

Commission for the Conservation of  
Southern Bluefin Tuna



みなまぐろ保存委員会

# **Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Compliance Committee**

**5 - 7 October 2017  
Yogyakarta, Indonesia**

## Twelfth Meeting of the Compliance Committee

5 - 7 October 2017

Yogyakarta, Indonesia

### 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 Indonesia 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. Overview of Compliance with CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures

#### *2.1. Report from the Secretariat*

6. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/04 which summarised compliance with CCSBT Management Measures by Members and CNMs. The main areas highlighted were that:
  - There were no reported over-catches in 2016;
  - There still appears to be an issue with some smaller importers of SBT not independently detecting and submitting import copies of CDS forms without assistance from the Secretariat, e.g. for Australia, the EU and South Africa;
  - Korea's submission of import copies of forms has increased a lot for REEFs, but no expected importer copies of CMFs were submitted;
  - There was an issue with 61.5% of Japan's REEFs not being validated by authorised validators during 2016;
  - New Zealand continues to submit a large number of duplicate tag numbers; there was also one small export detected which occurred without the required CDS documentation;

- The Philippines has not submitted any annual reports in 2017, most notably its National Report to the Compliance Committee (CC) and Extended Commission (EC);
  - Three Members/CNMs (Indonesia, Japan and the Philippines) have not yet submitted the required information for the Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution;
  - South Africa has not yet submitted CDS forms for three of its pole and line vessels for 2016, and the current CDS tags being used do not comply with CCSBT's tag standards; and
  - Two late carry-forward notifications were received – one from Australia and one from Indonesia.
7. The Secretariat advised that it would produce a further revision of its paper to include a few additional updates received from Members prior to the meeting.
  8. Members explained the reasons for their non-compliance and how they planned to address the issues and improve in the future.
  9. Indonesia reported that it ratified the FAO Port State Measure Agreement in July 2016. Currently, a Standard Operation Procedure for implementing this agreement is being developed, and CCSBT port inspection as well as other tuna-RFMOs Resolutions will be included. Indonesia commit to submit it to CCSBT as soon as it is completed.
  10. Japan reported that it has ratified the FAO Port State Measures Agreement in 2017 and harmonised it with its internal regulations. CCSBT port inspections are included in the framework and designated port and contact points are expected to be provided to the Secretariat soon after finalising internal arrangements.
  11. New Zealand noted that it will introduce electronic reporting which it hopes will help to address its problem of duplicate CDS tag numbers. Australia mentioned it will be trialling bar codes on CDS tags for longline vessels, the purpose of which is to enable fishers to better record tag numbers.
  12. There was some discussion on the late submission of carry forward notifications by Australia and Indonesia, in particular whether late notification prevents quota from being carried forward from the previous year. Members confirmed that such late notifications are against the resolution, but no agreement was reached on the interpretation of the above aspect of the Resolution<sup>1</sup>. Japan stated that such late notifications are invalid under the current resolution, but there is no intention to deny carry forward themselves, if other Members agreed. Australia indicated its view based on legal advice that the breach of the notification requirement did not invalidate or prevent a carry forward.
  13. A small working group was formed to consider the necessity of amendments to the Resolution to clarify the measure. The working group did not reach consensus on changes to the Resolution and the Compliance Committee decided to leave the Resolution unchanged and refer the matter to the EC. .
  14. Further discussion on the carry-forward Resolution occurred. The CC noted that there are two distinct areas that the EC may wish to consider with respect to the Carry-forward Resolution. These were to clarify:

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolution on Limited Carry-forward of Unfished Annual Total Allowable Catch of Southern Bluefin Tuna

- The best way to require the provision of carry-forward notifications in the future; and
  - The consequence of providing a late carry-forward notification.
15. In addition, a range of options were discussed regarding notification provision including potentially:
- Removing the notification requirement from the Resolution, and providing notifications through alternative means, for example annually in the National Reports to the CC/EC;
  - Retaining the notification period within the Resolution and:
    - Requesting the Secretariat to assist with the process by providing notification reminders; and/or
    - Clarifying the impact of providing late notifications on a Member's ability to carry-forward unfished quota to the next fishing season.
16. South Africa advised that it plans to deal with quota holders who exceeded their quota in the 2010 to 2015 fishing seasons and that it is considering what penalties to apply, in order to prevent South Africa from exceeding its national allocation again.

