximum from its country allocation.
20. New Zealand advised that its efforts to try to reduce the risk of discarding and high-grading include achieving the 10% observer coverage target, investigating reports from observed trips, and is exploring alternative sources of information, such as integrated electronic monitoring.
21. Japan noted the increase in seabird interactions by its fleet, despite the introduction of new seabird mitigation measures by the other tuna RFMOs, and is investigating the cause of the increase that it will report to the ERSWG meeting in March. It noted that other Members were reporting increased seabird bycatches and has heard that similar reports have been presented to ICCAT.

22. Japan also acknowledged the increase in shark bycatch and was not yet sure of the reason for this increase, considering the possibility that it is related to stock levels of sharks but a stock assessment may be required to determine the underlying reasons.
23. Humane Society International (HSI) was pleased to note that some Members are achieving and even exceeding target observer coverage levels, but considered the target levels to be too low. It also noted a variable performance by Members with respect to seabirds and urged Members to report seabird bycatch to the species level. HSI further noted that the seabird bycatch has not reduced as it had hoped with the introduction of new mitigation measures by the other tuna RFMOs, and stated that it believed that voluntary choice of measures were not good, and that the CCSBT should introduce more strict measures that require line weighting which is an easy measure to assess for compliance in port both before and after trips.
24. The meeting noted with dissatisfaction that the Philippines did not submit a national report to the meeting.

2.1.2. Fishing Sector Definitions

25. The CC10 Workplan notes that the definitions that Members use to distinguish the different fishing sectors (such as artisanal, commercial, recreational and customary) should be determined and recorded to assist in developing a common set of definitions. In relation to this, the Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/06 which summarised Member's response on their current definitions for each fishing sector.
26. With the agreed common definition of the Attributable SBT Catch and with this being fully implemented from 2018, it was agreed that common definitions for individual fishing sectors are not necessary since all SBT mortalities from all sources are to be accounted for within national allocations. However, it was noted that Members should be clear on the definitions of their fishing sectors for reporting purposes and report on the activities of each sector.

2.2. Report from the Secretariat

27. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/07 which summarised compliance with CCSBT Management Measures by Members and CNMs.
28. The main areas highlighted were that:
 - The overall timeliness of data submissions improved substantively during 2015;
 - Importing Members/CNMs are not always detecting and submitting CDS import documents to the Secretariat as required;
 - Korea submitted only very low numbers/percentages or no importer copies of the Catch Monitoring Forms (CMFs) required to be submitted in 2015 (7.4%) and the first quarter of 2016 (0%). However, in its National Report, Korea reported that it has put new processes in place to resolve this issue commencing on 1 June and 1 September 2016;

- South Africa exceeded its allocation in 2015 by 14.7t, and has exceeded its allocation each year since the CDS was introduced; and
 - The Philippines has not submitted an annual report to the Compliance Committee.
29. The Secretariat advised that it would produce a further revision of this paper to include a few additional updates received from Indonesia and Korea prior to the meeting.

2.3. Assessment of compliance with CCSBT management measures

2.3.1. Compliance of Members

30. It was noted that there was a high number of missing CDS import forms for two Members and clarification as to why this was the case and what actions had been taken was requested. Korea advised that it has new processes in place to address this issue and now all import forms will be reported to the Secretariat. Japan advised that it was checking its discrepancy internally and expected that it would be resolved in time.
31. New Zealand acknowledged the number of duplicate CDS tag numbers it had submitted in 2015, noting that the percentage of duplicate tag numbers was fairly consistent with previous years and that the duplicates were due to data errors at various stages of the data collection and entry process. It stated that it was looking for ways to improve in this area.
32. Members asked Australia if it planned to raise observer coverage levels in its longline fishery, or if it considered that electronic monitoring met the requirements of observer coverage. Australia clarified that the longline fishery had moved to 100% electronic monitoring but it did not replace human observers and it will always maintain a level of human observer coverage. It noted that overall its observer coverage was over 10%, but the figure reported to CC was less since it only reported the coverage of SBT shots observed.

2.3.2. Compliance of Cooperating Non-Members

33. It was noted that the Philippines advised that it had no SBT catch in 2015, but that it has not provided its annual reports nor attended any meetings in 2016. In addition it did not respond to questions of its annual report for 2015, and as yet has not submitted an application for a continuation of its status as a CNM.
34. It was proposed that a recommendation be provided to the EC to provide a warning to the Philippines regarding its need to submit reports if it wishes its CNM status to be continued.

2.3.3. Application of the Corrective Actions Policy

35. South Africa was asked if it intended to address its over-catch in 2015, noting that this occurred during a period of transition between being a CNM and a Member. South Africa advised that it had legislation that provides for certain measures to address issues of over-catch and that the issue will definitely be addressed in the most appropriate manner.
36. Members discussed a decision of CC10 that asked Members to provide assistance to Indonesia to help it comply with its allocation. Japan had made arrangements

to assist but these did not eventuate due to internal issues within Indonesia. Indonesia advised that it did visit New Zealand in 2013, where it gained valuable knowledge, and it used that information to develop its current quota system. Indonesia believed that with its new system it can control its SBT catch and it will not exceed its national allocation in the future. However, Indonesia noted that it will always welcome assistance from other Members.

Agenda Item 3. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan

3.1 Enhance Monitoring through Bilateral Arrangements and International Networks

37. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/08 updating Members on the CCSBT's Relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (IMCS) Network and other Regional Fisheries Bodies (RFBs) / Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) since CCSBT 22.
38. The Secretariat's Compliance Manager attended IMCS and FFA meetings in Auckland, New Zealand during March 2016, and the Executive Secretary attended an IMCS business meeting in Rome in July 2016. The FFA meeting was attended in order to explore opportunities where the CCSBT and the FFA may be able to cooperate and/or share information in areas of mutual interest, and more specifically to explore the possibility of the CCSBT being able to share FFA's Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data for longliners flagged to CCSBT NCNMs operating between 25⁰S and 50⁰S.
39. The CCSBT Secretariat also had routine interactions with the ICCAT (the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas) and IOTC (Indian Ocean Tuna Commission) Secretariats, as well as communication with the WCPFC Secretariat concerning the development of a potential transshipment MoC.

3.2 Update to the Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission

40. The Secretariat presented the paper CCSBT-CC/1610/09 which proposed revisions to the Template for the Annual Report to the CC and EC.
41. The proposed revisions included:
 - The insertion of a new section 4 to facilitate the reporting of data with respect to CCSBT's Minimum Standards for Inspections in Port which will enter into force on 1 January 2017;
 - An update to section 6 (SBT exports) to take into account the recommendations agreed by CC11 at agenda item 4.2.1 which included reporting export figures in net weight (tonnes) on a calendar year rather than a fishing year basis, and also reporting on re-exports of imported product;
 - An update to section 7 (SBT imports) to ensure that import data are reported in a consistent way to export data, i.e. that imports are reported in net weight (tonnes) and on a calendar year rather than a fishing year basis; and
 - Other minor editorial changes/ corrections.

42. Members proposed a few additional minor revisions for correction and simplification purposes.
43. The meeting agreed all of the revisions proposed by both the Secretariat and Members, and agreed to recommend the revised CC/EC annual reporting template for consideration by the EC. The revised template is provided as **Attachment 4**.

3.3 Electronic Observation Technologies

44. Members noted that considerable progress had been made with trials and implementation of electronic observation technologies and that some Members have progressed further with these technologies than others. There was a general view that electronic observation technologies were not a replacement for human observers but that they could provide highly valuable data to complement human observers. It was also noted that there are a range of valuable electronic systems beyond video which provided considerable benefits and efficiencies, such as electronic log books and licensing.
45. The meeting agreed that many Members were not in a position to implement electronic observations systems in 2017 and that implementation of electronic observation technologies should be considered in the context of the Compliance Action Plan for 2018 to 2020.

3.4 Study to Examine Systems/Processes on CCSBT Data Collection and Management

46. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/10 which provides draft terms of reference for a study to examine systems and processes for CCSBT data collection and management, together with some indicative cost estimates for conducting such a study.
47. There was general agreement that collecting information once, and as close to the source as possible is ideal, but Members were not ready to adopt such a proposal. The meeting noted that the proposal and terms of reference for the study is available if Members decide to revisit the concept to take it forward in the future.

3.5 Follow-Up on 2014 CCSBT Performance Review Panel Recommendations with respect to the 2015 – 2017 CAP

48. The Secretariat presented the possible action items from paper CCSBT-CC/1610/11, that had been developed previously to address compliance recommendations from the 2014 Performance Review of the CCSBT.
49. The meeting agreed to include the following action items related to the Performance Review recommendations in the 2018-2020 Compliance Action Plan (CAP):
 - Review the CCSBT's 2006 and 2008 VMS Resolutions; and
 - Targeted analysis of capacity building needs and Compliance "missions" to assist developing State Members.

50. It was agreed that the Performance Review's recommendations in relation to the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy would be considered at agenda item 4.1 of this meeting.
51. The meeting did not reach consensus on including an action item in the 2018-2020 CAP to develop standards and protocols for a high seas boarding and inspection scheme for SBT vessels. However, New Zealand stated that in accordance with Article 21(3) of the UNFSA¹, the UNFSA provisions for boarding and inspection are in force for the CCSBT since the CCSBT has not established its own procedures and it has been more than two years since the adoption of UNFSA. It was also noted that these provisions only apply to Parties to the UNFSA.
52. Members also agreed to revise the current action item 10.1.2 to become:
 - Ongoing identification and sharing of best practice and information for MCS systems.

3.6 Preliminary Consideration of Priority Compliance Areas for the 2018 - 2020 CAP

53. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/11, focusing on the compliance risks that are listed in the current Compliance Action Plan.
54. The meeting reviewed the previously identified compliance risks and produced the following revised list of compliance risks that should be considered when developing the Compliance Action Plan for 2018-2020:
 - Non-compliance or incomplete implementation of the CDS;
 - Risks associated with transshipments (both in port and at-sea), including difficulties in tracking product, preventing unauthorised introduction of product and the limitations of transshipment observers detecting infringements (including identification of SBT) when product is transhipped at-sea;
 - SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species;
 - Catches of SBT by Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs);
 - Expansion of markets for SBT that are not cooperating with the provisions of the CCSBT's CDS;
 - Incomplete reporting of SBT mortalities and not fully attributing all SBT mortalities (such as recreational catch, artisanal catches, discards, farm sector catches, non-farm commercial sector catches) against national allocations;
 - Incomplete or inaccurate reporting of non-SBT bycatches, including sea birds; and
 - Members not fully implementing the agreed Conservation and Management Measures of the CCSBT.

¹ Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

55. The Secretariat presented section 4 of paper CCSBT-CC/1610/11, which provided additional action items to be considered for inclusion in the 2018-2020 CAP. In relation to these potential action items, it was agreed:
- That implementation of electronic observation technologies should be considered; and
 - To review the option of cross-listing the CCSBT's IUU vessel list with the IUU vessel lists of the other tuna RFMOs. It was also suggested that ICCAT's cross-listing arrangements should be examined because these address many of the cross-listing process issues that need to be considered.
56. The possibility of reviewing current compliance reporting requirements with respect to ERS obligations was discussed. Instead of adding this review to the Compliance Action Plan, the Secretariat will compile information on compliance monitoring of mitigation measures from Members' national reports to the CC and EC, and present this information to the March ERSWG meeting for its consideration. This will provide an opportunity for the ERSWG to examine this information and to seek further information from the CC if required.
57. Members discussed the resources available to the Secretariat for compliance functions, noting that currently it was not sufficient to perform all of the desired compliance analyses. Members were favourable to increasing resources as needed, but noted that there were finance constraints and there were competing demands for resources.
58. The Secretariat suggested that it examine its current administrative work on the CDS with a view to rationalising the reconciliation process so that this focuses on the most important areas with the highest risk to free-up some time for other work. It was agreed that the Secretariat will correspond with Members intersessionally in relation to this rationalisation of the reconciliation process.
59. Members also discussed the current Compliance Committee meeting arrangements and agreed that the current arrangements were satisfactory, considering the resources available.

Agenda Item 4. Review and Revision of CCSBT MCS Measures

4.1. Review of the Corrective Actions Policy

60. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/12 which invited Members to undertake a review of the Corrective Actions Policy, including considering two recommendations (PR-2014-48 and PR-2014-49) made by the CCSBT Performance Review Panel (PRP) in 2014.
61. The meeting recommended that the Corrective Actions Policy be revised to specify that a public record of breaches of national allocations of the global TAC be developed and maintained. This record would include the corrective actions that were taken in relation to these breaches. The revised Corrective Actions Policy is provided at **Attachment 5**.
62. It was noted that in future this public record could be expanded to include additional compliance breaches as agreed by Members.

4.2. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)

4.2.1. Operational Issues with the CDS

63. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/13 which describes operational issues with CCSBT's Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) as detected and recorded by the Secretariat. The issues were similar to those identified in previous years and included:
- Non-submission of some CDS documents, in particular importer copies of CMFs/REEFs;
 - Vessels retaining SBT that were not authorised to fish for SBT during the catch/harvest month;
 - Validators not authorised at the date of validation;
 - Tagging data mismatches and duplicate tag numbers;
 - Copies of cancelled CMFs received back from importers;
 - SBT numbers/weights differing between exporter and importer copies of CDS forms;
 - Multiple preceding document numbers listed on REEFs preventing over-utilisation analyses; and
 - Information gaps occurring where SBT are re-/exported to NCNMs (with the exception of SBT product imported into the USA).
64. With regard to this last dot-point, the Secretariat and CC Chair expressed their appreciation to the USA which is now cooperating extensively with the Secretariat, having provided CDS import data submissions for both 2015 and 2016 (quarterly).

Analysis of SBT Weight Differences between the Catch/Harvest and Import Sections of CMFs for Korea and Taiwan

65. The Secretariat presented an analysis of weight differences found between the weights of SBT recorded in the catch/harvest section of CMFs versus the weights recorded in the import section of CMFs for Korea and Taiwan. The results are recorded in Table 1 of paper CCSBT-CC /1610/13. In summary there were no Korean CMFs (out of a total of 12 CMS analysed) where the weight difference was greater than 5%. For Taiwan, there were 6 (out of 83 CMFs) where the weight difference exceeded 5%.

Differences between Export/Import Volumes Provided in National Reports Versus Those Derived from CDS Data

66. As requested by CC10, the Secretariat provided a brief summary of the export/import volumes provided by Members in National Reports versus those derived from CDS Data. These results were presented in Table 2 of paper CCSBT-CC /1610/13. In addition, the Secretariat provided some recommendations regarding standardised formats for the reporting/provision of future export/ import information which the meeting endorsed and agreed to recommend to the EC as follows:
- To amend the annual CC/EC reporting template to specify that export figures (net weight in tonnes) are provided by the calendar year of the (re-)exported date;

- To amend the annual CC/EC reporting template to clarify that exports include both direct exports and any re-exports; and
- To request the Secretariat to provide combined CMF/REEF calendar year export/import totals at Attachment C (Characterisation of global fisheries) of the Compliance with Measures paper in future.

4.2.2. Revision of the CDS Resolution

67. The Secretariat introduced paper CCSBT-CC/1610/14 which provides the draft revised Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) Resolution produced by CCWG 4 in April 2016 for Members' consideration.
68. The Secretariat summarised the key areas of the Resolution that had not yet been finalised. These included Resolution text (unfinalised text is highlighted and square-bracketed within the draft), as well as some Certificates and their associated instructions. To try to resolve the outstanding issues, Members agreed to first step through the main Resolution text, followed by Appendix 2 (Tagging Programme Standards).
69. The meeting was able to agree some of the previously square-bracketed items within the main Resolution text, however some items were not resolved and remain square-bracketed for future consideration. The Secretariat's proposed changes to Appendix 2 were agreed. The updated CDS Resolution text including Appendix 2 is provided at **Attachment 6**.
70. The CC Chair will report to the EC on the progress made, noting that substantial parts of the CDS Resolution have not yet been fully agreed, and that Members agreed that the remaining issues could continue to be addressed intersessionally.

4.3. Authorised Vessel Resolution

71. The Secretariat presented part of paper CCSBT-CC/1610/13 which describes previously adopted revisions to the authorised vessel resolution pertaining to Lloyds/IMO numbers. Members were reminded that IMO numbers are required for all CCSBT authorised vessels of at least 100GT/GRT from 1 January 2017, with the exception of wooden and fibreglass vessels. It was noted that non-steel vessels greater than 100GRT can now apply for and be granted an IMO number and vessels greater than 12m overall length fishing outside of EEZs can be issued with a Unique Vessel Identification (UVI) number, both can be obtained by making a request to IHS Maritime and Trade.

4.4. VMS

72. The Secretariat presented part of paper CCSBT-CC/1610/13 pertaining to VMS, which advises Members that the Secretariat has received some transshipment observer reports that indicate that some VMS monitoring devices did not have the power light illuminated and may not have been switched on at the time of inspection by the transshipment observer.
73. It was clarified that the CCSBT has no formal procedure for infringements in relation to this, with the normal practice being to report the matter to meetings

and to contact flag states. It was noted that since the observer reports come from IOTC and ICCAT, and it was expected that those organisations would also take some form of action, such as reporting them to their respective Compliance Committees.

74. Members noted that the light on the VMS unit is not necessarily indicative of the unit being functional, and that some vessels have two VMS devices, so the observer may notice only the stand-by unit. It was also noted that not all VMS devices have a light to indicate when they are functioning.
75. There was agreement that a follow-up process was needed since there may be some cases of serious infringement and possible IUU activity. It was noted that IOTC has a working group on MCS issues that is working on centralised VMS issues, and they would be a good point of contact to obtain information that might assist the CCSBT in this matter.
76. Some Members shared concerns on the lack of a centralised VMS in IOTC, which presented the CCSBT with a higher risk of non-compliance in that region. Members were urged to support the development of a centralised VMS in IOTC. The EU pointed out that the implementation of centralised VMS could be cost ineffective and create problems in terms of fishing strategy confidentiality.
77. It was noted that the Secretariat lacked the resources to spend more time on VMS issues, and that the Secretariat spends a large amount of time on CDS administration. It was suggested that cost-effective alternatives to CDS administration could be a way of freeing up some of the Secretariat's Compliance Manager's time. Other RFMOs could be utilised to avoid redundant work.
78. The meeting agreed that there was a need to formally review the current VMS arrangements.

4.5. *Transshipment Resolution*

4.5.1. Transshipment Reporting

79. The Secretariat presented part of paper CCSBT-CC/1610/13 in relation to operational issues with the transshipment monitoring program. Due to difficulties that sometimes occurred with identifying SBT and that photos were usually not suitable for this purpose, the Secretariat recommended that: Members and the Secretariat should monitor developments in the effectiveness and availability of practical on-site genetic testing kits (for tuna species identification) so that any such tools developed can be considered for use by transshipment observers in the future and in the meantime look to collect samples for DNA analysis.
80. The meeting strongly endorsed this recommendation.

4.5.2. Potential Transshipment MOU with WCPFC

81. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/15 which contained a draft Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) on the endorsement of WCPFC regional observer programme observers for observing transshipments of southern bluefin tuna on the high seas of the WCPFC Convention Area.

82. The Secretariat advised that the WCPFC had considered the draft and that the draft has been recommended to the WCPFC Commission without amendment, but that Pacific Island Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) Members are still considering the implications of the MoC.
83. The meeting generally supported the MoC and agreed to provide the MoC to the EC for its consideration. It was agreed that support for the MoC was conditional on no change being made to the MoC by the WCPFC and on the EC agreeing to the following change to paragraph 37 of the CCSBT's transshipment Resolution:
- “To avoid the duplication of the same measures, ICCAT, IOTC, or WCPFC observers who are on board vessels on the CCSBT Record of Carrier Vessels, may be deemed to be participating in the CCSBT transshipment program, provided these observers meet the standards established in this Resolution and the CCSBT Secretariat is informed. The CCSBT Secretariat shall liaise with the ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC with respect to any information submitted to those organisations regarding SBT. The CCSBT Secretariat shall also exchange information on transshipment and observer standards with other RFMO Secretariats.”*
84. Australia noted that while it was happy for the MoC to be considered by the EC, Australia reserved its position and was not able to endorse the MoC at this stage.

4.6. Review of All Compliance Resolutions, Decisions and Recommendations

85. No Resolutions, decisions or recommendations were presented for review.

4.7. CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution

4.7.1. Potential IUU Fishing Activity Involving SBT

86. New Zealand presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/21, which reported its findings from New Zealand high seas patrols in the South Pacific. Four vessels that were working together were found or strongly suspected to have SBT on board, with two of the vessels being boarded by patrol officers. Some crew admitted to having SBT on board and to targeting SBT, and stated that they had been told to misreport the catch as bigeye tuna. Samples were taken that were confirmed to be SBT by DNA testing.
87. In response to questions from Members, New Zealand clarified that the vessels were fishing in an area similar to where authorised CCSBT vessels were targeting SBT at the time, and it believed all of the tuna on board was SBT, not bigeye tuna, based on admissions from the crew and skipper of one of the vessels and that 100% of DNA samples taken positively identified as SBT. The two vessels that weren't boarded were operating in a similar manner to the two that were boarded, and were considered very likely to have had SBT on board. One of the vessels boarded was suspected to have received transshipments of SBT from other vessels.
88. New Zealand contacted the Flag State in respect to this matter but has not yet received a reply. Depending on the response from the Flag State, New Zealand may propose the vessels for inclusion on the CCSBT and WCPFC IUU lists next year. The vessels were told to cease fishing and leave the area due to non-

compliance with WCPFC rules, but no further action was possible against the vessels at that time.

89. Members thanked and congratulated New Zealand for its excellent work in identifying and investigation of this SBT fishing activity.
90. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/16 which summarised information related to the CCSBT IUU Vessel List resolution. There are currently no vessels on the CCSBT IUU vessel list, but the Secretariat received some information on suspected SBT IUU fishing activity by a Chinese flagged fishing fleet from Sea Shepherd Global.
91. Members agreed to recommend to the EC that the Executive Secretary should draft a letter to China, seeking information on catches of SBT that it is aware of. The draft is to be circulated to Members before being sent to China.
92. It was suggested that a systematic response for taking action in relation to catches by non-Members would be beneficial. The Secretariat advised that the CCSBT adopted an “Action Plan” Resolution in 2000, which contains a series of steps for dealing with non-Members whose vessels have been catching SBT in a manner which diminishes the effectiveness of the CCSBT’s conservation and management measures. Members were invited to examine the Action Plan Resolution before EC.
93. Some Members advised that they would be willing to discuss these issues with China bilaterally, and the Chair urged Members to raise these matters with China whenever the opportunity arose.

4.7.2. Draft IUU Vessel List

94. The Secretariat noted that no Members submitted information to the Executive Secretary pursuant to paragraph 4 of the IUU Vessel List Resolution. Therefore, there is no Draft IUU Vessel List that requires CC11’s consideration

4.7.3. Proposed Update to the CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution

95. The meeting discussed two possible revisions to the CCSBT IUU Vessel list Resolution. One revision was to allow the Executive Secretary to add vessels to the Draft IUU Vessel List based on information received from Members/CNMs, as well as any other suitably documented information that the Executive Secretary may have. The other possible revision was to specify large-scale driftnets as a prohibited CCSBT gear type.
96. Members expressed varied opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the Executive Secretary being able to place vessels on the Draft IUU Vessel List. This will be discussed by Members in the margins of the CC and EC meetings to address concerns and possibly introduce a modified Resolution at the EC.
97. Instead of modifying the IUU Vessel List Resolution to prohibit large-scale driftnets, the meeting agreed to recommend a draft Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing to the EC. That draft Resolution is provided at **Attachment 7**.

4.8. Minimum Performance Requirements

98. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/17, which proposes a set of new draft Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) for the CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution.
99. Drafting of MPRs for the CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port has been postponed until 2017 when there will be more time available to thoroughly review areas where Port Inspection MPRs may potentially overlap with the existing Transshipment Resolution MPRs (for in-port transshipments).
100. The Secretariat reported that it had also reviewed the existing MPRs for Annual Reporting to the CC (section 6.5) and determined that these did not need to be updated at the current time.
101. The meeting agreed to the CCSBT IUU Vessel List MPRs proposed in the Secretariat's paper, and these are provided as **Attachment 8**.

4.9. Quality Assurance Reviews

102. The Secretariat presented an overview of paper CCSBT-CC/1610/18 which is the summary report of the overall 2016 QAR program. Two recommendations were made for changes to the procedures for future QARs. These were:
 - An "Application Process" to assist the Member to understand what the QAR is about, what to expect and what is expected of them, and to also provide the reviewer with important contact information; and
 - A more detailed on-site audit checklist that condenses the CCSBT's Minimum Performance Requirements for on-site use. This would assist with the collection of information, particularly when auditors are also managing translations at the audit meetings.
103. The two proposed changes to the QAR procedures were endorsed by the meeting.
104. The meeting agreed that Taiwan would undertake its phase 2 QAR in 2017 and that the European Union and South Africa would undergo combined phase 1 & 2 QARs in the following years.

4.10. Review of Trade Data

4.10.1. Annual Trade Analyses

105. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/19 concerning an updated analysis of trade data from the Global Trade Atlas (GTA) and highlighted the key conclusions of the paper as follows:
 - Any live-trade of SBT indicated in the GTA database records is almost certainly the result of species miscoding;
 - The main NCM markets for SBT between 2011 and 2015 appear to be China, Hong Kong, Singapore, the USA, and potentially also Lebanon and the Russian Federation, and no new emerging markets were detected; and
 - GTA trade data appear to generally reflect CDS submissions with the exceptions that:

- The EU seems to be over-represented both as an importer and an exporter (the majority of this recorded trade appears due to other fish species being miscoded as SBT); and
 - Indonesia and South Africa are recorded as having much fewer exports than indicated by CCSBT Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) submissions, but the reason for this is not known.
106. Indonesia advised that it is planning to do a study on its SBT supply chain during 2017, and therefore next year it should be able to provide some clarification as to why its export figures may be under-represented on the GTA database.
107. The USA noted that the fresh exports of SBT to Russia between 2010 and 2014 inclusive which are indicated in Table 10 of the paper are likely to be the result of miscoding, and that it will investigate this further and report back to the Compliance Committee in the future.

4.10.2. Review of Intra-EU Trade Figures on the GTA Database

108. The European Union gave a brief oral report on this item noting that:
- It investigated this matter by contacting relevant Member States in order to try to understand the reason for the high SBT trade statistics recorded on the GTA database;
 - It appears there is sometimes confusion between SBT and Atlantic Bluefin codes resulting in miscoding;
 - Members States were requested to correct data where possible, and some have done this while others have not, but will endeavour to do it in the future; and
 - It remains possible that additional miscoding issues may occur in the future.