## ***2.1. Reports from Members and Cooperating Non-Members***

### *2.1.1. Annual Reports*

17. Members summarised their Annual Reports to the Compliance Committee and 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.
18. 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.
19. In relation to attributable catch:
- Australia advised that it will outline its approach and intent at EC24.
  - Japan advised that their industry instructed their fishers not to discard dead SBT.
  - Indonesia advised that it reports all attributable catch from its CDS data, including vessels of less than 30 GRT.
  - Taiwan allocates 10 t to releases and discards, based on estimates by observers and fishing effort of its SBT fishing vessels.
  - It was agreed that transparency of how Members estimate attributable catch was important and would be part of future Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) reporting.
20. In response to questions about high levels of seabird interactions and mortalities:
- Korea needed to consult with its scientists to find the cause, but a possible reason could be a change of area fished.

- New Zealand had incidents where operators were not using required mitigation measures one of which caught a large number of birds. The operator was prosecuted and is no longer active in this fishery. Observer coverage was increased to help prevent further incidents. New Zealand has employed a liaison officer programme to help improve fishers understanding and compliance with mitigation measures.
  - Japan noted that its figure of seabird interactions has not decreased since 2014 and is also investigating the reasons. A possibility is that observers are being deployed in areas of high seabird interactions, due to the convenience of observer arrangement in effort to raise the observer coverage within a limited budget in recent years, and Japan encourages to deploy observers more equally among fishing areas.
21. In response to questions about observer coverage, both Indonesia and South Africa advised that they planned to increase the level of observer coverage of their domestic fleets.
  22. Australia clarified that all of its 2015/16 longline observer data has been from electronic monitoring (EM), with no physical observers on longline vessels since the middle of 2015.
  23. The European Union clarified that its vessels are prohibited from targeting SBT, as a precautionary measure to avoid exceeding its allocation, but its vessels are allowed to catch as bycatch and retain on board.
  24. Regarding Indonesia's over-catch in previous years, it was noted at paragraph 78 of the report of EC 22 that the agreed corrective action was to help Indonesia achieve compliance, not to pay back the over-catch. Indonesia has taken steps to strengthen its system and its 2016 catch was less than its allocation. Indonesia advised that it is improving its national CDS system further and aims to incorporate logbook, landings, and observer data to improve the accuracy and quality of data.
  25. Japan clarified that the reason for its high shark mortalities was mainly due to catches of blue shark that was being duly retained for commercial purposes due to catches increasing on a global basis. Japan also pointed out the fundamental difference between seabirds and sharks in the international framework (i.e. FAO Code of Conduct) and that sharks can be utilised if the relevant stocks are managed in a sustainable manner.
  26. Japan introduced the paper CCSBT-CC/1710/BGD01 on the 2017 update on monitoring of Southern Bluefin Tuna trading in the Japanese domestic markets. Improvements in the market analysis were presented to ESC22 and were noted by Members. Japan advised that there were no anomalies detected in the market.
  27. Australia understood that Korea introduced an e-monitoring trial on four vessels in the second half of 2016 and indicated that subject to the trial, it may further develop the system in 2017. Australia asked how this work was progressing.
  28. Korea advised that it is still analysing the results of its EM trials in 2016 and has not yet decided on its future plans for EM.
  29. Taiwan advised that it has conducted a Quality Assurance Review (QAR) phase 2 in 2017 and the overall findings indicate strong compliance, and that the

management systems are robust, capable of detecting infringements and issuing punishment.

30. The meeting noted that the Philippines did not submit a national report to the meeting.
31. It was noted that logbooks may contain important disaggregated data for the review of bycatch mitigation effectiveness and not reported directly for confidentiality reasons. A recommendation could be made to the ERSWG for it to consider developing an internal process or framework for Members to analyse their logbook data and prepare ERSWG reports for this purpose.
32. The Chair noted that some Members are using CDS data as their main catch monitoring tool, and this requires that the CDS be as accurate and as efficient as possible. An electronic CDS needs to be considered. The benefits of EM have been demonstrated and discussion on how to progress this is also needed, noting that human observers are required but EM can help reduce bias in certain instances.