4.10.3. Analysis of SBT Market Presence in China

109. TRAFFIC, the contractor of the CCSBT for Analysis of SBT Market Presence in China, presented papers CCSBT-CC/1610/20 and CCSBT-CC/1610/23 which reported the outcomes of its component of the CCSBT funded project to determine the presence of SBT products in China through analyses of trade data. The papers reported that 26 of the 199 tested sashimi samples taken from sashimi restaurants in Beijing and Shanghai were identified as SBT by DNA testing, with most of them (25) being from Shanghai. TRAFFIC also presented paper CCSBT-CC/1610/24 on behalf of CSIRO on a proof of concept study for the use of biochemical techniques to estimate the source ocean of SBT from tissue samples.
110. Members noted the high proportion of SBT in the lower priced sashimi sampled, which suggested that the source of that product was not from official imports that would be higher-priced.
111. Japan industry advised that Guangzhou, which was not sampled, was a market that preferred fatty tuna and might prefer SBT for sashimi, unlike Beijing markets that prefer less oily but strong red colour.
112. Members were unsure how to use the information in the report to gain an overall estimate of undocumented SBT in China. It was agreed that the data needed to be

treated cautiously and that more information and research was required before such estimates could be made, but there were indications that a high proportion of SBT in China was from illicit sources.

113. Members saw a need to engage with China to get more data, and request it to cooperate with the CDS.

Agenda Item 5. Consideration of the level of non-Member SBT catch

114. The Secretariat introduced paper CCSBT-CC/1610/BGD02, which was a joint paper by New Zealand and Australia to provide estimates of NCNM catch. The paper used a modelling approach to estimate the predicted catch rate from CCSBT Member data and apply that catch rate to non-Member effort data from ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC in order to predict potential unreported catch. It was noted that the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) had advised that estimates from this analysis will potentially underestimate the true SBT catch by non-Members in cases where:

- Fishing effort is not reported to the other RFMOs (e.g. IUU fishing); and
- Where the datasets used in the analysis may exclude some effort due to application of the ‘three-vessel rule’ to address confidentiality provisions of WCPFC and ICCAT.

115. One of the most influential factors for the analysis in this paper was whether the effort was assumed to be bycatch or targeted. Consequently, the ESC presented scenarios for both forms of assumed effort as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Scenarios for catches of SBT by year by non-Member longline effort assuming “targeted” and “bycatch” fishing based on analysis of publically available effort distributions and Member CPUE for SBT.

Year	Target (t)	Bycatch (t)
2007	81	10
2008	35	5
2009	224	75
2010	372	53
2011	246	28
2012	476	131
2013	293	54
2014	210	22

116. The meeting discussed whether NCNM catches of SBT were most likely to be targeted fishing for SBT or bycatches of SBT. New Zealand believed that, from the findings of its high seas patrols reported in paper CCSBT-CC/1610/21, there was likely to be substantial targeting of SBT. Some other Members thought that NCNM SBT catches were more likely to be an incidental catch.

117. All Members considered that, given the high degree of uncertainty involved, the catch of NCNM longliners with effort reported to the other tuna RFMOs might best be estimated from the midpoint of bycatch and targeted catch rates. Most Members noted that the average estimated tonnage of SBT in Table 1 from 2011 to 2014 for both bycatch and targeted catch rates is 182.5t and that this is an

appropriate estimate and a reasonable starting point for discussion on the level of NCNM catches of SBT.

118. New Zealand agreed that 182.5t was a reasonable starting point for the discussion on the level of NCNM SBT catch, but for any estimate of that catch to be appropriate it must also include unreported SBT catch. HSI supported New Zealand's view.
119. The EU, without specifying any specific figure, pointed out that the unreported SBT catch should also be taken into account.
120. Some Members noted that the higher CPUE levels observed in 2015 indicate that future estimates of NCNM SBT catches are likely to be higher if maintained.
121. Other information available to the Compliance Committee on NCNM catches of SBT, which includes compliance and market information, comprised:
 - A New Zealand estimate of 166t of SBT from its high seas patrols in July and August 2016, concerning 4 longliners;
 - Results of New Zealand interviews with the crew of the above vessels that indicated the fishing company had another four vessels operating outside the Pacific;
 - Reports from "Sea Shepherd Global" on the activities of the Chinese "Fu Yuan Yu" fleet, which included 25 alleged SBT in a drift net confiscated by the "*M/Y Steve Irwin*";
 - A TRAFFIC/CSIRO study in January and March 2016 in which 13% of sashimi tuna sampled from 199 restaurants in Shanghai and Beijing were found to be SBT; and
 - A WWF study in July and August 2011 in which 26% of sashimi tuna sampled from 97 restaurants in Shanghai and Beijing were found to be SBT.
122. All Members agreed that there is a high degree of uncertainty in relation to the information currently available relating to NCNM catches. Taken together, this information provides strong evidence for the occurrence of SBT catch by NCNMs.
123. New Zealand noted that with the uncertainty, 1,000t would be the minimum NCNM SBT catch estimate that it could consider to be precautionary. The European Union supported the concept of taking a precautionary approach to the NCNM catch estimate due to the uncertainty. However, the EU did not have a specific view on the most appropriate estimate.
124. Other Members did not consider that they had sufficient information to provide a range of possible NCNM catches and preferred using the mid-point of the ESC estimates of 182.5t as a starting point for discussions by the EC.
125. HSI suggested that, in future, the Committee should set aside space on its agenda for an in-depth discussion on non-Member catch and IUU fishing to develop a clear picture of the nature, scale and extent of the two overlapping problems and thence develop a comprehensive response strategy to these threats to the integrity of the Commission's management of the fishery.

Agenda Item 6. Discussion of new or enhanced MCS measures, including ongoing identification and sharing of best practise for MCS systems

6.1. R & D on new technologies & tools to aid observers, certifiers and validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed)

126. There were no items of discussion under this agenda item.

6.2. Ongoing identification and sharing of best practise for MCS systems

127. There were no items of discussion under this agenda item.

Agenda Item 7. Work program for 2017

128. The Compliance Committee developed the following workplan for 2017. Annual tasks of an ongoing nature are not shown unless they are new for 2017.

Activity	Approximate Period	Resource
Send a letter to the Philippines regarding their CNM status	Dec 2016	Executive Secretary
Retain the contract with the current service provider to implement a QAR for Taiwan subject to funding by CCSBT 23.	Nov-Dec 2016	Secretariat
Send a letter to Chinese authorities regarding the “Fu Yuan Yu” fleet. Draft letter to be cleared by Members.	Dec 2016	Executive Secretary
Review the VMS resolutions	Before CC12	Secretariat and Members
Develop a draft Compliance Action Plan 2018-20 for consideration at CC12	Before CC12	Secretariat
Members engage with China as appropriate to gain information on SBT catches, their domestic market for SBT and interest in becoming a Member of the Extended Commission	Before CC12	Members
Taiwan undertake a phase 2 QAR in 2017.	Before CC12	Taiwan/Secretariat
Review current compliance analysis and functions with a view to addressing all high-risk activities. Provide appropriate additional resources if available.	Before CC12	Secretariat

Agenda Item 8. Other business

129. Japan presented information on Australia’s formal commitments to the implementation of stereo-video monitoring from 2010 to the present, and requested Australia:

- To confirm that Australia’s commitment in 2013 on the implementation of stereo video monitoring still remains;
- To provide its road map from 2017 (after finishing the current project) for the implementation of stereo video monitoring; and

- Until stereo video monitoring is introduced, to conduct other methods suggested at the past CCSBT meetings in order to estimate the accuracy of the current 100 fish sampling.
130. Australia presented Paper CC/1610/BGD04 – An update of tuna growth performance in ranching and tuna farming operations. Australia noted that its weight sampling into farms was totally controlled by government, and had very strict rules which are publicly available on www.afma.gov.au. The precision of the annual sample of about 3,000 fish ($\geq 10\text{kg}$) was very high but there had been a continuing debate about the accuracy. Australia further noted that there is no dispute within the CCSBT in the accuracy of the number of fish into farms and the weight out of farms – but Japan’s hypothesis had been that the length and weight of fish into farms was under-estimated. Australia had now developed a number of basic tests to assess the various hypotheses on the accuracy. The first is the large literature base on the growth of Bluefin Tunas in farms. Second is the expert comment on possible bias in the sampling system. Third is the comparison between growth in Pacific Bluefin farms and growth in the wild. Fourth is whether the hypotheses on the sampling accuracy were consistent with the global benchmark on Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR). Fifth is whether these hypotheses were consistent with the global benchmark on Condition Index (CI). All these tests indicated hypotheses that the current 3,000 fish ($\geq 10\text{kg}$) are not an accurate measure of all fish into farms are not supported. Nevertheless, Australia was pleased to continue the Australia/Japan dialogue set up by the 2016 ESC meeting to improve understanding on the issue.
131. Australia and Japan exchanged views on their respective presentations, and it was noted that technical questions could be addressed in the Extended Scientific Committee.
132. The European Union requested that papers for future meetings include a reference to the agenda item in which they will be discussed and that there be a list of papers in each agenda item. The Secretariat noted that the latter currently exists, and that the former could be implemented for future meetings.

Agenda Item 9. Recommendations to the Extended Commission

133. The Compliance Committee made the following recommendations to the Extended Commission:
- Singapore, USA and China be invited to attend future Compliance Committee meetings.
 - Note that steady progress is being made against the Compliance Action Plan 2015-17.
 - The proposed 2017 Workplan for the Compliance Committee be approved.
 - No further work be undertaken to obtain common fishing sector definitions, as the implementation of “attributable catch” will cover all mortalities regardless of which sector is responsible for the mortalities.
 - That the Executive Secretary sends a letter to the Philippines advising that its CNM status is in jeopardy as necessary reports have not been submitted and it

does not attend key meetings, and noting also that it has not renewed its commitments as a CNM.

- That the implementation of e-monitoring not be pursued in 2017 as provided for in the 2015-17 Compliance Action Plan, but that implementation is included in the 2018-20 Compliance Action Plan.
- That the Extended Commission endorses the revised Corrective Actions Policy which provides that a public record of breaches of national allocations of the global TAC and the corresponding corrective actions be developed and maintained.
- That the VMS resolutions be reviewed to provide information on contemporary arrangements that can adequately support CCSBT management measures.
- Members and the Secretariat monitor developments in the effectiveness and availability of practical on-site genetic testing kits (for tuna species identification).
- That changes be approved to the Transshipment Resolution to add the WCPFC to paragraph 37 and that subject to the WCPFC agreeing to the current draft MOC without modification in December 2016 this be adopted by the Extended Commission.
- Note the revised compliance risks identified by the CC and that these will be incorporated into the 2018-2020 Compliance Action Plan to be considered in 2017.
- That the Executive Secretary write to the appropriate Chinese authorities and seek information on the 'Fu Yuan Yu' fleet, in particular the action taken in relation to the use of large scale driftnets and details of their catch of SBT. Members will be given an opportunity to review the draft letter.
- That Extended Commission Members engage with China as appropriate with a view to gaining information on current SBT catches, the domestic Chinese market for SBT and China's desire to become a Member of the Extended Commission.
- That the Extended Commission notes that the Compliance Committee is unable to provide an estimate of non-Member catches but that it is clear these are occurring both as target and bycatch.
 - All Members considered that, given the high degree of uncertainty involved, the catch of NCNM longliners with effort reported to the other tuna RFMOs might best be estimated from the midpoint of bycatch and targeted catch rates. Most Members noted that the average estimated tonnage of SBT in Table 1 from 2011 to 2014 for both bycatch and targeted catch rates is 182.5t and that this is an appropriate estimate and a reasonable starting point for discussion on the level of NCNM catches of SBT.
 - New Zealand agreed that 182.5t was a reasonable starting point for the discussion on the level of NCNM SBT catch, but for any estimate of that catch to be appropriate it must also include unreported SBT catch.
 - The EU, without specifying any specific figure, pointed out that the unreported SBT catch should also be taken into account.
- That a Phase 2 QAR be conducted in Taiwan in 2017 and that the European Union and South Africa QARs be undertaken in the following years.

- That changes to the Minimum Performance Requirements relating to the IUU Vessel Listing Resolution be approved.
- That the Extended Commission adopts the proposed Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing as provided in **Attachment 7**.
- That the Executive Secretary analyses current Compliance functions to ensure elements of high risk activities which are currently not being fully reviewed are reviewed and seeks additional limited resources (subject to availability) to free up the Compliance Manager's time to do this work.
- That the changes to the Annual Reporting template be endorsed.