### ***2.3. Assessment of compliance with CCSBT management measures***

#### *2.3.1. Compliance of Members*

33. The meeting did not identify any areas of non-Compliance by Members that required specific recommendations for improvement.

#### *2.3.2. Compliance of Cooperating Non-Members*

34. The Compliance Committee noted that the only Cooperating Non-Member, the Philippines, did not attend the meeting and has not been compliant with its reporting requirements in that it did not provide an Annual Report to the Extended Scientific Committee or to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission.

#### *2.3.3. Application of the Corrective Actions Policy*

35. The meeting discussed a hypothetical question from Birdlife International regarding whether a response under the CCSBT Corrective Actions Policy would be triggered if a Member failed to implement the required seabird bycatch mitigation measures.
36. The Executive Secretary advised that only failure to implement the CCSBT's Tori line measure would trigger the CCSBT's Corrective Action's Policy as CCSBT's other seabird bycatch mitigation measure (the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on Ecologically Related Species of Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna) is not a binding measure. However, the guidelines of the Corrective Actions Policy could be used to assist a Member to improve its compliance with the CCSBT's ERS Recommendation.
37. The meeting noted that CCSBT Members are legally bound to comply with their Ecologically Related Species (ERS) obligations and commitments under relevant Convention Areas of RFMOs to which CCSBT Members belong when fishing for SBT in the absence of a binding CCSBT measure. Furthermore, at CCSBT

20, CCSBT Members provided a commitment to adhere to the ERS rules in the relevant RFMO Convention Areas in which their vessels fish for SBT and their commitment has already been reflected in CCSBT's MPRs.

38. Australia advised that it has submitted a proposal for a binding seabird mitigation resolution for consideration at CCSBT 24.
39. The Chair noted that if the CCSBT had binding mitigations measures, then the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy would apply and that to his knowledge, the other tuna RFMOs do not have such a corrective actions policy.

### **Agenda Item 3. Operation of CCSBT Measures: Issues & Updates**

40. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/06 which reports on any problems or updates with respect to the operation of CCSBT's key measures not discussed in other papers, or for which supplementary information is available.
41. The United States (USA) provided an update of its participation with the CCSBT. The USA is continuing to strengthen its efforts to cooperate with the CCSBT. Since 20 September 2017, USA importers are now required to submit all import data through a centralised electronic portal called the International Trade Data System, and this is expected to improve timely collection of USA CDS import data. The USA also recently conducted a review of SBT imports and identified incorrect codes used to mislabel SBT. The USA is undertaking targeted outreach and enforcement based on this review. The USA also thanked Indonesia for their assistance in identifying intended importers of Indonesian product, which greatly assisted in the review.
42. The meeting expressed its appreciation for the cooperation with the CDS by the United States.
43. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/07 concerning CCSBT's draft IUU Vessel List. This paper summarised alleged IUU activity information received, and included a copy of the CCSBT Draft IUU Vessel List along with the supporting evidence distributed to Members/CNMs in Circular #2017/037 on 28 July 2017. Three Chinese-flagged fishing vessels were placed on CCSBT's Draft List for consideration. Notification for two of these vessels (*Da Yang 15* and *Da Yang 16*) was received from New Zealand. Information for the third vessel (*Yuan Da 19*) was received from Australia, and it was placed on the Draft List by the Executive Secretary following intersessional discussion with the Extended Commission. The Draft CCSBT IUU Vessel List was transmitted to China on 28 July 2017. China responded to the Executive Secretary noting that the, "*Chinese government does not agree to put these three Chinese fishing vessels into the CCSBT IUU vessel list*".
44. The meeting agreed that China has taken effective action against all three vessels in accordance with paragraph 14b of the CCSBT IUU Vessel List Resolution<sup>2</sup>, and noted that these vessels had been removed from the relevant RFMO authorised vessel lists. The Compliance Committee welcomed the action by

---

<sup>2</sup> Resolution on Establishing a List of Vessels Presumed to have Carried Out Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing Activities For Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT).

China against these vessels and agreed to remove the three vessels from CCSBT's Draft IUU Vessel List.

45. HSI noted the value of ensuring that decisions made pursuant to paragraph 14b were based on the same documentation test used for delisting decisions pursuant to paragraph 22.
46. Members expressed disappointment that China was not present at the Compliance Committee meeting because direct feedback from Chinese officials would provide greater assurance in regards to corrective actions taken by China. Members were also concerned that other Chinese vessels could be catching SBT and requested that China strengthen its MCS measures. Some Members considered it likely that some Chinese vessels would be catching SBT as a bycatch and that if this was occurring, China should consider becoming a Member or Cooperating Non-Member of the CCSBT otherwise its vessels that bycatch SBT would be considered to be IUU vessels.
47. There was general agreement that the CCSBT should continue to seek improved cooperation from China in general and China's cooperation with the CDS in particular.

#### **Agenda Item 4. CCSBT Resolutions: Review and Revision**

##### ***4.1. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)***

48. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/08 concerning CCSBT's draft revised CDS Resolution which has been under discussion since 2015. The paper provided updates on:
  - The current status of the draft revised CDS Resolution (section 4 and Attachment A); and
  - Any known intersessional discussions that occurred on the draft CDS since CC11.
49. The Secretariat advised that, at Korea's request, it had drafted some additional new text (6.6 bis) to try to assist Korea resolve its difficulties with validating the landed weights on the proposed Catch/Harvest and Export Certificate (CHEC).
50. Members expressed their desire to make further progress with the draft revision of the CDS Resolution and discussion focused on three main aspects of the draft for which consensus had not been reached, these being:
  - Rules regarding delegation of the authority to validate CDS documents;
  - Whether Farm Stocking Certificates and Catch Tagging Certificates should be attached to Catch Harvest Export Certificates (CHECs); and
  - The need to validate landed weights on CHECs.
51. No progress was made towards an agreed approach for the above aspects of the draft revised CDS.
52. There was general agreement that the CCSBT should be moving towards an eCDS, noting that issues such as costs and administrative burdens need to be minimised for an eCDS.



53. The meeting gave consideration to alternative models for developing an eCDS, including being based on CCSBT's current CDS resolution, or on ICCAT's eCDS. However, it was noted that ICCAT's system was likely to be a high cost option and that there were inefficiencies in CCSBT's current CDS that should be addressed before moving to an eCDS. The Chair also noted that there is a need to settle outstanding issues before starting the development of an eCDS otherwise there could be cost blowouts in the system development.
54. It was agreed that the steps for developing an eCDS would be further considered in the discussion of the Compliance Action Plan for 2018-2020.

#### ***4.2. Authorised Vessel Resolution***

55. The Chair noted that the possibility that IMO Numbers might be issued for non-steel and/or small vessels which operate outside areas under national jurisdiction is being considered for formal inclusion within the International Maritime Organisation's (IMO) Resolution A.1078(28) in November this year. If included, IMO numbers should be available for issue to a much wider range of vessel sizes/types in future.
56. In response to a suggestion from HSI that the Secretariat commence work to prepare for collection of additional vessel data that might result from this change, the Chair advised that it may be too early to direct the Secretariat to do any preparatory work at the current time because:
  - The IMO Resolution has not yet been agreed; and
  - If it is agreed in November (with respect to smaller, non-steel vessels), CCSBT Members will need to decide whether they wish to adopt/require the issuing of IMO Numbers for non-steel vessels of less than 100GT/GRT.

#### ***4.3. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Resolutions***

57. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/09. This paper addresses CC11's request that Members and the Secretariat review CCSBT's existing 2006 and 2008 VMS Resolutions prior to CC12.
58. The Secretariat noted that it did not receive any Member proposals in relation to CC11's request. Therefore, the Secretariat reviewed the existing two VMS Resolutions, taking a two-step approach to the review process:
  - Firstly, it consolidated the two existing Resolutions into a single 2017 Resolution; and
  - Secondly, it proposed adding a series of amendments to try to strengthen the new consolidated VMS Resolution, and to better align it with current VMS arrangements already adopted by other tuna RFMOs.
59. A small working group was formed to consider a new consolidated VMS Resolution. The working group agreed to remove most of the proposed enhancements of the Resolution to ensure that the consolidated VMS Resolution is compatible with the VMS Resolutions of other RFMOs in the jurisdictions that SBT fishing vessels operate.