Agenda Item 10. Conclusion

10.1. Adoption of meeting report

134. The report was adopted.

10.2. Close of meeting

135. The meeting closed at 6:23 pm on 8 October 2016.

List of Attachments

Attachment

1. List of Participants
2. Agenda
3. List of Documents
4. Revised Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission
5. Revised Corrective actions policy
6. Revised Draft Resolution on the Implementation of a CCSBT Catch Documentation Scheme
7. Draft Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing
8. Minimum Performance Requirements with respect to the IUU Vessel list

List of Participants
The Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR								
Frank	MEERE	Mr			AUSTRALIA			fmeere@aapt.net.au
MEMBERS								
AUSTRALIA								
Gordon	NEIL	Mr	Assistant Secretary	Department of Agriculture	GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6272 5863		gordon.neil@agriculture.gov.au
Neil	HUGHES	Mr	Assistant Director	Department of Agriculture	GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6271 6306		neil.hughes@agriculture.gov.au
Brian	JEFFRIESS	Mr	Chief Executive Officer	Australian SBT Industry Association Ltd (ASBTIA)	PO Box 1146, Port Lincoln, SA 5066, Australia	61 419 840 299		austuna@bigpond.com
Terry	ROMARO	Mr	Managing Director	Ship Agencies Australia	PO Box 1093, Fremantle, WA 6160, Australia	61 8 9335 5499		terryromaro@aol.com
EUROPEAN UNION								
Orlando	FACHADA	Mr	Head of EU Delegation	European Union	Rue de la Loi 200 (J99-3/46), Belgium	32 2299 0857		Orlando.Fachada@ec.europa.eu
FISHING ENTITY OF TAIWAN								
Shiu-Ling	LIN	Ms.	Deputy Director	Fisheries Agency of Taiwan	8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 23835 855	886 2 89987 395	shiuling@msl.f.gov.tw
I-Lu	LAI	Ms.	Specialist	Fisheries Agency of Taiwan	8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 23835 895	886 2 89987 395	ilu@msl.f.gov.tw

First name	Last name	Title Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Wei-Yang	LIU	Mr. Secretary	Overseas Fisheries Development Council	3F, No.14 Wenzhou St., Da'an Dist. Taipei City 106, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 23680 889	886 2 23686 418	weiyang@ofdc.org.tw
Sheng-Ming	HUNG	Mr. Secretary	Overseas Fisheries Development Council	3F, No.14 Wenzhou St., Da'an Dist. Taipei City 106, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 23680 889	886 2 23686 418	allen@ofdc.org.tw
WEN-JUNG	HSIEH	Mr. President	Taiwan Tuna Association	3F-2, No.2, Yu Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 7 83121 51	886 7 84175 19	wenjung@tuna.org.tw
YIN-HO	LIU	Mr. Chairman of IOOC of TTA	Taiwan Tuna Association	3F-2, No.2, Yu Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 7 84196 06	886 7 83133 04	woen.chang@msa.hinet.net
KUAN-TING	LEE	Mr. Secretary	Taiwan Tuna Association	3F-2, No.2, Yu Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 7 84196 06	886 7 83133 04	simon@tuna.org.tw

INDONESIA

Saut	TAMPUBOLON	Mr Deputy Director for Fish Resource in Indonesia EEZ and High Seas	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta Pusat 10110 Indonesia	62 21 35190 70 ext. 1002	62 21 34530 08	s.tampubolon@yahoo.com and sdi.djpt@yahoo.com
Novia Tri	RAHMAWATI	Ms Assistant Deputy Director of Sub-Directorate of Fish Resources Management in Indonesia EEZ and High Seas	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries	Jln. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Gedung Mina Bahari II, Lantai 10, Jakarta Pusat, 10110 Indonesia	62 21 35190 70 ext. 1002	62 21 34530 08	novia_dkp@yahoo.com
Dwi Agus Siswa	PUTRA	Mr Secretary General	Indonesia Tuna Long Line Association	Jl. Ikan Tuna Raya Timur, Pelabuhan Benoa, Denpasar – Bali, Indonesia	62 361 72739 9	62 361 72509 9	atli.bali@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
JAPAN								
Ryo	OMORI	Mr	Assistant Director	International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907	81 3 3502 8459	81 3 3502 0571	ryo_omori330@maff.go.jp
Nabi	TANAKA	Ms		Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919	81 3 5501 8338	81 3 5501 8332	nabi.tanaka@mofa.go.jp
Shingi	KOTO	Mr.	Deputy Director	Agricultural and Marine Products Offices, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry	1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan	81 3 3501 0532	81 3 3501 6006	koto-shingi@meti.go.jp
Tomoyuki	ITOH	Dr	Group Chief	National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries	5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu Shizuoka 424-8633	81 54 336 6000	81 543 35 9642	itou@fra.affrc.go.jp
Takeru	IIDA	Mr		Fisheries Management Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907	81 3 3591 6582	81 3 3595 7332	takeru_iida150@maff.go.jp
Kiyoshi	KATSUYAMA	Mr	Councilor	Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	gyojyo@japantuna.or.jp
Kojiro	GEMBA	Mr	Chief	Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	gyojyo@japantuna.or.jp
Michio	SHIMIZU	Mr	Executive Secretary	National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association	Coop Bldg 7F, 1-1-12, Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-0047	81 3 3294 9633	81 3 3294 9607	mic-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp

First name	Last name	Title Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
NEW ZEALAND							
Dominic	VALLIÈRES	Mr. Manager, HMS Team	Ministry for Primary Industries	PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	64 04 819 4654		dominic.vallieres@mpi.govt.nz
Arthur	HORE	Mr. Manager, Offshore Fisheries	Ministry for Primary Industries	PO Box 19747, Avondale, Auckland 1746, New Zealand	64 09 820 7686		arthur.hore@mpi.govt.nz
Alex	JEBSON	Mr. Legal Advisor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	195 Lambton Quay, Private Bag 18 901, Wellington 6160, New Zealand	64 04 439 8547		alex.jebson@mfat.govt.nz
REPUBLIC OF KOREA							
Jeongseok	PARK	Mr Fisheries Negotiator	Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	30110 Government Complex Sejong, 94, Dasom2-Ro, Sejong Special Self-governing City, Korea	82 442 005 347	82 442 005 379	jeongseok.korea@gmail.com
Zanggeun	KIM	Dr Policy Advisor	Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	30110 Government Complex Sejong, 94, Dasom2-Ro, Sejong Special Self-governing City, Korea	82 442 005 339	82 442 005 379	zgkim5676@gmail.com
Hojeong	JIN	Mr Manager	Korea Overseas Fisheries Association	83, Nonhyeon- ro, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Korea	82 2589 1613	82 2589 1630	jackiejjin@kosfa.org
SOUTH AFRICA							
Bernard	LIEDEMANN	Mr Deputy Director	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Roggebaai 8012 Republic of South Africa	27 21 402 3535		BernardL@daff.gov.za
Aphiwe	NONKENEZA	Mr Senior Adminstrati on Officer	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Roggebaai 8012 Republic of South Africa			

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
OBSERVERS								
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA								
Melanie	KING	Ms.	International Policy Advisor	NOAA Fisheries	1315 East West Highway (F/IA), Silver Spring, MD 20910 USA	001 301 427 8366		melanie.king@noaa.gov
SINGAPORE								
Adrian	LIM	Mr	Director (Fisheries)	Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority of Singapore	52 Jurong Gateway Road, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6325 7347	65 6220 6068	adrian_lim@ava.gov.sg
Valerie	CHIA	MS	Manager	Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority of Singapore	52 Jurong Gateway Road, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6265 5052	65 6265 1683	Valerie_CHIA@ava.gov.sg
HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL								
Alistair	GRAHAM	Mr	Adviser, international conservation	Humane Society International	PO Box 439, Avalon NSW 2107	61 439 568 376	61 2 9973 1729	alistairgraham1@bigpond.com
TRAFFIC								
Joyce	WU	Ms	Senior Programme Officer	TRAFFIC	3F, No. 92, Lane 106, Section 3, Bade Road, Taipei 106, Taiwan	886 2 2579 5826	886 2 2576 6036	Joyce.Wu@traffic.org
INTERPRETERS								
Kumi	KOIKE	Ms						
Yoko	YAMAKAGE	Ms						
Kaori	ASAKI	Ms						
CCSBT SECRETARIAT								
Robert	KENNEDY	Mr	Executive Secretary					rkennedy@ccsbt.org
Akira	SOMA	Mr	Deputy Executive Secretary		PO Box 37, Deakin West ACT 2600 AUSTRALIA	61 2 6282 8396	61 2 6282 8407	asoma@ccsbt.org
Colin	MILLAR	Mr	Database Manager					CMillar@ccsbt.org
Susie	IBALL	Ms	Compliance Manager					siball@ccsbt.org

**Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee
6 – 8 October 2016
Kaohsiung, Taiwan
Agenda**

1. Opening of Meeting
 - 1.1. Welcome
 - 1.2. Adoption of Agenda
 - 1.3. Meeting Arrangements

2. Compliance with CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures
 - 2.1. Reports from Members and Cooperating Non-members
 - 2.1.1. Annual Reports
 - 2.1.2. Fishing Sector Definitions
 - 2.2. Report from the Secretariat
 - 2.3. Assessment of compliance with CCSBT Management Measures
 - 2.3.1. Compliance of Members
 - 2.3.2. Compliance of CCSBT's Cooperating Non-Member
 - 2.3.3. Application of the Corrective Actions Policy

3. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan
 - 3.1. Enhance Monitoring through Bilateral Arrangements and International Networks
 - 3.2. Update to the Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission
 - 3.3. Electronic Observation Technologies
 - 3.4. Study to Examine Systems/Processes on CCSBT Data Collection and Management
 - 3.5. Follow-Up on 2014 CCSBT Performance Review Panel Recommendations with respect to the 2015 – 2017 CAP
 - 3.6. Preliminary Consideration of Priority Compliance Areas for the 2018 - 2020 CAP

4. Review and Revision of CCSBT MCS Measures
 - 4.1. Review of the Corrective Actions Policy
 - 4.2. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)
 - 4.2.1. Operational Issues with the CDS
 - 4.2.2. Revision of the CDS Resolution

- 4.3. Authorised Vessel Resolution
- 4.4. VMS
- 4.5. Transshipment Resolution
 - 4.5.1. Transshipment Reporting
 - 4.5.2. Potential Transshipment MOU with WCPFC
- 4.6. Review of Compliance Resolutions, Decisions and Recommendations
- 4.7. CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution
 - 4.7.1. Potential IUU Fishing Activity Involving SBT
 - 4.7.2. Draft IUU Vessel List
 - 4.7.3. Proposed Update to the CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution
- 4.8. Minimum Performance Requirements
- 4.9. Quality Assurance Reviews
- 4.10. Review of Trade Data
 - 4.10.1 Annual Trade Analyses
 - 4.10.2 Review of Intra-EU Trade Figures on the GTA Database
 - 4.10.3 Analysis of SBT Market Presence in China
- 5. Consideration of the level of non-Member SBT catch
- 6. Discussion of New or Enhanced MCS Measures, Including Ongoing Identification and Sharing of Best Practise for MCS Systems
 - 6.1. R & D on New Technologies & Tools to Aid Observers, Certifiers and Validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed)
 - 6.2. Ongoing Identification and Sharing of Best Practise for MCS Systems
- 7. Work Program for 2017
- 8. Other business
- 9. Recommendations to the Extended Commission
- 10. Conclusion
 - 10.1. Adoption of Meeting Report
 - 10.2. Close of Meeting

**List of Documents
The Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee**

(CCSBT-CC/1610/03)

1. Provisional Agenda
2. List of Participants
3. List of Documents
4. (CCSBT) Phase 1 & 2 combined - Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. Member Report: Korea (CC agenda items 2.1.1, 4.9)
5. (CCSBT) Phase 1 & 2 combined - Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. Member Report: New Zealand (Phase 2) (CC agenda items 2.1.1, 4.9)
6. (Secretariat) Fishing Sector Definitions (CC agenda item 2.1.2)
7. (Secretariat) Compliance with CCSBT Management Measures (Rev.1) (CC agenda item 2.2)
8. (Secretariat) Update on CCSBT's Relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (IMCS) Network and RFBs/ RFMOs (CC agenda item 3.1)
9. (Secretariat) Proposed Revision to the Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission (CC agenda item 3.2)
10. (Secretariat) CCSBT Data Collection & Management Study (CC agenda item 3.4)
11. (Secretariat) Preliminary Consideration of a Three Year Compliance Action Plan for 2018 – 2020 (CC agenda items 3.5 and 3.6)
12. (Secretariat) Review of the Corrective Actions Policy (CC agenda item 4.1)
13. (Secretariat) Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures (CC agenda items 4.2.1, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.1)
14. (Secretariat) Draft Revision of the CCSBT's Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) Resolution (CC agenda item 4.2.2)
15. Potential Transshipment MoC with WCPFC (CC agenda item 4.5.2)
16. (Secretariat) IUU Vessel Resolution (CC agenda item 4.7)
17. (Secretariat) Draft Revised Minimum Performance Requirements (CC agenda item 4.8)
18. (CCSBT) Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. Summary Report on the 2016 QAR Programme (CC agenda item 4.9)

19. (Secretariat) Southern Bluefin Tuna Trade Data: Annual Analyses
(CC agenda item 4.10.1)
20. (CCSBT) Internal Draft Report to CCSBT Southern Bluefin Tuna market presence in China (CC agenda item 4.10.3)
21. (New Zealand) Findings from New Zealand High Seas Patrols in the South Pacific
(CC agenda item 4.7.1)
22. (Japan) Monitoring of Southern Bluefin Tuna trading in the Japanese domestic markets: 2016 update (CC Agenda Item 2.1)
23. (CCSBT) Genetic species identification – SBT market presence in China: Draft final report to CCSBT and Traffic International (CC Agenda Item 5)
24. (CCSBT) Proof of concept study for the use of biochemical techniques to estimate source ocean of SBT from tissue samples (CC Agenda Item 5)

(CCSBT- CC/1610/BGD)

1. (Secretariat) Draft Updated Three-Year Compliance Action Plan (2015 – 2017)
(Previously **CCSBT-CC/1410/05**) (CC agenda item 3.5)
2. (New Zealand and Australia) Updated estimates of southern bluefin tuna catch by CCSBT non-member states (Previously **CCSBT-ESC/1609/BGD 02 (Rev.1)**)
(CC agenda item 5)
3. (Australia) A review of SBT supplies in the Japanese domestic market (Previously **CCSBT-ESC/1609/13**) (CC agenda item 2.1.1)
4. (Australia) An update of tuna growth performance in ranching and farming operations (Previously **CCSBT-ESC/1609/14**) (CC agenda item 2.1.1)

(CCSBT-CC/1610/SBT Fisheries)

Australia	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission
European Union	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission
Indonesia	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission
Japan	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission

Korea	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission (Rev.1)
New Zealand	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission (Rev.2)
South Africa	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission (Rev.1)
Taiwan	Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission (Rev.2)

(CCSBT-CC/1610/Rep)

1. Report of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2016)
2. Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (April 2016)
3. Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2015)
4. Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2015)
5. Report of the Twentieth Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2015)
6. Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (March 2015)

**Template for the Annual Report
to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission**

(Revised as agreed at CC11 following CCSBT 23)

If there are multiple SBT fisheries, with different rules and procedures applying to the different fisheries, it may be easier to complete this template separately for each fishery. Alternatively, please ensure that the information for each fishery is clearly differentiated within the single template.