60. The Compliance Committee noted that a variety of simple enhancements to the CCSBT VMS Resolution would be desirable, such as improved clarity of the requirements in the event of VMS failure, transmitting speed and course, and increasing the transmission frequency to enable better determination of a vessel's fishing activity.
61. The EU highlighted that the revision and merging of the existing VMS Resolutions was an opportunity to considerably improve the VMS provisions, notably on requirements that are commonly adopted in other tuna RFMOs, and regretted that the CC was unable to further review the VMS Resolution.
62. Both HSI and the United States urged the CCSBT to consider increased transmission frequencies. The United States also noted that it considers that a reporting rate of more than once every two hours is not sufficient to adequately determine a vessel's fishing activity.
63. The Compliance Committee supported the consolidated VMS Resolution produced by the working group at **Attachment 4** and noted that this is an interim step in the work to develop enhanced VMS arrangements that commences in 2018.

#### ***4.4. Transshipment/ Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolutions***

64. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/10 which examines areas of overlap between the CCSBT's Transshipment and Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolutions. This paper proposed a series of amendments to the Transshipment Resolution to:
  - Attempt to standardise the text in areas where the two Resolutions overlap;
  - Update references to CCSBT's 2006 and 2008 VMS Resolutions to instead refer to the consolidated 2017 VMS Resolution; and
  - Amend Annex II, paragraph 6c to reflect the actual frequency (every 5 days) that observers' daily reports are transmitted to the observer programme administrator.
65. The meeting agreed to the revised Transshipment Resolution at **Attachment 5**.
66. The Chair reminded the meeting that the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) had requested the Compliance Committee to consider ways to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures. The ERSWG had suggested that modifications to CCSBT's Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port and CCSBT's transshipment Resolution to provide for the collection of appropriate information was one option. This could include the examination of fishing gear for evidence of tori lines and tori poles, the presence of line weights, and the inspection of log books for evidence of night setting.
67. Birdlife International presented the paper CCSBT-CC/1710/Info01, noting that the paper is intended to generate discussion amongst CCSBT Members regarding options for monitoring usage of seabird mitigation measures using transshipment observers at sea and in-port inspections. The paper suggested that for transshipments at sea, observers could take stern photos to detect the presence of tori poles, 10-15 photos of log book pages to obtain evidence of night setting and

photos of the gear to verify use and positioning of line weights. Similar options existed for inspections in port.

68. Members discussed the practicality of collecting the additional information, particularly for transshipments at sea given that the observer's priority is in relation to the transshipment and that any delays caused by the extra work could impact on transshipment schedules. It was noted that there was a similar recommendation to IOTC in 2016 and it was agreed that the Secretariat would contact IOTC to see what is being done at IOTC and to consider the likely impact of such work on transshipment observers.
69. For inspections in port, it was noted that Annex B of the Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port could be modified to include the additional information fields necessary for monitoring usage of seabird mitigation measures.
70. Members will provide the Secretariat with fields for monitoring of seabird mitigation measures to add to Annex B of the Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port. This will be considered at CC13.

#### ***4.5. IUU Vessel List Resolution***

71. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/10 which proposed minor amendments to CCSBT's IUU Vessel Resolution.
72. The meeting agreed the amendments and the updated IUU Vessel Resolution is provided at **Attachment 6**.

### **Agenda Item 5. CCSBT Policies & Arrangements: Review, Revision & Progress Reports**

#### ***5.1. Compliance Action Plan for 2018-2020***

73. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/12 which provides a draft three-year Compliance Action Plan (CAP) for the 2018 – 2020 period. The draft CAP included:
  - The set of revised compliance risks agreed by 11th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC11);
  - Several specific action items agreed by CC11;
  - An action item to address ERSWG12's request to the CC to consider ways to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures; and
  - Other proposed action items for either specific project or regular maintenance work, many of which were carried forward from the 2015 - 2017 CAP.
74. For item 1 of the CAP (review areas of greatest compliance risk), it was agreed to make this a standing item on the agenda and that the Secretariat review the list of risks identified by CC11 and report what has been done to mitigate or better quantify the risks.
75. Action on electronic observation technologies was excluded from the CAP and the meeting recommended that the EC consider establishing an EM working

group of the EC, since EM is relevant to other CCSBT subsidiary bodies as well, not just the Compliance Committee, but noting that the cost of the meeting needs to be minimised.