This template sometimes seeks information on a quota year basis. Those Members/CNMs that have not specified a quota year to the CCSBT (i.e. EU, South Africa and the Philippines), should provide the information on a calendar year basis. Within this template, the quota year (or calendar year for those without a quota year) is referred to as the “fishing season”. Unless otherwise specified, information should be provided for the most recently completed fishing season. Members and CNMs are encouraged to also provide preliminary information for the current fishing season where the fishing for that season is complete or close to complete.

Table of Contents

I. Summary of MCS Improvements.....	2
(1) Improvements achieved in the current fishing season.....	2
(2) Future planned improvements	2
(3) Implementation of the common CCSBT definition for the “Attributable SBT Catch”	2
II. SBT Fishing and MCS Arrangements.....	2
(1) Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna.....	2
(2) SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)	5
(3) SBT Transhipment (in port and at sea).....	6
(4) Port Inspections of Foreign FVs/CVs with SBT/SBT Products on Board.....	7
(5) Landings of Domestic Product (from both fishing vessels and farms).....	7
(6) SBT Exports.....	8
(7) SBT Imports	9
(8) SBT Markets	9
(9) Other	9
III. Additional Reporting Requirements.....	10
(1) Coverage and Type of CDS Audit undertaken.....	10
(2) Ecologically Related Species.....	10
(3) Historical SBT Catch (retained and non-retained)	11

(c) Describe the system used for controlling the level of SBT catch. For ITQ and IQ systems, this should include details on how the catch was allocated to individual companies and/or vessels. For competitive catch systems this should include details of the process for authorising vessels to catch SBT and how the fishery was monitored for determining when to close the fishery. The description provided here should include any operational constraints on effort (both regulatory and voluntary):-

(d) Provide details of the methods used to monitor catching in the fishery by completing the table below. Details should also be provided of monitoring conducted of fishing vessels when steaming away from the fishing grounds (this does not include towing vessels that are reported in Section 2).

Monitoring Methods	Description
Daily log book	<p>Specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Whether this was mandatory. If not, specify the % of SBT fishing that was covered:- ii. The level of detail recorded (shot by shot, daily aggregate etc):- iii. Whether the effort and catch information collected complied with that specified in the “Characterisation of the SBT Catch” section of the CCSBT Scientific Research Plan (Attachment D of the SC5 report), including both retained and discarded catch. If not, describe the non-compliance:- iv. What information on ERS was recorded in logbooks:- v. Who were the log books submitted to¹:- vi. What was the timeframe and method² for submission:- vii. The type of checking and verification that was routinely conducted for this information:- viii. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:- ix. Other relevant information³:-

¹ If the reports are not to be submitted to the Member’s or CNM’s government fisheries authority, then also specify whether the information will later be sent to the fisheries authority, including how and when that occurs.

² In particular, whether the information is submitted electronically from the vessel.

³ Including information on ERS, and comments on the effectiveness of the controls or monitoring tools and any plans for further improvement.

<p><i>Additional reporting methods (such as real time monitoring programs)</i></p>	<p><i>If multiple reporting methods exists (e.g. daily, weekly and/or month SBT catch reporting, reporting of tags and SBT measurements, reporting of ERS interactions etc), create a separate row of in this table for each method. Then, for each method, specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Whether this was mandatory. If not, specify the % of SBT fishing that was covered:-</i> <i>ii. The information that was recorded (including whether it relates to SBT or ERS):-</i> <i>iii. Who the reports were submitted to and by whom (e.g. Vessel Master, the Fishing Company etc):-</i> <i>iv. What was the timeframe and method² for submission:-</i> <i>v. The type of checking and verification that was routinely conducted for this information:-</i> <i>vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i> <i>vii. Other relevant information³:-</i> 																																														
<p><i>Scientific Observers</i></p>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. The percentage of the SBT catch and effort observed and the total number of days that observers were actually deployed for in the three previous seasons for each sector (e.g. longline, purse seine, commercial charter fleet, domestic fleet). The unit of effort should be hooks, sets and tows for longline, purse seine and towing respectively:-</i> <table border="1" data-bbox="403 1010 1337 1249"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)</th> <th colspan="2">Sector 1</th> <th rowspan="2">Obs. days deployed</th> <th colspan="2">Sector 2</th> <th rowspan="2">Obs. days deployed</th> <th colspan="2">Sector 3</th> <th rowspan="2">Obs. days deployed</th> </tr> <tr> <th>% effort obs.</th> <th>% catch obs.</th> <th>% effort obs.</th> <th>% catch obs.</th> <th>% effort obs.</th> <th>% catch obs.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>ii. The system used for comparisons between observer data and other catch monitoring data in order to verify the catch data:-</i> <i>iii. Excluding the coverage, specify whether the observer program complied with the CCSBT Scientific Observer Program Standards. If not, describe the non-compliance. Also indicate whether there was any exchange of observers between countries:-</i> <i>iv. What information on ERS was recorded by observers:-</i> <i>v. Who were the observer reports submitted to:-</i> <i>vi. Timeframe for submission of observer reports:-</i> <i>vii. Other relevant information (including plans for further improvement – in particular to reach coverage of 10% of the effort):-</i> 	Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Sector 1		Obs. days deployed	Sector 2		Obs. days deployed	Sector 3		Obs. days deployed	% effort obs.	% catch obs.	% effort obs.	% catch obs.	% effort obs.	% catch obs.																														
Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Sector 1		Obs. days deployed	Sector 2		Obs. days deployed	Sector 3		Obs. days deployed																																						
	% effort obs.	% catch obs.		% effort obs.	% catch obs.		% effort obs.	% catch obs.																																							
<p><i>VMS</i></p> <p><i>The items of "ii" are required in association with the Resolution on establishing</i></p>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Whether a mandatory VMS for SBT vessels that complies with CCSBT's VMS resolution was in operation. If not, provide details of non-compliance and plans for further improvement:-</i> 																																														

<p><i>the CCSBT Vessel Monitoring System</i></p>	<p>ii. <i>For the most recently completed fishing season, specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The number of its flag vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List that were required to report to a National VMS system:-</i> • <i>The number of its flag vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List that actually reported to a National VMS system:-</i> • <i>Reasons for any non-compliance with VMS requirements and action taken by the Member:-</i> • <i>In the event of a technical failure of a vessel's VMS, the vessel's geographical position (latitude and longitude) at the time of failure and the length of time the VMS was inactive should be reported:-</i> • <i>The procedures used for manual reporting in the event of a VMS failure (e.g. "manual position reporting on a 4 hourly basis"):-</i> • <i>A description of any investigations initiated in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of the CCSBT VMS resolution including progress to date and any actions taken:-</i> <p>iii. <i>Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i></p>
<p><i>At-Sea Inspections</i></p>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <p>i. <i>The coverage level of at sea inspections (e.g. % of SBT trips inspected):-</i></p> <p>ii. <i>Other relevant information³:-</i></p>
<p><i>Other (use of masthead cameras etc.)</i></p>	

(e) Report on the review of internal actions and measures taken in relation to the authorised vessel requirements provided at Attachment B, including any punitive and sanction actions taken.

(2) SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring towing of SBT from the fishing ground to the farming area. This should include details of:

- i. *Observation required for towing of SBT (include % coverage):-*
- ii. *Monitoring systems for recording losses of SBT (in particular, SBT mortality):-*

(c) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transferring of SBT from tow cages into farms. This should include details of:

- i. *Inspection/Observation required for transfer of SBT (include % coverage):-*
- ii. *Monitoring system used for recording the quantity of SBT transferred:-*
- iii. *Plans to allow adoption of the stereo video systems for ongoing monitoring:-*

(d) For “b” and “c” above, describe the process used for completing, validating⁴ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Farm Stocking Form, Farm Transfer Form):-

(e) Other relevant information³

(3) SBT Transhipment (in port and at sea)

(a) In accordance with the Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transhipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels, report:

i. The quantities of SBT transhipped at sea and in port during the previous fishing season:-

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped at sea	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped in port

ii. The list of the LSTLVs registered in the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List which have transhipped at sea and in port during the previous fishing season:-

iii. A comprehensive report assessing the content and conclusions of the reports of the observers assigned to carrier vessels which have received at-sea transhipments from their LSTLVs during the previous fishing season:-

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transhipments in port. This should include details of:

- i. Flag State rules for and names of:
 - designated foreign ports where SBT may be transhipped, and
 - foreign ports where in-port transhipments of SBT are prohibited:-
- ii. Flag State inspection requirements for in-port transhipments of SBT (include % coverage):-
- iii. Information sharing with designated Port States:-
- iv. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT transhipped:-
- v. Process for validating⁴ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, Catch Tagging Form):-
- vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-
- vii. Other relevant information³:-

(c) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transhipments at sea. This should include details of:

- i. The rules and processes for authorising transhipments of SBT at sea and methods (in addition to the presence of CCSBT transhipment observers) for checking and verifying the quantities of SBT transhipped:-
- ii. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT transhipped:-
- iii. Process for collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, Catch Tagging Form):-

⁴ Including the class of person who conducts this work (e.g. government official, authorised third party)

iv. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-

v. Other relevant information³:-

(4) Port Inspections of Foreign FVs/CVs with SBT/ SBT Products on Board

This section provides for reporting with respect to the CCSBT's Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port. It should be filled out by Port State Members that have authorised foreign Fishing Vessels/Carrier Vessels carrying SBT or SBT products to enter their designated ports for the purpose of landing and/or transshipment. Only information for landings/transshipments of SBT or SBT products that have NOT been previously landed or transhipped at port should be included in the table below.

i. Provide a list of designated ports into which foreign FVs/ CVs carrying SBT or SBT product may request entry:-

ii. Provide the minimum number of hours of notice required for foreign FVs/CVs carrying SBT or SBT product to request authorisation to enter these designated ports:-

iii. For the most recent whole calendar year, provide information about the number of landing/ transshipment operations that foreign FVs/CVs carrying SBT or SBT product made in port, the number of those landing/ transshipment operations that were inspected, and the number of inspections where infringements of CCSBT's measures were detected:-

Calendar Year	Foreign Flag	No. of Landing/ Transshipment Operations (that occurred)	No. of Landing/ Transshipment Operations Inspected	No. of Landing/ Transshipment Operations where an Infringement of CCSBT's Measures was Detected
	TOTAL NUMBER			

(5) Landings of Domestic Product (from both fishing vessels and farms)

(a) Specify the approximate percentage of the annual SBT catch that was landed as domestic product.

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring domestic landings of SBT. This should include details of:

i. Rules for designated ports of landing of SBT:-

ii. Inspections required for landings of SBT (including % coverage):-

iii. Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being landed as a different species:-

iv. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT landed:-

v. Process for validating⁴ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, and depending on circumstances, Catch Tagging Form):-

vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-

vii. Other relevant information³:-

(6) SBT Exports

(a)

i. Specify the quantity of the domestic catch that was exported and provide an estimate of the total quantity of the domestic SBT catch (weight in tonnes to 1 decimal place) that was retained within the country/fishing entity (i.e. the quantity can be estimated by subtracting the total export from domestic catch) during each of the last 3 full calendar years to each country/fishing entity. All weights provided in this table should be net weights, not whole weights.

Calendar Year ⁵	Estimate of retained within the country/fishing entity (Domestic catch-Export)	SBT Exported to							
		Country / Fishing Entity 1	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

ii. Specify the quantity of imported catch that was re-exported

Calendar Year	SBT Re-exported to							
	Country / Fishing Entity 1	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring exports of SBT (including of landings directly from the vessel to the foreign importing port). This should include details of:

- i. Inspections required for export of SBT (including % coverage):-
- ii. Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being exported as a different species:-
- iii. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT exported:-
- iv. Process for validating⁴ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form and depending on circumstances, Catch Tagging Form or Re-export/Export after landing of domestic product Form):-
- v. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-
- vi. Other relevant information³:-

⁵ “Calendar year” refers to the calendar year of the (re-)export date

(7) SBT Imports

(a) Specify the total quantity of SBT (weight in tonnes to 1 decimal place) imported during each of the last 3 full calendar years from each country/fishing entity. All weights provided in this table should be net weights, not whole weights.

Calendar Year ⁵	SBT Imported from								
	Country / Fishing Entity 1	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring imports of SBT. This should include details of:

- i. Rules for designating specific ports for the import of SBT:-
- ii. Inspections required for imports of SBT (including % coverage):-
- iii. Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being imported as a different species:-
- iv. Process for checking and collecting CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form and depending on circumstances, Re-export/Export after landing of domestic product Form):-
- v. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-
- vi. Other relevant information³:-

(8) SBT Markets

(a) Describe any activities targeted at points in the supply chain between landing and the market:-

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring of SBT at markets (e.g. voluntary or mandatory requirements for certain documentation and/or presence of tags, and monitoring or audit of compliance with such requirements):-

(c) Other relevant information³

(9) Other

Description of any other MCS systems of relevance.

III. Additional Reporting Requirements

(1) Coverage and Type of CDS Audit undertaken

As per paragraph 5.9 of the CDS Resolution, specify details on the level of coverage and type of audit undertaken, in accordance with 5.8⁶ of the Resolution, and the level of compliance.