76. The meeting noted that no progress had been made since CC 11 in resolving the remaining issues in the draft revised CDS resolution. It was agreed to continue discussions intersessionally for another year to attempt to resolve them. Australia will work with Japan on certain issues and the Secretariat will continue to work with Korea. There was some discussion as to whether an eCDS could be progressed despite having outstanding issues, but it was noted that the CDS resolution should be finalised before commencing the development of the eCDS system, as identified in communication with ICCAT, to avoid extra costs.
77. It was noted that the compliance action plan did not contain any items concerning the issues related to Australian farms and the Japanese market survey that had been identified by the ESC. The meeting did not reach consensus on including any of these issues in the compliance action plan. New Zealand expressed its disappointment in the lack of progress by the Compliance Committee in regards to these issues.
78. The CC discussed the value of cross-listing provisions in IUU vessel listing procedures and agreed to consider appropriate cross-listing procedures during future reviews of the IUU vessel list resolutions and take into accounts similar resolutions adopted in other RFMOs.
79. The recommended Compliance Action Plan for 2018 to 2020 is provided at **Attachment 7**.

### ***5.2. Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs)***

80. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/13 concerning proposed additions and amendments to CCSBT's Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs).
  - New sets of MPRs were proposed for:
    - 3.5 Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port; and
    - 6.4 ERSWG Data Exchange.
  - Revised MPRs were proposed for:
    - 4.1 Scientific Observer Program Standards (SOPs);
    - 5.2 Recommendation on Ecologically Related Species; and
    - 6.6 Annual Reporting to the Compliance Committee.
81. The meeting agreed to the revised Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) with only a minor change. The agreed revised MPRs are provided at **Attachment 8**.

### ***5.3. Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs)***

82. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/14 which is the final report on the overall 2017 Quality Assurance Review (QAR) Program. The Secretariat noted that the main purpose of the overall QAR report is to document the

methodology and to provide recommendations on the methodology for future QARs. Consequently, much of the 2017 report is the same as the 2016 report and the focus of the meeting should be on the recommendations in the report.

83. The Compliance Committee noted that recommendations and agreed that the current methodology should be continued until all Members have completed the first round of QARs. The Compliance Committee further commented that recommendations for improvements would be considered after all Members had conducted their QARs.
84. The meeting recommended that South Africa undergo a QAR in 2018 and that the European Union undergo a QAR in 2019. It was considered appropriate that South Africa's QAR be conducted before the QAR of the European Union because South Africa is an important Port State and because South Africa has a higher allocation of SBT global catch limit than the European Union. Both QARs would be combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 QARs.

#### ***5.4. Template for Annual Report to the CC and EC***

85. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/15 which proposed two minor amendments to the Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission.
86. The meeting agreed to the proposed amendments. The revised reporting template is provided at **Attachment 9**.

#### ***5.5. Transshipment MoC with WCPFC***

87. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/16 on a Transshipment Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) between the CCSBT and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC). It was noted that:
  - Several information exchanges had occurred between the CCSBT and WCPFC Secretariats;
  - The work required to operationalise the MoC is still in progress, and therefore it is not yet possible to implement it; and
  - This work will continue as a priority following CCSBT 24.
88. Japan appreciated the work being conducted by the CCSBT and WCPFC Secretariats and hoped that the process to implement the transshipment MoC would be in place soon.

#### ***5.6. International Networks and Bilateral Arrangements***

89. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/17 which provided updates on the CCSBT's compliance relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMCSN), the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN), and RFBs/ RFMOs.
90. The meeting noted the report from the Secretariat and in particular, the benefits that could be gained through involvement in the Tuna Compliance Network.

## **Agenda Item 6. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan**

### ***6.1. Monitoring of Markets and IUU Activity***

91. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1710/18 on potential Non-Member fishing activity and trade/emerging markets. The paper provided information on a potential instance of non-Member fishing activity that occurred during 2017, as well as a brief update on 2016 trade information. Global Trade Atlas (GTA) data indicated that there still appear to be species miscoding issues occurring for trade in some markets, in particular the EU and the USA.