(2) Ecologically Related Species

(a) Reporting requirements in relation to implementation of the 2008 ERS Recommendation:

- i. Specify whether each of the following plans/guidelines have been implemented, and if not, specify the action that has been taken towards implementing each of these plans/guidelines:-*
 - International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catches of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries:*
 - International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks:*
 - FAO Guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing operations:*
- ii. Specify whether all current binding and recommendatory measures⁷ aimed at the protection of ecologically related species⁸ from fishing of the following tuna RFMOs are being complied with. If not, specify which measures are not being complied with and the progress that is being made towards compliance:-*
 - IOTC, when fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*
 - WCPFC, when fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*
 - ICCAT, when fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*
- iii. Specify whether data is being collected and reported on ecologically related species in accordance with the requirements of the following tuna RFMOs. If data are not being collected and reported in accordance with these requirements, specify which measures are not being complied with and the progress that is being made towards compliance:-*
 - CCSBT⁹:*
 - IOTC, for fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*
 - WCPFC, for fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*
 - ICCAT, for fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*

⁶ Paragraph 5.8 of the CDS Resolution specifies that "Members and Cooperating Non-Members shall undertake an appropriate level of audit, including inspections of vessels, landings, and where possible markets, to the extent necessary to validate the information contained in the CDS documentation."

⁷ Relevant measures of these RFMOs can be found at: http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch_mitigation.php.

⁸ Including seabirds, sea turtles and sharks.

⁹ Current CCSBT requirements are those in the Scientific Observer Program Standards and those necessary for completing the template for the annual report to the ERSWG.

(b) Specify the number of observed ERS interactions including mortalities, and describe the methods of scaling used to produce estimates of total mortality (information should be provided by species – including the scientific name – wherever possible¹⁰):

	Sector 1 (please name)		Sector 2 (please name)	
Most Recent Calendar Year (please specify)				
Total number of hooks (shots for PS)				
Percentage of hooks (shots) observed				
	Total number of observed interactions/mortality			
	Interactions	Mortality	Interactions	Mortality
Seabirds				
Sharks				
Sea Turtles				
Previous Calendar Year (please specify)				
Total number of hooks (shots for PS)				
Percentage of hooks (shots) observed				
	Total number of observed interactions/mortality			
	Interactions	Mortality	Interactions	Mortality
Seabirds				
Sharks				
Sea Turtles				

(c) Mitigation – describe the current mitigation requirements:

(d) Monitoring usage of bycatch mitigation measures:

- i. Describe the methods being used to monitor compliance with bycatch mitigation measures (e.g. types of port inspections conducted and other monitoring and surveillance programs used to monitor compliance). Include details of the level of coverage (e.g. proportion of vessels inspected each year):

- ii. Describe the type of information that is collected on mitigation measures as part of compliance programmes for SBT vessels:

(3) Historical SBT Catch (retained and non-retained)

Specify the best estimate (weight and number as available) of the historical fishing amounts of SBT for each sector (e.g. commercial longline, commercial purse seine, commercial charter fleet, domestic fleet, recreational) in the table below. The table should include the most recently completed fishing season. Figures should be provided for both retained SBT and non-retained SBT. For longline and recreational, “Retained SBT” includes SBT retained on vessel and “Non-Retained SBT” includes those returned to the water. For farming, “Retained SBT” includes SBT stocked to farming cages and “Non-Retained SBT” includes towing mortalities. If the number of individuals is known but the value in tonnes is unknown, enter the number of individuals in square brackets (e.g. [250]). Table cells should not be left empty. If the value is zero, enter “0”. It is recognised that for some sectors, the information requested in this table may not yet be available. Therefore, if the value is unknown, enter “?”. However, estimates are preferred over unknown entries. Cells containing estimates with a high degree of uncertainty should be shaded in light grey. A description of any estimation methods should be provided below the table.

¹⁰ Where species specific information is available, insert additional line(s) for each species below the relevant Seabird, Sharks, and/or Sea Turtles sub headings.

Report of CCSBT 21

53. The action points shown in Table 1 were agreed by Members, noting that within the table, “External” refers to non-Member catches, while “Internal” relates to Members’ attributable catches.

Table 1: Action points in relation to implementing the Attributable SBT Catch.

	External	Internal	ESC work schedule
2015	The EC initiates discussion on the principles and process for taking account of non-member catch in the 2018-20 TAC period. The ESC, CC and Members to undertake analyses to provide estimates of non-member catch. Commission market analyses on significant markets to contribute to estimating non-member catch.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individual Member research on applicable sources of mortality and report back to ESC and CC for discussion and review. 2. Members shall endeavour to set allowances to commence for 2016-17 quota years for all sources of attributable mortality based on best estimates and notify other Members by CCSBT22. If Members can't they will notify CCSBT22 and explain why they are unable to and set a date by which they can set the allowance. 3. The EC initiate discussion and agreement to a process for dealing with attributable catch within the next quota block (2018-20). 	Collation of information on unreported mortalities and categorising this information in accordance with OM “fleets” (ESC19 Report).
2016	The ESC, CC and Members continue analyses to provide estimates of non-member catch. The EC decides on the adjustment to take account of non-member catch in the 2018-20 TAC period.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EC if necessary continue discussion so as to agree on a process for dealing with attributable catch within the next quota block (2018-20). 2. Individual Members continue research on applicable sources of mortality and report back to the ESC and CC for discussion and review. 	ESC scheduled to run MP to recommend TAC for 2018-2020.
2017	The ESC, CC and Members continue analyses to provide estimates of non-member catch.	Individual Members continue research on applicable sources of mortality & report back to the ESC and CC for discussion review.	ESC scheduled to conduct full stock assessment and the first formal review of MP.
2018		Full implementation of the common definition of attributable catch.	

CCSBT Authorised Vessel Resolution

The flag Members and Co-operating Non-members of the vessels on the record shall:

- a) authorize their FVs to fish for SBT only if they are able to fulfill in respect of these vessels the requirements and responsibilities under the CCSBT Convention and its conservation and management measures;
- b) take necessary measures to ensure that their FVs comply with all the relevant CCSBT conservation and management measures;
- c) take necessary measures to ensure that their FVs on the CCSBT Record keep on board valid certificates of vessel registration and valid authorization to fish and/or tranship;
- d) affirm that if those vessels have record of IUU fishing activities, the owners have provided sufficient evidence demonstrating that they will not conduct such activities any more;
- e) ensure, to the extent possible under domestic law, that the owners and operators of their FVs on the CCSBT Record are not engaged in or associated with fishing activities for SBT conducted by FVs not entered into the CCSBT Record;
- f) take necessary measures to ensure, to the extent possible under domestic law, that the owners of the FVs on the CCSBT Record are citizens or legal entities within the flag Members and Co-operating Non-members so that any control or punitive actions can be effectively taken against them.

Corrective actions policy
Compliance Policy Guideline 3

(revised at the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting – 10-13 October 2016)

1. Introduction

This compliance policy provides direction and guidance to implement Strategy 9.1(ii)¹ of the CCSBT Strategic Plan:

Establish fair, transparent and non-discriminatory procedures for penalties (e.g. payback of overcatch, quota reduction) and incentives to promote compliance.

In this policy all references to the Commission include the Extended Commission, and all references to Members include Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs) of the Commission.

2. Purpose of policy

The purpose of this policy is to bring all Members into compliance with their CCSBT obligations in a way that maintains the stability and cohesion of the Commission. To this end, it sets out a framework to respond to evidence of non-compliance by a Member. The primary response focus is to assist Members to achieve capacity to effectively comply with CCSBT obligations.

3. Guidelines for corrective actions

Non-compliance with Members' obligations can arise due to three main sources:

- administrative failings, including not fully implementing effective systems and processes to support obligations
- failure by Members to take action against non-compliance by fishers, farmers, processors, exporters or importers within their jurisdiction
- deliberate actions by Members to avoid meeting obligations.

The following guidelines will be used to determine the corrective action to be recommended where there is evidence of non-compliance:

1. Catch in excess of the Member's annual or multi-year national catch limit should, in the first instance, be repaid at a ratio of 1:1 over a time period specified by the Commission. Where there are specific aggravating factors a higher ratio of quota payback may be determined.

¹ This corresponds to *Strategy 9.2 Corrective action and remedies* in the draft Compliance Plan.

2. Administrative failings should, in the first instance, be addressed through an agreed programme to correct administrative deficiencies within a specified timeframe.
3. Corrective actions for administrative failings by a developing country Member should focus on capacity building programmes, provided this is effectively targeted at correcting the deficiencies.
4. Corrective actions should take into account relevant aggravating factors such as harm caused to other Members, ongoing non-compliance without good cause (including systematic under-reporting or over-catch over multiple years), or evidence of intent to avoid CCSBT obligations.

4. Decision-making process

Compliance Committee

In considering potential non-compliance and any necessary corrective actions, the Compliance Committee may:

- assess initial evidence of non-compliance
- request the Member to investigate and report back
- if necessary (for instance, where the Member needs assistance or the Committee is not satisfied with the Member's investigation), recommend an independent investigation which may include an audit or market review
- review evidence of non-compliance on the basis of the reports received
- consider any remedies suggested by the Member
- prepare a report to Commission, setting out findings, any remedies already agreed with the Member, and any recommended further corrective actions based on this policy guideline.

The Member will be provided with an opportunity to suggest corrective actions or remedies to improve their compliance with CCSBT obligations. Members will seek the support of the Compliance Committee for their suggested course of action.

Following consideration of the Member's suggestions, the Compliance Committee may agree to the Member's suggestion or recommend corrective actions for consideration by the Commission. The Compliance Committee report to the Commission may include majority and minority views.

Commission

The Commission will:

- consider the Compliance Committee report, and
- negotiate an outcome (corrective action) with the Member.

5. Corrective actions list

Depending on the particular circumstances and degree of non-compliance, corrective actions recommended by the Compliance Committee may include:

1. *Compliance assistance/capacity building programmes*
 - Skills training—e.g. for observers, compliance officers or validators
 - Systems development – e.g. technical or financial assistance to establish or improve operating systems and procedures
 - Analytical assistance – e.g. to improve monitoring of trade flow of SBT from catching phase to the market place
 - Technology purchase – e.g. VMS, data recording and transmission from fishing vessels
2. *Quota pay back*
3. *Quota reductions in national catch allocations*
4. *Increased monitoring requirements*
 - Placement of observers
 - Increased inspection requirements
 - Increased VMS reporting frequency
 - Restrictions on transshipment or landings
5. *Public disclosure*

The Executive Secretary shall maintain on the public side of the CCSBT website, a record of any instances of non-compliance with Members' allocation of the global SBT TAC, and the corrective action(s) that was/were taken by the relevant Member in response to that non-compliance.
6. *Trade or market restrictions consistent with international law*

6. Roles and responsibilities under this Policy

<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibility to:</i>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve policy • Consider Compliance Committee's recommendations • Initiate investigations • Determine corrective actions
Compliance Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor Member compliance • Assess evidence of non-compliance and consider Members' views • Consider Members' suggestions for corrective actions • If necessary, recommend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ independent investigation ○ quota payback timeframe ○ quota payback greater than 1:1 ○ corrective actions. • Review policy and recommend any revisions.

Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Place policy and reports on website
Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Investigate evidence of national non-compliance• Respond to evidence of non-compliance from national or independent investigations

7. Policy review

This policy is to be reviewed every three years from the date of agreement. The Commission may direct a review at any earlier time. A Member may request an earlier review. The request, setting out the reasons for the review, must be submitted to the annual meeting of the Compliance Committee.

Attachment 6

Draft Resolution on the Implementation of a CCSBT Catch Documentation Scheme

(revised at the Twenty-xxx- Annual meeting: xx October 20xx)

Concerned that any illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna has a negative impact on the status of the stock;

Referring to the principles adopted to guide the development of a Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) at CCSBT12 in 2005 and the ‘Resolution on the implementation of a CDS to record all catch of Southern Bluefin Tuna regardless of whether the Southern Bluefin tuna were traded’, adopted at CCSBT 13 in 2006;

Noting the need for Members and Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs) to provide for the traceability and validation of legitimate SBT product flow from catch to at least the point of first sale in domestic and export markets;

Bearing in mind the goal of trying to achieve harmonisation of Catch Documentation Schemes across Regional Fisheries Management Organisations;

Emphasising that a CDS must be applied consistently and comprehensively across all sectors of the global SBT fishery to accurately confirm the SBT catch by each Member and CNM;

Recognising that a CDS may be operated as either a paper-based CDS or web-based electronic CDS (eCDS);

In accordance with Article 8.3(b) of the Convention on the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna, the Extended Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) adopts the following measure to monitor compliance with the Commission’s conservation measures:

1. General Provisions and Application

- 1.1 Throughout this Resolution the terms “documentation”, “Documents” and “Certificates” refer to either:
- paper documentation, Documents and Certificates, or
 - Electronic Catch Tagging Certificates used domestically by Members or CNMs in replacement of paper based Catch Tagging Certificates, or
 - Documents and Certificates that exist electronically and that were generated by a web-based CCSBT eCDS.

The attached Appendices 1-3 shall be considered part of this CDS Resolution.

- 1.2 Throughout this Resolution, the term “offloading” is used to describe the *initial* physical off(un)-loading of SBT product(s) from a farm (*i.e.* harvesting) or a fishing vessel, irrespective of whether the offloading results in a landing in port. Therefore, landings of domestic product¹, or landings into cold-

¹ The term ‘landing of domestic product’ means landing of SBT into the territory of a Member or CNM caught by a vessel flagged to that Member or CNM or on the register of fishing vessels of that Member or CNM.

storage facilities or at an export destination, transshipments and harvesting SBT from farms, are all types of offloading in terms of this Resolution.