### ***6.2. Cooperation with Non-Members***

92. The meeting considered whether there are any specific Non-Member port and market States whose cooperation should be sought and advise the EC accordingly. It was recommended that China, Singapore and the USA be invited to participate as observers to CC 13.
93. The meeting noted that trade and CDS export data suggested that the main Non Member markets were still China and the USA, with no new countries having substantial SBT imports that needed be considered.
94. There was discussion on efforts to engage with China and its lack of response to letters from the CCSBT, apart from IUU correspondence. The meeting agreed to recommend to the EC that the Chair of the EC write a formal letter to China during EC24, requesting that China participate in CCSBT meetings, exercise greater control over its fishing vessels, and cooperate with the CCSBT CDS.
95. The meeting noted that fishing activities for SBT by Non-Members could be conducted potentially and share the view on the importance of high sea patrol and port inspection in order to gather evidence of IUU fishing activities.

### ***6.3. Electronic Observation Technologies***

96. Australia presented an overview of its electronic monitoring (EM) system that has been operating since July 2015. Key points of the system are as follows:
  - The system has been implemented in Australia's Eastern and Western tuna and billfish fisheries, currently on 37 vessels.
  - The primary goal of the system is to improve logbook reporting.
  - The system can monitor 100% of fishing activities, apart from rare cases of system breakdown. In these cases the fisher must return to port after conclusion of their current trip to have the system repaired before fishing again. The EM system is monitored remotely to ensure it is operational while the vessel is at sea.
  - There are no physical observers on board. Biological samples could be taken in port.
  - 10% of footage is sampled, generally at random but some targeting occurs.
  - The system has been successful in improving logbook reporting, particularly with respect to discards and bycatch. Identification of birds and sharks to a species level can sometimes be difficult.

- Camera placement is key to success of the system and requires careful consideration for each vessel to get the best angles and views. Each vessel has between 4 and 6 cameras.
97. It was noted that the trip period of Australian longline fishing vessels monitored by EM is from 2 to 7 days and different from that of far sea longline vessels.
98. Korea provided some information on its EM trials, which had a purpose of protecting the human rights and the safety of fishers. Korea is considering expanding the system to obtain fishing and bycatch information but it is waiting for feedback from vessels and costs need to be considered.
99. Taiwan reported that it is trialling EM on small vessels and has noted challenges for deep sea vessels due to long fishing trips and photos not being clear. Its tests are continuing.
100. It was noted that some vessels in CCAMLR waters are using interesting EM technologies, including
- Sensors on winches that detect starting and ending of fishing sets, with software to show graphically whether sets during a trip were set during the night or during the day; and
  - Pressure sensitive mechanisms used to detect tori line usage.
101. Members noted the potential and power of the technology and supported its use, but there was concern that EM should not fully replace human observers but should be complementary to them and therefore discussion on this issue remain open to subsequent CCSBT meetings.

#### ***6.4. SBT Identification Technologies***

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

#### ***6.5. Ongoing Identification and Sharing of Best Practices for MCS systems***

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

### **Agenda Item 7. Work program for 2018**

104. The Compliance Committee developed the following workplan for 2018. Annual tasks of an ongoing nature are not shown unless they are new for 2018.

Activity	Approximate Period	Resource
Update the contract with the current service provider to implement a QAR for South Africa subject to funding by CCSBT 23.	Nov-Dec 2017	Secretariat
Continue work with the WCPFC to operationalise the transshipment MoC with the WCPFC	As soon as practical	Secretariat
South Africa undertake a combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 QAR in 2018	Before CC13	South Africa
Invite China, Singapore and the USA to participate as observers at CC13	Before CC13	Secretariat
Contact IOTC to determine whether IOTC is trialing the use of transshipment observers for collecting information on usage of seabird mitigation measures and to obtain information on the likely impact of this on the work of transshipment observers.	Before CC13	Secretariat
Members to provide the Secretariat with fields for monitoring of seabird mitigation measures to add to Annex B of the Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port	Before CC13	Members / Secretariat
Add a new annual standing item in the CC agenda to review the list of compliance risks identified by CC11 & consider emerging risks.	Before CC 13	Secretariat
Conduct intersessional discussions to resolve outstanding issues in the draft revised CDS resolution in order to pave the way for developing an eCDS. In particular, Australia and Japan will work on certain issues and the Secretariat will work with Korea.	Before CC13	Members (particularly Australia, Japan, Korea) / Secretariat
Implement the 2018 action items of the Compliance Action Plan	Before CC13	Members / Secretariat