- 1.3 All Members and CNMs shall implement the CCSBT CDS for Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) to document the movement of all SBT as outlined in this Resolution. The CCSBT CDS incorporates CCSBT CDS documentation and tagging of SBT.
- 1.4 For all offloadings of SBT and/or transshipments, landings of domestic product¹, exports, imports and re-exports under the jurisdiction of a Member or CNM or Other State/Fishing Entity Cooperating in the CDS (OSEC²), all SBT shall be accompanied by a paper Document described in section 3 of this Resolution. There is no waiver of this requirement. However, the exportation/import of fish parts other than the meat³ (*i.e.* **[[head]]**, eyes, roe, guts, tails) may be allowed without the Document.
- 1.5 Transfers of SBT into and between farms under the jurisdiction of a Member or CNM shall be documented on the **[[Farm Stocking Certificate]]** and Farm Transfer Certificate as applicable.
- 1.6 Members or CNMs that prohibit the sale of fish caught by recreational fishers may exempt their recreational fisheries from the requirements of the CCSBT CDS.
- 1.7 The Commission shall request the cooperation of appropriate authorities of States other than Members and CNMs of the Extended Commission that are involved in catching, landing, transferring and/or farming of SBT in the implementation of this Resolution.
- 1.8 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall not permit the offloading, landing as domestic product, transshipment, import, export and/or re-export of SBT caught by vessels not authorised to catch SBT and (if SBT farming is conducted under their jurisdiction) the transfer of SBT to or between, and harvest of SBT from, farms not authorised to farm SBT.
- 1.9 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall not permit whole⁴ SBT to be offloaded, landed as domestic product, transhipped, exported, imported or re-exported without a tag, except that:
 - 1.9.1 in the case of farming operations, the SBT may be offloaded without a tag provided a tag is attached within 30 hours of kill;
 - 1.9.2 in exceptional circumstances, where a vessel on the CCSBT Record of Authorised Vessels does not have sufficient tags on board the vessel, the tag may be attached at offloading;

² The term 'Other State/Fishing Entity Cooperating in the CDS' will be abbreviated to 'OSEC' within this Resolution and means a State/Fishing Entity that has expressed its commitment, in writing, to cooperate with this Resolution.

³ Any meat separated from fish parts is considered to be meat in this context.

⁴ In this Resolution, a SBT is considered to remain whole despite cleaning, gilling and gutting, freezing, and/or removing fins, operculae (gill plates/covers) and tail and/or removing the head or parts of the head (*i.e.* whole product types include at least RD, GG, GGO, GGT, DR, DRO or DRT). A SBT is no longer considered to be whole if it has undergone processes such as filleting (FIL) or loining (LOI).

- 1.9.3 in exceptional circumstances, where a vessel catches SBT as unexpected bycatch and has no or insufficient tags on board, the tag may be attached at offloading.
- 1.10 In exceptional circumstances, where a tag becomes accidentally detached/broken and cannot be reattached, or is broken and its number cannot be read, then a replacement tag shall be attached as soon as possible, and no later than the time of offloading.
- 1.11 Members and CNMs shall report any exceptional circumstances referred to in 1.9.2, 1.9.3 or 1.10 to the Executive Secretary within 7 days of the offloading. The report shall provide details of the exceptional circumstances, the number of SBT tagged and for 1.10, the old (where known) and new tag number(s).
- 1.12 Members and CNMs shall require that tags be retained on whole SBT to at least the first point of sale for landings of domestic product, and shall encourage the retention of tags on whole fish thereafter.

2. Registers Required

- 2.1 A record of farms is to be established and maintained by the Executive Secretary to identify authorised farms.
- 2.2 A record of fishing vessels, maintained by the Executive Secretary, identifies all authorised fishing vessels.
- 2.3 CCSBT CDS Documents that record information for fishing vessels and/or farms not included on the above-mentioned authorised registers shall not be considered valid Documents for the purposes of this scheme.

3. Documents and Information Required

- 3.1 The CCSBT CDS Documents are :
 - 3.1.1 **[[Farm Stocking Certificate (FSC)]]** – records information on the catch, towing and any associated mortalities of SBT during the farm stocking process.
 - 3.1.2 Farm Transfer Certificate (FTC) – records information on the transfers of SBT between farms
 - 3.1.3 **[[Catch/Harvest and Export Certificate (CHEC) – records information on the catch/harvest, offloading, landing, and transshipment, export, and import of all SBT]].**
 - 3.1.4 Catch Tagging Certificate (CTC) – records information on individual SBT tagged as part of the CDS
 - 3.1.5 **[[Export Certificate (ExC) – records information on SBT already recorded on a Catch/Harvest and Export Certificate and any preceding ExC that is, either in full or part, then exported or re-exported.]]**
- 3.2 The information to be contained in the CCSBT CDS documentation referred to in 3.1, along with associated instruction sheets, is included in Appendix 1.

- 3.3 Once approved CDS Documents are adopted, only the following changes, may be made to produce a Member-specific version⁵:
- minimal modifications, such as the addition of translations or formatting;
 - for the Combined Catch/Harvest and Export Certificate:
 - Removal of the Transshipment sub-section if that Member does not conduct transshipments;
 - Removal of the Export and Import Sections if that Member will not use the Combined Catch/Harvest and Export Certificate for exporting SBT.

No information field may be omitted from the standard Documents presented in Appendix 1, except where the field is not applicable.

- 3.4 Any CDS documentation modified, as described in 3.3, shall be provided to the Executive Secretary immediately for placement on the CCSBT website and for]] distribution to other Members, CNMs, and Non-Members known to be involved in the landing, transshipment, import, export, or re-export of SBT.
- 3.5 Significant amendments to CDS Documents and their content may be made only with the agreement of the Commission at its annual meeting based on recommendations from the CCSBT Compliance Committee.
- 3.6 CCSBT CDS Documents must be uniquely numbered.

4. Amendment or Cancellation of CDS Documents

- 4.1 If a CDS Certificate is amended, copies of any amended Certificates must be submitted to the Executive Secretary by both the issuer and the receiver of the Certificate as part of their quarterly CDS submissions. Furthermore:
- 4.1.1 amendments to non-importer sections may only be made by the issuing Member/CNM, and amendments to importer sections may only be made by the importing Member/CNM; and
 - 4.1.2 any amended Certificates must be re-certified and potentially re-validated⁶ (by issuer/ importer as applicable).
- 4.2 CDS Certificates may be cancelled by the issuing Member/CNM providing that if Certificates are cancelled after being validated:
- a) a replacement Certificate is issued, certified and validated (as applicable) by the issuing Member/CNM, and
 - b) where the SBT are being re-/exported, replacement Certificates shall be certified by the importing Member/CNM; and
- 4.2.1 a list of cancelled Certificates, together with the Certificate number of any associated replacement Certificates shall be submitted to the Executive Secretary by the issuing Member/CNM as part of its quarterly CDS submission; and

⁵ With the exception of additions to the Catch Tagging Certificate.

⁶ Any Certificates that are amended and have an associated validation section need to be re-validated.

- 4.2.2 importer-certified replacement Certificates shall be submitted to the Executive Secretary by the importing Member/CNM as part of its quarterly CDS submission.

5. Tagging

- 5.1 Members and CNMs shall require that an SBT tag be attached to each SBT at the time of kill except:
- 5.1.1 If the SBT is to be processed to a non-whole⁴ state immediately after kill and before offloading, a tag does not need to be attached to the SBT, but a tag number must be allocated to that SBT so that the tag number and details of that SBT can be recorded on a Catch Tagging Form;
 - 5.1.2 in the case of farming operations, the tag may be attached within 30 hours of kill;
 - 5.1.3 in exceptional circumstances, where a vessel on the CCSBT Record of Authorised Vessels does not have sufficient tags on board, the tag may be attached at offloading;
 - 5.1.4 in exceptional circumstances, where a vessel catches SBT as unexpected bycatch and has no, or insufficient, tags on board, the tag may be attached at offloading.
- 5.2 As outlined at 3.1.4, a Catch Tagging Certificate records relevant tagging information for individual SBT. The Catch Tagging Certificate shall be filled in as soon as practicable after the time of kill. Length and weight measurements shall be conducted before the SBT is frozen. Where measurements cannot be accurately made on board the vessel, they may be made at the time of offloading, provided the measurements and the associated Catch Tagging Certificate are filled in before any further transfer of the SBT.
- 5.3 Completed Catch Tagging Certificates shall be provided to the Flag Members and CNMs which shall provide the information in the Catch Tagging Certificate to the Executive Secretary in an electronic format on a quarterly basis.
- 5.4 [[A copy of a completed Catch Tagging Certificate shall be attached to the relevant Catch/ Harvest and Export Certificate (CHEC), and Export Certificate (ExC).]]
- 5.5 A tagging programme shall meet the minimum procedural and information standards set out in Appendix 2.
- 5.6 Members and CNMs shall prohibit the unauthorised use of SBT tags.

6. Validation

- 6.1 The CCSBT CDS documentation must be validated as applicable:
- 6.1.1 [[for Farm Stocking Certificates,]] by an official of the Flag Member or CNM that holds the national quota allocation against which the SBT were taken;
 - 6.1.2 for Catch/ Harvest and Export Certificates, by an official of the Flag Member or CNM of the catching/harvesting vessel or, when the fishing

vessel is operating under a charter arrangement, by a competent authority or institution of the chartering Member or CNM;

- 6.1.3 for all exports of SBT, by an official of the exporting Member or CNM; and
 - 6.1.4 for all re-exports of SBT, by an official of the re-exporting Member, CNM, or OSEC.
- 6.2 The authority to validate CDS Documents may be delegated to an authorised person by an official of the relevant State/Fishing Entity [[only when such person does not have a substantial interest in SBT fisheries and its products.]] Members, CNMs and OSECs who utilise delegated person/s shall submit a certified copy of such delegation/s to the Executive Secretary. The individual who certifies a CCSBT CDS Document shall not be the same person who validates the Document.
- 6.3 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall provide to the Executive Secretary information on validation (including type of validation, name of the organisation which validates the Documents, name and signature of officials who validate the Documents, sample impression of stamp or seal, and a list of all persons holding delegated authority to validate CCSBT CDS documentation prior to those officials and persons exercising the authority). Members, CNMs and OSECs shall inform the Executive Secretary of any changes no later than 15 days from the date the change(s) occur(s).
- 6.4 The Executive Secretary will maintain the information specified in 6.3, promptly publish an updated history of validation authorities on the private area of the CCSBT web site, and provide access to this history to all Members, CNMs and OSECs.
- 6.5 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall not validate any CCSBT CDS documentation referred to in 3.1 that is not complete, has obviously incorrect information, or has not been validated as required by this Resolution.
- 6.6 [[Members, CNMs ~~operating Non-Members~~ and OSECs shall not validate any Catch Harvest and Export Certificate (CHEC) unless they have viewed seen sufficient evidence to confirm the veracity of the 'Measured and Verified Landed Weights' recorded on the CHEC.]]
- 6.7 No Member or CNM or OSEC shall accept any SBT for offloading, transshipment, landing of domestic product, export, import, or re-export where any or all required Documents do not accompany the relevant consignment of SBT, where required fields of information required on the Certificate are not completed, or where the Certificate has not been validated as required by this Resolution.
- 6.8 Full or partial consignments of untagged whole SBT must not be validated or accepted for offloading, transshipment, landing of domestic product, export (including export after landing of domestic product), import or re-export.
- 6.9 Members and CNMs shall undertake an appropriate level of audit, including inspections of vessels, offloadings, and where possible markets, to the extent necessary to validate the information contained in the CDS documentation.

- 6.10 Members and CNMs shall include in their annual review of SBT fisheries, details on the level of coverage and type of audit undertaken, in accordance with 6.9, and the level of compliance.

7. Exchange of Information and Confidentiality of Data

- 7.1 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall retain all original CCSBT CDS Documents (or scanned electronic copies of the original Documents) received by them for a minimum of 3 years after the most recent signed date on the Document. Members, CNMs and OSECs shall also retain a copy of any CCSBT CDS Documents (or scanned electronic copies of the original Documents) issued by them for a minimum of 3 years after the most recent issuing State/Entity signed date on the Document. Copies of these CDS Documents except Catch Tagging Certificates⁷ and those CD Documents not already submitted to the Executive Secretary via a web-based eCDS system, shall be forwarded⁸ to the Executive Secretary on a quarterly basis.

A list of any Documents (including the Document number, Document type and intended export destination – if any) that were cancelled each month shall also be forwarded⁸ to the Executive Secretary on a quarterly basis.

- 7.2 The Executive Secretary shall compile the raw data from CDS documentation into an electronic database. The Executive Secretary shall ensure the confidentiality of the raw data in its database and release to any State/Fishing Entity only the raw data relating to the CCSBT CDS Documents it validated and any associated pre-requisite Documents that it is required to receive under this Resolution. If a State/Fishing Entity requests CCSBT CDS Documents relating to another State/Fishing Entity, the Executive Secretary may release those data only with the latter's agreement.
- 7.3 The Executive Secretary shall report to the Extended Commission on and circulate to all Members and CNMs the data collected by the CCSBT CDS each year by 1 June for the period of 1 January - 31 December of the preceding year and by 1 December for the period of 1 January - 30 June of the current year. The information to be contained in the reports is specified in **Appendix 3**. The Executive Secretary shall provide an electronic copy of the report only to a designated authority of each Member and CNM.
- 7.4 The Executive Secretary will post on the public area of the CCSBT web site a subset of the report comprising:
- Catch related details of:
 - Flag State/Fishing Entity;
 - Harvest year;
 - Verified landed net weight⁹; Estimated whole weight (calculated by applying a conversion factor to the verified net weight);

⁷ Requirements to provide information in the Catch Tagging Certificate are set out in 5.3.

⁸ Either as a copy of the original paper Certificate or in electronic format containing all the information in the Certificates.

⁹ Calculated by adjusting the estimated net weight in section 3 of the CHEC with the verified weights at section 6 of the CHEC.

- Initial export details (excluding re-exports) of:
 - Flag State/ Fishing Entity;
 - Destination State/ Fishing Entity¹⁰;
 - Net weight exported;
 - Copies of all modified CDS Documents provided in accordance with paragraph 3.4.
- 7.5 On request by the Scientific Committee, Compliance Committee, or other subsidiary body of the Commission, the Executive Secretary shall, with the approval of the Commission, provide to that body data collected by the CCSBT CDS more frequently or at a greater level of detail than specified in 7.3.
- 7.6 The Executive Secretary shall analyse the data provided in 7.1 and notify the relevant Member(s) or CNM(s) of any identified discrepancies.

8. Verification of CDS Documentation

- 8.1 Each Member and CNM shall ensure that its competent authorities, or other authorised individual or institution, take steps to identify each consignment of SBT landed as domestic product in, imported into or exported or re-exported from its territory and examine the validated CCSBT CDS Documents for each consignment of SBT. These competent authorities, or authorised individuals or institutions, may also examine the content of the consignment to verify the information contained in the CCSBT CDS Document and in related Documents and, where necessary, shall carry out verifications with the operators concerned.
- 8.2 Each Member and CNM shall review information, and investigate and resolve any irregularities identified in relation to their information in the CDS reports, including any discrepancies identified during the comparison of data from the Executive Secretary. Among other matters, Members and CNMs shall cross-check the report provided by the Executive Secretary under 7.3 using information available to it.
- 8.3 Each Member, CNM and OSEC shall, as soon as practicable, identify to the Executive Secretary and relevant Members, CNMs and OSECs, any consignments of SBT where there are:
 - 8.3.1 doubts about the information contained in any associated CDS documentation; or
 - 8.3.2 incomplete, missing or unvalidated CCSBT CDS documentation.
- 8.4 Each Member and CNM shall co-operate and take all necessary steps with relevant authorities, and within domestic law, to review, investigate and resolve any concerns identified in 8.1 and 8.2, and notify the Executive Secretary of the outcome of any such action for inclusion in its report to the Commission.

¹⁰ For Export Certificates where the destination differs from the point of import, the import State/ Fishing Entity will be used.

- 8.5 The Compliance Committee will consider the summary information compiled by the Executive Secretary in 7.3 and 7.4, including any irregularities and anomalies identified and the outcome of any investigations notified under 8.3.
- 8.6 The Commission, may, on the recommendation of the Compliance Committee, consider any action as may be required in relation to the findings and outcomes of any verification investigation. Such action may be, but is not limited to, a review of this or other relevant compliance measures.
- 8.7 Members, CNMs and OSECs shall cooperate to ensure that CDS Documents are not forged and/or do not contain misinformation.

9. Access to and Security of Information

- 9.1 Subject to each Member's, CNM's and OSEC's national law, the information produced from the CCSBT CDS shall be confidential and may only be used in support of CCSBT purposes or for any other purpose agreed by the Commission.
- 9.2 Where necessary, in support of catch verification procedures, Members, CNMs and OSECs agree to exchange the necessary supporting information and, where relevant, evidence as may be necessary to verify the integrity of the flow of CDS information and to reconcile any discrepancies.

10. Implementation and Review

- 10.1 ~~[[The current revision of this Resolution will be effective from enter into force on the commencement of the first fishing season following 1 January 2018⁷⁰. The existing CDS Resolution applies until this time.]]~~
[[NOTE: Consider transitional period aligned with fishing seasons.]]
- 10.2 The Compliance Committee will review the operation of this Resolution on an annual basis to identify any implementation issues, strengths, and weaknesses, and to recommend options to improve this Resolution and its supporting procedures at the Extended Commission meeting. This review will include any concerns associated with the operation of the CDS Documents, and the operation of an eCDS (compared to a paper-based system) if one has already been introduced, breakage or loss of tags and the extent of the use of exemptions in 1.9, 1.10 and 1.11 as reported by Members and CNMs to the Executive Secretary.
- 10.3 The Executive Secretary will monitor available technology associated with electronic documentation and fish tags to assist the Compliance Committee in its reviews.

Appendix 2

Minimum Procedural and Information Standards for CCSBT Member and Cooperating Non-Member (CNM) Tagging Programmes

General requirements of an SBT tagging system

1. As outlined in sections 1.8 and 1.9 of the Resolution, the SBT tag shall remain on each individual fish while the fish carcass remains whole. A fish remains whole despite cleaning, gilling and gutting, freezing, and/or removing fins, operculae (gill plates/covers) and tail and/or removing the head or parts of the head. A fish is no longer considered to be whole if it has undergone processes such as filleting or loining.
2. Members and CNMs shall take steps to ensure that SBT tags cannot be reused.

Specifications for SBT tags

3. Each SBT tag shall meet the following minimum standards:
 - a. have a unique pre-recorded tag number in an easily readable form;
 - b. have a CCSBT logo/ identifier;
 - c. tag numbering shall include a unique flag state identifier and a fishing year identifier (e.g. NZ-2008-000001);
 - d. be able to be securely fastened to SBT;
 - e. be non-reusable, tamper-proof and secure from counterfeiting or replication;
 - f. be able to withstand at least negative sixty (60) degrees Celsius temperatures, salt water and rough-handling, and remain flexible and not become brittle in these conditions; and
 - g. be food safe.
4. Purchase of standard, centralised CCSBT tags can be arranged annually from the Executive Secretary. Members/CNMs that do not purchase and use these centralised CCSBT tags shall provide a colour photograph of the type of tag they are using. These photographs should be in sufficient resolution to clearly show any tag labels and logos, and any other security features incorporated as part of the tag. The Executive Secretary will post these photographs on the public area of the CCSBT web site.

General requirements for tag related information

5. Members and CNMs shall record the distribution of SBT tags to entities they authorise to fish for, or farm, SBT.

6. In relation to each tag, Members and CNMs shall ensure their vessels and operators, and the relevant authorities have reporting procedures and formats allowing the collection of the required tagging information which must include month, area, and method of capture, and weight and length for each SBT.
7. All requirements of the CCSBT CDS Resolution outlined in Sections 4 – 10 of this Resolution apply to tagging documentation and information for Members and CNMs implementing tagging programmes.

Draft Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing

(Adopted at the Twenty Third Annual Meeting – 10-14 October 2016)

The Extended Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna,

Recalling that the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 46/215 calls for a global moratorium on large-scale high seas driftnet fishing;

Noting recent evidence that a number of vessels continue to engage in high seas driftnet fishing affecting the southern bluefin tuna fishery;

Concerned that any vessel fishing with large-scale driftnets on the high seas in a manner which can reasonably be expected to result in the catching, taking or harvesting of southern bluefin tuna is likely to undermine the effectiveness of CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures;

Agrees in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of Article 8, that

1. The use of large-scale driftnets¹ on the high seas in a manner which can reasonably be expected to result in the catching, taking or harvesting of southern bluefin tuna is prohibited.
2. Members and CNMs shall take all measures necessary to prohibit their fishing vessels from using large-scale driftnets in contravention of paragraph 1.
3. Nothing in this resolution shall prevent Members from applying more stringent measures to regulate the use of large-scale driftnets.

¹ 'Large-scale driftnets' are defined as gillnets or other nets or a combination of nets that are more than 2.5 kilometres in length whose purpose is to enmesh, entrap, or entangle fish by drifting on the surface of, or in, the water column.

3.3 IUU Vessel List (Resolution)

Title: Resolution on Establishing a List of Vessels Presumed to have Carried Out Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing Activities for Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT)

Link: https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_IUU%20Vessel_List.pdf

Notes: This Resolution includes Annexes I to IV. Annex I includes a list of CCSBT IUU vessel definitions; Annex II lists prohibited or non-compliant fishing gears; Annex III is a CCSBT Reporting Form for SBT Illegal Activity, and Annex IV lists the information fields that need to be included in any draft, provisional or current CCSBT IUU Vessel Lists.

3.3 IUU Vessel List	
Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
i. Members and CNMs shall transmit every year to the Executive Secretary at least 14 weeks before the annual meeting of the CC, a list of vessels presumed to be carrying out SBT IUU fishing activities during the current and/or previous year, accompanied by the suitably documented supporting evidence concerning the presumption of SBT IUU fishing activity. ¹	1. Submit a list of alleged IUU vessels and supporting evidence electronically to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the Executive Secretary at least 14 weeks before the annual meeting of the Compliance Committee, and the Flag State/Fishing Entity concerned either at the same time as submitted to the Executive Secretary, or earlier. 2. Operating systems and processes established and implemented to effectively monitor the activities of any vessels included on the circulated Draft CCSBT IUU Vessel List.
ii. Before or at the same time as transmitting a list of presumed SBT IUU vessels to the Executive Secretary, the Member or CNM shall notify the relevant Flag State or entity, either directly or through the Executive Secretary ¹ , of a vessel's inclusion on this list, and provide that flag State or entity with a copy of the pertinent suitably documented information.	
iii. Upon receipt of the Draft IUU Vessel List, Members and CNMs shall closely monitor the vessels included in the Draft IUU Vessel List in order to determine their activities and possible changes of name, flag and/or registered owner.	

¹ Using the CCSBT Reporting Form for SBT Illegal Activity included at Annex III of the Resolution

3.3 IUU Vessel List	
Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
iv. Members, CNMs and NCNMs with vessels included on the Draft IUU and/or current CCSBT IUU Lists will transmit any comments to the Executive Secretary at least 6 weeks before the annual CC meeting, including suitably documented information showing that the listed vessels have not fished for SBT in a way that undermines CCSBT conservation and management measures.	1. Members/ CNMs with vessels on the Draft CCSBT IUU List to submit comments and suitably documented information electronically to the Executive Secretary at least 6 weeks before the annual meeting of the Compliance Committee as appropriate.
v. All Members, CNMs, and any NCNMs concerned may at any time submit to the Executive Secretary any additional information, which might be relevant for the establishment of the CCSBT IUU Vessel list.	
vi. Upon adopting the new CCSBT IUU Vessel List, Members, CNMs and NCNMs with vessels on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List are requested to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Notify the owner of the vessel of its inclusion on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List and the consequences that result from being included on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List, and b. Take all the necessary measures to eliminate these IUU fishing activities, including, if necessary, the withdrawal of the registration or the fishing licenses of these vessels, and to inform the Extended Commission of the measures taken in this respect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members/ CNMs with vessels included on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List should have operating systems and processes in place to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Immediately notify the owner of the vessel's IUU listing and advise of and take any appropriate punitive and sanction actions consistent with the Flag State's domestic laws and regulations; and b. Inform the Extended Commission of any measures taken. 2. Operating systems and processes established and implemented to identify, monitor and communicate with as appropriate, vessels listed on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List in order to:
vii. Members and CNMs shall take all necessary non-discriminatory measures subject to, and in accordance with their applicable laws and regulations, international law and each Member's/ CNM's international obligations to:	

3.3 IUU Vessel List

Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remove or withdraw any SBT fishing authorisations for the vessel or impose alternative sanctions consistent with domestic laws and regulations of the Flag State; b. Ensure that the fishing vessels, flying their flag do not assist in any way, engage in fishing processing operations or participate in any transshipment or joint fishing operations with vessels included on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List; c. Ensure that vessels on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List are not authorised to land, tranship, re-fuel, re-supply, or engage in other commercial transactions in their ports, except in case of force majeure; d. Ensure that foreign flagged vessels included on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List do not enter into their ports, except in case of force majeure, unless vessels are allowed entry into port for the exclusive purpose of inspection and/or effective enforcement action; e. Ensure that a vessel included in the CCSBT IUU Vessel List is not chartered based on its license; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Notify all fishing vessels flying its Flag to neither assist nor participate in fishing interactions with IUU-listed² vessels³; b. Ensure that IUU-listed vessels are not authorised to conduct commercial transactions in port, including landing and/or transshipping SBT³; c. Refuse port entry to IUU-listed foreign flagged vessels³ except for the purpose of targeted inspection/enforcement action; d. Ensure that IUU-listed vessels are not chartered; e. Ensure that IUU-listed foreign-flagged vessels are not granted the Member/ CNM’s Flag unless thorough checking has occurred to determine that this will not result in IUU fishing; f. Ensure that SBT sourced from IUU-listed vessels are not farmed, landed, transhipped or traded within its jurisdiction; and g. Detect and/or prevent the creation of false SBT trade documentation from IUU-listed vessels.

² In this context, “IUU-listed” means that the vessel is listed on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List

³ Except in the case of *force majeure*

3.3 IUU Vessel List

Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<p>f. Ensure that foreign-flagged vessels included in the CCSBT IUU Vessel List are not granted their flag, except if the vessel has changed owner and the new owner has provided sufficient evidence demonstrating the previous owner or operator has no further legal, beneficial or financial interest in, or control of, the vessel, or having taken into account all relevant facts, the flag Member or CNM determines that granting the vessel its flag will not result in IUU fishing;</p> <p>g. Ensure that SBT from vessels included in the CCSBT IUU Vessel List are not landed, farmed, transhipped and/or traded internationally and and/or domestically; and</p> <p>h. Collect and exchange with other Members and CNMs any appropriate information with the aim of searching for, controlling and preventing false CDS documents and/or false import/export certificates of SBT from vessels included in the CCSBT IUU Vessel List.</p>	
<p>viii. Each Member of the Extended Commission will examine the request to remove the vessel and notify the Executive Secretary in writing of their conclusion regarding either the removal from, or the maintenance of the vessel on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List within 21 days following the notification by the Executive Secretary.</p>	<p>1. Within 21 days of receiving a request for the removal of a vessel from the CCSBT IUU Vessel List from the Executive Secretary, provide advice in writing as to whether the removal request is supported.</p>