### **Agenda Item 8. Other business**

105. Japan tabled paper CCSBT-CC/1710/BGD01, which provided an update on the monitoring of southern bluefin tuna trading in Japanese domestic markets, for the information of Members.
106. Australia tabled paper CCSBT-CC/1710/BGD03 which provided Australia's analysis of the Japanese market data, and suggestions on how it can be improved. Australia also tabled paper CCSBT-CC/1710/BGD02 on an updated review of tuna growth performance in ranching and farming operations.
107. In response to questions about its study on the automation of underwater measurement of fish length using stereo video monitoring technology, Australia clarified that:
- The camera footage used was from a trial in 2011.
  - Of the 22138 fish transferred into 8 pontoons, 11647 were able to be measured manually, while 2614 (11.8%) were measured using the semi-automatic method. The paper details the difficulties encountered with the semi-automatic approach, which includes fish moving too fast, being occluded, or in poor light.
  - While the results were positive, Australia is seeking a fully-automated and cost-effective system that operates in real time without bias. There are still



issues to resolve and further work is required, noting improvements in camera and computing technologies since the trial was done. It needs to consult with scientists, AFMA, and consider budgetary implications before deciding on a way to move forward.

- No 40-fish sampling of the fish in the pontoons was done coincident with the camera trials.
108. Australia was requested to perform a comparison of the stereo-video results with the harvest data from the trialled pontoons, in particular with respect to growth rates, and report either intersessionally or at the next ESC meeting. Australia noted that this was a complicated issue and it would take this on notice and will consider and respond when able.
109. Australia presented some information on the fishing methods used for farms, to highlight that the fishers cannot practically target specific age groups as it believed that Japan has hypothesised that farmed fish were mostly 4 years old.
110. Japan clarified that this was not its hypothesis and that it assumed that there were larger proportions of 2 and 3 year olds than 4 year olds placed into farms. Japan also pointed out that the catch level is quite sensitive to the age composition of farmed SBT.
111. It was noted and appreciated that Japan, Australia and other interested Members will work intersessionally to resolve their differences, as agreed and outlined at ESC22.

### **Agenda Item 9. Recommendations to the Extended Commission**

112. The Compliance Committee made the following recommendations to the Extended Commission.
- USA, Singapore and China be invited to attend future Compliance Committee meetings;
  - That the EC Chair write to China seeking greater cooperation in the operation of the CDS, participation at CCSBT meetings and improved control of vessels likely to catch SBT;
  - That the EC encourage Members to undertake additional high seas patrols and in port inspections in order to gather evidence of IUU fishing is collected;
  - The proposed 2018 Workplan for the Compliance Committee be approved;
  - That the EC note that the Philippines had not submitted an Annual Report to the CC/EC and did not attend the CC meeting;
  - That the EC note the strong support indicated by Members for a smooth and orderly move to an eCDS in accordance with the Compliance Action Plan and that a new CDS Resolution would facilitate such a move;
  - That the EC consider establishing an e-monitoring Working Group to develop standards for the use of this new technology;
  - That the following revised Resolutions be adopted:
    - the Transshipment Resolution,
    - the IUU Vessel List Resolution, and

- the VMS Resolution;
- That the revised Minimum Performance Requirements be adopted;
- That the revised Annual Report template to the CC/EC be adopted;
- That an integrated Phase 1 and 2 QAR be conducted in South Africa in 2018 and the European Union in 2019;
- That the Compliance Action Plan 2018 – 2020 be adopted; and
- That any amendment to the Carry-Forward Resolution seek to clarify:
  - the consequences of providing a late notification of carry-forward, and
  - the preferred way for Members to notify carry-forward in the future.

## **Agenda Item 10. Conclusion**

### ***10.1. Adoption of meeting report***

113. The report was adopted.

### ***10.2. Close of meeting***

114. The meeting closed at 16:01 pm on 7 October 2017.

## **List of Attachments**

### **Attachment**

- 1 List of Participants
- 2 Agenda
- 3 List of Documents
- 4 Revised Resolution on the CCSBT Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)
- 5 Revised Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels
- 6 Revised Resolution on Establishing a List of Vessels Presumed to have Carried Out Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing Activities For Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT)
- 7 Three-Year Compliance Action Plan (2018-2020)
- 8 Revised Minimum Performance Requirements (Sections 3.5, 4.1, 5.2, 6.4, 6.6)
- 9 Revised Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission