

Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna



みなまぐろ保存委員会

Report of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee

**11 - 13 October 2018
Noumea, New Caledonia**

Thirteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee

11 - 13 October 2018

Noumea, New Caledonia

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 the European Union (EU) for hosting the meeting and providing the venue.
2. The Chair noted that the meeting will be a busy one with a large agenda and that this has put a heavy workload on the Secretariat, making it difficult for the Secretariat to provide some documents in a timely manner.
3. Members and observers introduced their delegations to the meeting. The list of participants is shown at **Attachment 1**.

1.2. Adoption of agenda

4. The agenda was adopted, noting that some agenda items would be discussed in a different order to that shown in the agenda. The agenda is provided at **Attachment 2**.
5. The list of documents for the meeting is shown at **Attachment 3**.

1.3. Meeting arrangements

6. 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

7. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/04 which summarised compliance with CCSBT Management Measures by Members. The main areas highlighted were that:
 - There continue to be cases where vessels and validators are being authorised retrospectively;
 - Korea, a regular importer, failed to submit some import copies of CDS forms in 2017;
 - South Africa had many issues with the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) during 2017 including late/missing forms, multiple errors being present on submitted forms and in tagging data submissions, use of outdated versions of CDS forms, and discrepancies between different data

sets such as monthly catch reports, CDS data and catch by fleet data, however systems have been put in place to improve future submissions.

- There are various cases of non-compliance with CCSBT's Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution, for example Indonesia and Japan have not yet provided all the information required to be submitted by 30 January 2017, not all Members seem to be conducting the required port inspections, and the port inspection reports that the Secretariat has received have generally not been submitted within the required timeframe.

8. In response to issues raised in the Secretariat's paper:

- It was noted that the CDS can be difficult to implement for new Members and in this context, both New Zealand and Australia offered to assist South Africa on CDS issues that it may have difficulty with. It was also noted that incomplete and incorrect completion of CDS documents adversely impacts on the workload of the Compliance Manager.
- South Africa advised that it is working to resolve issues such as discrepancies in its CDS documents. To this end, South Africa has developed an electronic database for entry of CDS data that will resolve many of the problems in the future. South Africa has also assigned more officials for validating CDS documents to overcome workload issues occurring with the increased number of CDS documents since South Africa received an increase in its allocation.
- Indonesia advised that it is starting the implementation of an electronic log book for vessels over 30 gross tonnes and that this should improve the quality and availability of its catch and effort data. Indonesia also advised that with respect to Port State measures, foreign vessels will not be permitted to land their catch in Indonesia until its regulation for implementing Port State measures is finalised.
- Japan advised that it is working on the implementation of Port State measures with FAO and that after this, it will commence working on implementation of CCSBT's minimum standards for inspection in port. Once implemented, Japan will notify the Secretariat of designated ports for landing by foreign vessels and points of contacts for those ports.
- Japan expressed a concern about reliability of the CDS validation by the fishers, farmers and exporters who are authorised by the state/Fishing entity as they still sometimes make basic mistakes due to the lack of understanding of the CDS Resolution and its instruction sheets.

9. It was noted that the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures paper does not make it clear whether Members are fully complying with CCSBT's "Resolution on Reporting all Sources of Mortality of Southern Bluefin Tuna". It was suggested that, in future, the paper should consider lack of reporting by Members with respect to discards, recreational fishing and other sources of SBT mortality.

2.2. Annual Reports from Members

10. Members summarised their Annual Reports to the CC and provided highlights from their reports, including improvements to management

systems, recent catches, observer coverage, attributable catch, electronic monitoring, bycatch of Ecologically Related Species (ERS), and other issues of significance.

11. Discussions, including questions of clarification, were held in relation to the contents of Annual Reports submitted prior to the meeting. Important aspects of reported matters and associated discussions are described below.
12. In relation to SBT mortalities from recreational fisheries and artisanal fleets:
 - Australia advised that it has set aside 250t of its national quota to account for recreational catch, and that a recreational fishing survey will commence next month. It will again review estimates of mortalities from this sector following the finalisation of the survey.
 - Indonesia clarified that its artisanal catch is included in its CDS. It has investigated the possibility of unaccounted SBT mortalities but has so far found no sources other than longline.
 - New Zealand stated that its newly emerged recreational fishery targeting SBT was likely to have been driven by ease of access to SBT, which seem to be much closer to shore. Early indications are that the recreational fishery was less successful in 2018 than in 2017.
 - Japan clarified that it has determined that a mortality rate of 9% for live releases was appropriate based on a pop-up archival tag data study.
13. During discussions about observer coverage:
 - Australia clarified that its longline observer coverage was entirely from electronic monitoring, however more than 10 % of Australia's catch is observed by human observers;
 - Some Members noted that there was no agreement by the CCSBT to replace human observers with electronic monitoring;
 - Indonesia stated that it hopes to increase its observer coverage and would like to learn more about electronic monitoring;
 - Japan stated that it was not currently planning to use electronic monitoring and that it is waiting for the outcome of discussions on this at the WCPFC;
 - Japan noted that there is no electronic monitoring at the moment that can automatically identify the species and size of the fish and that costs for this are currently too high.
14. In relation to the bycatch of ERS:
 - The EU stated that it complies with the regulations of the relevant RFMO responsible for the area where fishing occurs for the reporting of ERS interactions;
 - Indonesia clarified that Indonesia has complied with all current binding and recommendatory measures adopted by other RFMOs (IOTC and WCPFC) aimed at the protection of ERS. It was a mistake/misunderstanding to read and respond on the relevant questions of the annual report template.

- Korea commented that its sharp decline in seabird interactions could have been due to a shift in fishing ground, and the sound cause will be shared with Member states when it is found from the research by the national scientists;
 - Japan commented that its change in reported seabird catch rates, in regard to species composition etc., could be due to the distribution of observers amongst its fleet, which had previously been focused in areas of high albatross concentrations;
 - New Zealand stated that the reason for its high survival rate of captured seabirds is partly due to efforts in ERS outreach, such as visits to vessels, that included information on safe release and handling.
 - Some attendees expressed a concern at the high numbers of seabird interactions and mortalities. It was noted that this included some endangered species and that in order to better assess the impacts on ERS and the effectiveness of mitigation measures, it would be preferable for all Members to report on ERS at the species level, know what mitigation measures are being used where and when, and require ERS interactions to be recorded in logbook data.
 - Some Members noted that the number of seabird interactions reported by Members was the number observed and not an estimate of total seabird interactions, which makes the number of seabird interactions even more serious.
15. Some Members suggested, in the context of at sea observer coverage, that Australia had made no progress toward the implementation of stereo-video monitoring of the transfer of SBT into farms. Australia clarified all transfers were observed by independent observers.
 16. The EU stated that it would investigate an apparent export of 18t of SBT from Spain to Italy, reported in the Global Trade Atlas, but it expected this to be due to a miscoding of the species as has occurred previously.
 17. Taiwan clarified that it had not reported any fishing effort in the Tasman sea because no SBT had been retained or targeted. Taiwan did not authorise any fishing vessels to catch SBT in WCPFC convention area in 2017/18 fishing season. All SBT catch in such area are discarded. The quantity discarded is still being calculated and it may have more specific information to report next year.
 18. It was noted that Members had not provided the “comprehensive report assessing the content and conclusions of the reports of the observers assigned to carrier vessels which have received at-sea transshipments from their LSTLVs” that is required in Members’ annual reports to the CC and Extended Commission. It was further noted that CC10 had agreed that Members should commit to report in more detail for this part of their annual reports, but that this had not yet occurred. Members that tranship at sea confirmed that they receive reports from transshipment observers for transshipments at sea in the ICCAT and IOTC Convention Areas. In future annual reports to the CC/EC, these Members agreed to report on any irregularities reported by transshipment observers and on action taken to address such irregularities.

19. South Africa advised that it received its final Quality Assurance Review (QAR) report from Global Trust Certification Ltd. on the 14th of September. The main weaknesses identified by the QAR and South Africa's initial responses to the weaknesses are as follows:
- Incorrectly numbered tags were issued in 2016/17 from a new supplier, that were missing the country code and year. South Africa has decided to use centralised CCSBT tags from 2018.
 - In 2014/15 some officials were not authorised to validate CDS documents but had done so. A team has been tasked with validating CDS documents which will resolve that issue.
 - Catch landing sheets had been completed incorrectly. A newly implemented CDS database will help to eliminate this issue.
 - The observer program was not operational for some time. South Africa has amended permit conditions to include observers at the fishing right holders' expense and has increased coverage from 5% to 20%.
 - Foreign vessels were not transmitting VMS data when transiting in South African waters. An obligation for these vessels to transmit VMS data will be introduced.
 - VMS is not monitored 24 hours a day. This is being looked into as there are costs to consider.
20. The QAR of South Africa identified some strengths that included the following:
- Allocation of fishing rights;
 - A comprehensive catch monitoring system; and
 - A strong legislative framework with violations and sanctions, including the power to revoke a license.

2.3. Assessment of compliance with CCSBT management measures

2.3.1. Compliance of Members

21. The meeting did not identify any areas of non-Compliance by Members that required specific recommendations for improvement under the Corrective Actions Policy.
22. The Chair commented that a formal compliance assessment process might assist the meeting to formally identify areas of non-compliance in the future and noted that this could be discussed at agenda item 6.2.

2.3.2. Application of the Corrective Actions Policy

23. No items were raised that required application of the Corrective Actions Policy.

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

24. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/06 which reported on problems or updates with respect to the operation of CCSBT's key measures not discussed in other papers, or for which supplementary information was available.
25. The Secretariat acknowledged the voluntary cooperation of the USA with the CCSBT's CDS Resolution, particularly its continued provision of quarterly CDS submissions.
26. In response to questions:
 - The Secretariat advised that the joint tuna RFMOs' Consolidated List of Authorised Vessels (CLAV) can continue to operate after the current funding ceases in September 2019 with essentially no funding. However, to maintain current levels of data quality in the CLAV, new funding of approximately US\$30,000 per year would be required. If the costs were distributed amongst tuna RFMOs in accordance with the number of vessels authorised by each tuna RFMO, the CCSBT's contribution is likely to be about US\$2,000 per year.
 - Australia advised that it would provide a paper to Members intersessionally with details of the process and costings for conducting genetic analysis of tissue samples.
27. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/07 concerning the update on the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme and possible revisions to CCSBT's Authorised Vessel Resolution.
28. In December 2017, the IMO agreed to extend its IMO Ship Identification Number scheme to include:
 - Fishing vessels of steel and non-steel hull construction greater than 100 gross tonnage; and
 - All motorised inboard fishing vessels of less than 100 gross tonnage down to a size limit of 12m in length operating outside areas of national jurisdiction.
29. The Secretariat proposed including some new text within paragraph 3 of the CCSBT's Authorised Vessel Resolution to require that all CCSBT authorised vessels in these two categories authorised to operate outside of their EEZ that are currently without IMO numbers, to have IMO numbers issued to them in the future.
30. Substantial discussion was held in relation to the Secretariat's proposal. Members and observers generally supported the concept of modifying the CCSBT's Authorised Vessel Resolution to take into account either some or all of the update to the IMO's Ship Identification Number Scheme. However, there was concern, particularly from Indonesia, that it might not be possible to receive IMO numbers for vessels in cases that IHS Markit considered that insufficient information was available for it to issue an IMO number.
31. The USA advised the meeting that in 2013, ICCAT adopted an exemption for large scale fishing vessels that were unable to obtain an IMO number provided that the CPC issued an explanation as to why it could not obtain an

IMO number for the vessel. The USA also informed the meeting of its experience with IHS Markit whereby it was able to provide a spreadsheet with a bulk list of vessels to IHS Markit and receive IMO numbers back from IHS Markit. This approach simplified the application for IMO numbers, and the lack of some information fields such as shipbuilding yard did not necessarily prevent the issue of IMO numbers. The USA offered Members assistance with working with IHS Markit.

32. The meeting agreed to defer consideration of revisions to the CCSBT Authorised Vessel Resolution until the 2019 CC meeting. In the interim, Indonesia provided an undertaking to seek IMO numbers for all its Authorised CCSBT Vessels that meet the requirements of the updated IMO numbering scheme. Other Members may also wish to seek IMO numbers for their eligible vessels.

Agenda Item 4. CCSBT Resolutions: Review and Revision

4.1. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)

33. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/08 concerning CCSBT's draft revised CDS Resolution which has been under discussion since 2015. The paper briefly:
 - Summarised the current status of the draft revised CDS Resolution (details are provided in paper CCSBT-CC/1810/BGD01);
 - Advised that no known intersessional discussions had occurred on the draft revised CDS Resolution since CC12; and
 - Noted that Korea's consideration had not arrived prior to the CC regarding the validation of landed weights issue.
34. The Chair commented that the CC has made little progress with the revised CDS Resolution over the last two years, and that this is disappointing particularly since the CC has agreed on the importance of moving to an eCDS.
35. Despite discussions during the meeting some key issues remain that prevented Members from finalising the revised CDS resolution. In particular, Australia, Japan and New Zealand have been unable to reach an agreement over delegating validation.
36. The Secretariat held discussion with Korea over its concern with the revised CDS Resolution. Korea's main issue was with the requirement for validation of landed weights. There is a 7 to 10-day delay between validation and the product being accepted for import in Japan. This delay would increase the cost to industry in terms of cold storage etc. However, if a solution to this delay can be found, then most of Korea's concerns would be resolved and Korea expects to be able to validate landed weights. This is still being discussed between the Korean government and industry, but Korea hopes to be able to provide confirmation during the Extended Commission meeting.

37. Korea also requested that the agreement the EC reached a few years ago regarding acceptable discrepancies between landed and estimated weights be included within the new CDS Resolution.
38. The meeting recommended that a technical working group meeting be convened immediately prior to CC14 to work towards resolving outstanding matters relating to the revised CDS Resolution.
39. The USA reported on its continuing efforts to cooperate with the CCSBT's CDS, which included providing quarterly reports of SBT imports to the Secretariat. The USA also noted that its new electronic trade data system has provided expected improvements in the quality of information provided and it looks forward to working with the Secretariat to cross-check the US submissions.
40. Members expressed appreciation for the USA's continued cooperation with the CDS.
41. The European Union advised that it had some concerns with the CDS due to it not catching SBT and having no SBT imports with some minor exceptions. Because of its rare dealings with SBT, it is difficult for its fishers to comply with the CDS (e.g. by carrying valid tags) and there is a potential for masters to misreport SBT to avoid the difficulties involved in reporting SBT. In this respect, the EU asked Members to consider the possibility of having a simplified set of CDS requirements for Members that have very low SBT catches. The EU also noted that it can be difficult to detect infrequent imports of small quantities of SBT. In relation to this, the EU requested that if Members are aware of SBT exports being made to the EU, that they advise the EU of this so that the EU can be certain of collecting and reporting the required CDS documentation to the Secretariat.
42. Japan appreciated the EU's concerns and further commented that simplified CDS requirements could also be useful to gain the cooperation of non-Member markets, such as China, with the CDS.

4.2. *Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Resolution*

43. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/09 concerning information gaps in the CCSBT's current VMS arrangements.
44. First, the Secretariat reported back on the status of some relevant VMS consultancy work that is currently being conducted for the IOTC. The consultant's report will be presented first to the IOTC's Working Party on the Implementation of Conservation and Management Measures (WPICMM) in February 2019, and then subsequently to the IOTC's Compliance Committee/Commission along with any recommendations made by the WPICMM in approximately June 2019.
45. The Secretariat then presented a summary of the VMS information gaps/potential information gaps it had identified. These were divided into two main categories for ease of presentation:
 - Technical VMS information gaps, and
 - Higher-level VMS information gaps.

46. The meeting agreed that it should wait for the outcomes of the IOTC's VMS consultancy and the WPICMM's recommendations in relation to its VMS before considering changes to the CCSBT's VMS Resolution. It was noted that this would delay the CCSBT's planned work on VMS by a year as a substantive paper on the CCSBT's VMS could not be presented to the CC in 2019. Instead, a slightly expanded version of the Secretariat's current paper, taking into account the work done by IOTC, would be submitted to the CC for its October 2019 meeting.
47. The meeting further agreed that it would consider possible VMS related changes to the annual reporting template at agenda item 5.6 for implementation in 2019.

4.3. Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution

48. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/10 concerning:
 - A review of CCSBT's Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution including a proposed increase to the required minimum inspection level from "at least 5%" to "at least 20%", and other minor revisions; and
 - Consideration of proposed revisions to Annex B (inspection report) of the Resolution to include new fields to monitor the use of and compliance with seabird mitigation measures.

Review of the Port Inspection Resolution

49. Members agreed that port inspections were important, but some Members felt that moving from 5% to 20% was too large an increase and did not support it. Korea proposed an increase to at least 10%, which was supported by some Members. Some Members required that the current level of 5% be maintained.

Information on transshipment observation and seabird bycatch mitigation measures

50. As requested by CC 12, the Secretariat contacted the IOTC Secretariat to determine whether the IOTC is trialling the use of at-sea transshipment observers to collect information on the usage of seabird mitigation measures. The IOTC advised that:
 - Its transshipment observers are not currently collecting information on the use of seabird mitigation measures; and
 - The IOTC has no plans to request the transshipment contractor/observers to conduct inspection/observation for bird mitigation devices as this is not included in their responsibilities as defined under the current contract / Resolution.
51. BirdLife International (BirdLife) presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/Info01, titled "Transshipment observers – a tool for understanding seabird bycatch mitigation measure use on high seas tuna longline vessels". The pilot study presented in the information paper suggests that there are opportunities for RFMOs to use transshipment observers, including through photographs, to check compliance with conservation measures for seabird bycatch mitigation.

The results indicate low levels of use of effective seabird bycatch mitigation measures by the vessels studied.

52. Some Members stated strong concern over the use of logbook data in the study, which is usually not allowed to be used by third-parties without special permission of Flag States. BirdLife clarified that all required permissions were received from IOTC with agreement from all IOTC Members. BirdLife clarified that it is not proposing for such data to be made available to it but was suggesting that this could be a tool that RFMOs could consider using. Japan questioned how and under what conditions BirdLife could obtain the individual logbook data from IOTC, and before resolving this question, Japan stated that it cannot proceed with further discussion on this issue.

Proposed Revisions to Annex B of the Resolution to Allow Effective Monitoring of Seabird Mitigation Measures

53. BirdLife presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/Info02 on monitoring compliance with seabird mitigation measures through port inspection. The paper proposed six data fields, a comments box and a notes section (that gives guidance to port inspectors on factors to help determine compliance) to be added to port inspection forms for the monitoring of seabird mitigation measures.
54. Members held extensive discussions on the proposed modifications to Annex B. Differing views were expressed in relation to the format and detail of information that should be collected in relation to seabird mitigation. A compromise was agreed which is provided at **Attachment 4**, noting that this was a starting point and should be revisited in the future.

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

5.1. Compliance Plan

55. The Secretariat provided a proposed draft revised Compliance Plan. The revisions included:
- Updates to the main body of the Plan to reflect updates that were made to the Strategic Plan in 2015; and
 - The addition of two new risks to the list of compliance risks on page 1 of Appendix 1.
56. The two new risks added were:
- Limited ability of some RFMOs to share relevant compliance information with each other due to confidentiality constraints and/or lack of relevant data exchange/ cooperation agreements; and
 - Limited information regarding fleet compliance with respect to binding and recommendatory ERS measures.

57. After making some additional minor changes to the main body of the Plan, the meeting agreed the revised Compliance Plan. This is provided at **Attachment 5**.

5.2. CPG1: Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs)

58. The meeting agreed to the revised Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) with only a minor change.
59. The agreed revised MPRs are provided at **Attachment 6**.

5.3. CPG3: Corrective Actions Policy

60. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/13 concerning proposed revisions to CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy (CPG3).
61. The proposed revisions reflect updated text in the Strategic Plan and the Carry-forward Resolution, as well as updating the Policy's review period and the scope of non-compliance instances which should be publicly disclosed.
62. The meeting made further revisions to the Policy and noted that it may be pertinent to re-consider the agreed text under item 5 (Public Disclosure – dotpoint 2) if the CCSBT develops a formalised compliance assessment process in the future.
63. The meeting agreed to the revised Corrective Actions Policy provided at **Attachment 7**.

5.4. CPG4: MCS Information Collection and Sharing

64. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/14 concerning proposed revisions to CCSBT's MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy (CPG4).
65. The proposed revisions included the addition of references to coastal and market States, the replacement of the text "Member(s)" with "relevant Member(s)" as appropriate, and the addition of Annex 1: Guidelines for Confidentiality and Use of MCS Information.
66. Following some discussion and further revisions, the meeting agreed to the revised MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy provided at **Attachment 8**.

5.5. Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs)

67. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/15 which is the final report on the overall 2018 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 2018 report is the same as the 2017 report and the focus of the meeting should be on the recommendations in the report.

68. The Secretariat summarised the recommendations of the overall QAR report. New Zealand supported the recommendation that future QARs be expanded in scope. The meeting made no other comments or decisions in relation to the recommendations.
69. The Secretariat confirmed that the next QAR was to be of the EU and that this is the last QAR to be conducted in the current round of QARs. It was agreed that planning for future QARs would commence at CC14 and it was noted that the scope and terms of reference for future QARs would need to be revised.
70. The Secretariat advised that three options have been costed for the QAR of the EU in 2019. These are: (1) A Phase 1 and 2 QAR of DG MARE only; (2) A Phase 1 and 2 QAR of DG MARE and a Phase 1 QAR of Spain/Portugal; and (3) A Phase 1 and 2 QAR of both DG MARE and Spain/Portugal.
71. It was agreed that option “2” was the preferred approach for the EU’s QAR.
72. The meeting was asked to advise on the risks of delaying the EU’s QAR by one year for budgetary reasons. The meeting preferred to conduct the EU’s QAR in 2019 but agreed that the risks caused by a delay were low, with the main risk being a slight administrative risk of a change in the QAR team and resultant inefficiencies.

5.6. Template for Annual Report to the CC and EC

73. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/16 concerning proposed revisions to the Template for the Annual report to the CC and EC.
74. Most of the revisions proposed were to recognise that a common definition of Attributable Catch has now been agreed and to improve the transparency of reporting of mortalities in each SBT sector.
75. Updates were also proposed to the VMS section of the template (II(1)(d) - VMS) to take into account observations made in paper CCSBT/1810/09 on the existing VMS information gap with respect to carrier vessels. The revisions proposed in section II(1)(d) – VMS require that Members report on VMS implementation of all fishing vessels and carrier vessels flagged to the Member.
76. The meeting agreed to the proposed revisions and the revised reporting template is provided at **Attachment 9**.
77. HSI proposed that consideration be given to inserting an additional ERS subsection III 2(d)iii on monitoring usage of bycatch mitigation measures into the annual CC/EC template and was invited to prepare a working paper detailing the proposal.
78. HSI/BirdLife subsequently submitted a proposal and the meeting agreed that Members would assess its feasibility and appropriateness prior to CC14 in terms of providing improved information for monitoring of seabird mitigation measures. The Secretariat was tasked with providing a copy of the proposal to the Chair of the ERSWG to seek ERSWG’s feedback on the proposal.

5.7. *Transshipment MoC with WCPFC*

79. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/17 which provided an update on the Transshipment Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the WCPFC. It was noted that:
- The MoC has been signed but not yet been operationalised;
 - There is currently only one CCSBT Member that is interested in transshipping SBT in the High Seas of the WCPFC Convention Area under the provisions of the MoC; and
 - The Secretariat has identified three options that may allow the MoC to be operationalised.
80. The three options identified by the Secretariat are:
- Option 1 – That the Secretariat continue to work with the WCPFC, Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and South Pacific Community (SPC) to try to ensure that CCSBT’s requirements are incorporated into the Pacific Island minimum transshipment observer standards that the FFA and SPC will commence developing in the near future;
 - Option 2 – Interested CCSBT Members approach WCPFC Regional Observer Programme (ROP)-authorised National or Observer Programmes directly to determine their ability to provide suitably trained transshipment observers who can collect transshipment data according to CCSBT’s standards and so become CCSBT-endorsed¹; and
 - Option 3 - Interested CCSBT Members approach MRAG Asia-Pacific/ the PNA Office directly to determine its ability to provide suitably trained transshipment observers (from amongst PNA Members) who can collect transshipment data according to CCSBT’s standards and so become CCSBT-endorsed¹.
81. The meeting recommended that option 1 be pursued by the Secretariat and noted that individual Members could simultaneously pursue option 2 or 3 bilaterally.

5.8. *International Networks and Bilateral Arrangements*

82. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/18 which provided update on CCSBT’s Compliance Relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMCSN), the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN), (Inter-) Governmental Bodies and Other Organisations.
83. The Secretariat outlined specific interactions that had occurred with various bodies over the past year and expressed special thanks to the IOTC, Singapore, CapFish, INTERPOL and CSIRO for the excellent cooperation it had received while following up on a carrier vessel of concern to the CCSBT.

¹ The provision of transshipment observers, their deployment and training and any associated costs, etc would need to be negotiated and agreed as part of a bilateral arrangement between the Member and the observer provider.

84. The meeting commended the Secretariat for making use of international networks and expressed gratitude to parties that assisted with the investigations. It was noted that the Regional Plan of Action against IUU fishing in South East Asia (RPOA) is an effective MCS network and Australia advised that it would be willing to share information through that network.

5.9. Compliance Committee Arrangements

85. New Zealand presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/24 concerning a review of Compliance Committee Arrangements. The paper proposes 2 models on how the CC could be improved. Option 1 proposes a compliance working group that would meet separately from the CC, while option 2 proposes a one-day technical meeting that would be added before the main CC meeting and would not produce a formal report (although it could produce attachments for inclusion in the report of the CC).
86. Members preferred option 2 due to considerations of time, cost, and human resource constraints. It was agreed for New Zealand to work with the Secretariat to get precise estimates of the costs of option 2 and report back. If this could be done in time, then it would be presented to the Finance and Administration Committee for its consideration at EC 25.

Agenda Item 6. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan

6.1. Review of Compliance Risks

87. The Chair advised that the review of compliance risks was conducted at agenda item 5.1 and that two new compliance risks were endorsed.

6.2. Potential Formalised Compliance Assessment Process

88. Australia provided an overview of its work on a proposal for a formalised compliance assessment process for another RFMO. It produced a paper for SIOFA and plans to produce a modification of that paper for discussion at CCSBT. The SIOFA process considers compliance broadly and not on individual incidents. It suggests a compliance status with areas identified as compliant, non-compliant, and priority non-compliant, to separate trivial non-compliance from serious breaches.
89. It was suggested that other sources of information could be useful, namely the independent panel review of the WCPFC's compliance monitoring scheme and work of the Tuna Compliance Network that will be looking at compliance assessment processes of tuna RFMOs early next year.
90. The meeting agreed that Australia would prepare a paper prior for CC14, with assistance from the Secretariat.

6.3. Standing Agenda Items

91. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/20 on Potential Non-Member Fishing Activity & Trade/ Emerging Markets. The paper highlighted potential Non-Member fishing activity, in particular by Chinese flagged vessels in the Southern Indian Ocean.
92. The paper includes copies of letters written to the IOTC's Chinese Commissioner by both the IOTC and the CCSBT concerning potential SBT fishing activity by the Chinese vessels, and notes China's response advising that it will come back to the IOTC and CCSBT with the outcome of its investigations.
93. It was noted that some of the data from the Global Trade Atlas was likely to be an error, including live exports of SBT from Australia and South Africa, imports into the EU and also EU intra-trade, and exports of fresh SBT from China to the USA. Australia, the EU and the USA indicated that they will investigate the issues relevant to them and will report back.
94. Indonesia noted the under-representation of its SBT exports in the GTA database compared to CDS figures. It stated it was committed to improving this and would contact the relevant authorities in Indonesia.
95. The meeting agreed to invite China, Mauritius, Singapore and the USA to the next CC meeting, and for the Secretariat to contact Lebanon and Jordan advising them that CDS documents that should accompany SBT imports.
96. There was discussion on efforts to engage with China and its possible interest in joining the CCSBT. It was noted that China has recently had significant changes in its bureaucracy, and that it would be worth re-engaging with it. The meeting agreed to recommend to the EC that the Chair of the EC write a further letter to China, requesting that China participate in CCSBT meetings or become a Member of the CCSBT.
97. Australia presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/25 on the WCPFC's progress on the development of e-monitoring standards. The paper outlines the content of the concept paper presented and discussions at the third meeting of the WCPFC E-Reporting and E-Monitoring Working Group in August 2018.
98. The meeting noted the information provided and thanked Australia for the report.

Agenda Item 7. Review of the implementation of the ERS Recommendation

99. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/21 which summarised the outcome of a desktop review of the implementation of the ERS Recommendation. The paper concluded that:
 - Overall, Members have complied well in implementing the ERS Recommendation, with the caveat that the review did not collect information on the compliance of Members' fleets with respect to ERS measures;
 - There has been no sharing of ERS data with the Secretariats of IOTC, WCPFC and ICCAT, but the Secretariat plans to make some CCSBT ERS

data public in late 2018 now that the CCSBT's confidentiality rules have been changed to allow this;

- The Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) has provided seabird mitigation advice to the EC, but the EC has not acted on the ERSWG's main recommendations with respect to seabird mitigation measures.

100. The Secretariat commented that advice from the last meeting of the ERSWG together with the lack of information on compliance with mitigation measures in other RFMOs, suggests that there is a need for the CCSBT to focus efforts on actively encouraging full implementation of the mentioned mitigation measures and verifying compliance with the measures. To this end, the Secretariat sought advice from the CC as to whether it would like the Secretariat to collaborate with BirdLife and Members to develop a project involving both outreach/education and verification of compliance with seabird mitigation measures for funding by a second phase of the Common Ocean's ABNJ tuna program.
101. The meeting agreed that the Secretariat should work with BirdLife and Members to develop a proposal and seek external funding for that proposal. BirdLife welcomed the opportunity of developing a joint project under the Common Oceans umbrella.
102. Indonesia clarified that it has complied with all current binding and recommendatory measures adopted by other RFMOs (IOTC and WCPCF) aimed at the protection of ERS. Its responses of "None" in its 2017 annual report to the CCSBT were a mistake due to misunderstanding and so the information on pages 10 and 11 of paper CCSBT-CC/1810/21 should indicate that Indonesia is complying if this is taken into account.
103. BirdLife presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/Info03, which described a novel method for monitoring the use of night setting using Global Fishing Watch's AIS data. Results indicated that in areas where seabird mitigation measures are required, a maximum of 15% of sets have less than two hours overlap with daylight, and the percentage of sets fully compliant with night setting could be much lower (<5%). BirdLife commented that the approach used in its study could potentially be used for monitoring night-setting compliance by Member States, RFMOs and the general public.
104. Some Members thanked BirdLife for its effort to develop a new method for monitoring the night settings that could be used to complement the existing MCS methods to assess compliance and contribute to more efficient mitigation of seabird incidents in SBT fisheries.
105. Japan and Taiwan appreciated BirdLife's paper submission but commented that they needed time for their scientists to examine the methodology before they could comment on the results of the study. BirdLife offered to respond to any questions that Members' scientists had in relation to the methodology.
106. HSI commented that there is evidence of widespread non-use of mitigation measures and encouraged Members to conduct analysis on the use of mitigation measures by their own fleets using their own log book data and report back on their conclusions.

Agenda Item 8. Proposed On-line Data Submission/ Data Access Project

107. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/22 which proposed to upgrade CCSBT's databases and develop on-line data submission/data access facilities for Members.
108. It was noted that the Secretariat had evaluated the SPC's TUFMAN 2 software and found it highly appropriate for the CCSBT's needs. Therefore, the Secretariat is planning to use this software as the basis for both its database upgrades and also for the on-line data submission/access project if endorsed. Being able to use this pre-developed software represents a significant cost saving for the Secretariat.
109. The meeting expressed support for the proposal providing it was developed with robust data arrangements and security, data standards, and that care was taken in progressing it in order to not overburden Members.
110. The meeting expressed favourable position to support the project and recommended to the EC that it consider the endorsement and funding of the project in the EC budget.

Agenda Item 9. Work program for 2019

111. The CC developed the following workplan for 2019. Annual tasks of an ongoing nature are not shown unless they are new for 2019.

Activity	Approximate Period	Resource
Implement the 2019 action items of the Compliance Action Plan.	Before CC14	Members / Secretariat
Update the contract with the current service provider to implement a QAR for the EU subject to funding by CCSBT 25.	Nov-Dec 2018	Secretariat
Continue work with the WCPFC to operationalise the transshipment MoC with the WCPFC.	As soon as practical	Secretariat
The EU to undertake a QAR in 2019.	Before CC14	EU
Invite the USA, Singapore, China, and Mauritius to participate as observers at CC14.	Before CC14	Secretariat
Contact the IOTC Secretariat to obtain a copy of the consultant's VMS report once it is made public and circulate to Members.	Before CC14	Secretariat
Prepare a draft 2021-2023 Compliance Action Plan	Before CC14	Secretariat
Assess the feasibility and appropriateness of the HSI/BirdLife proposed amendment to the Annual Report template to provide improved monitoring of seabird mitigation measures	Before CC14	Members
Provide the HSI/BirdLife proposed amendment to the Annual Report template to the Chair of the ERSWG and ask for feedback on the proposal	Before CC14	Secretariat

Activity	Approximate Period	Resource
Monitor the availability of external funds for AIS risk analysis.	Before CC14	Secretariat
Discuss future CDS validation requirements and other outstanding issues with a view to reaching agreement.	Before CC14	Australia / Japan / New Zealand
Contact Lebanon and Jordan advising them that CDS documents should accompany SBT imports	As soon as practical	Secretariat
Expand the Compliance with Measures paper to record whether Members are fully complying with CCSBT's "Resolution on Reporting all Sources of Mortality of Southern Bluefin Tuna".	Before CC14	Secretariat
Share results of analysis of the sharp decline in seabird interactions with all Members.	Before CC14	Korea
Investigate an apparent export of 18t of SBT from Spain to Italy, reported in the Global Trade Atlas and advise the Secretariat.	Before CC14	European Union
In the next annual report to the CC, transshipping Members to report on any irregularities reported by transshipment observers and on action taken to address such irregularities.	Before CC14	Japan, Korea, Taiwan
Provide a paper to Members with details of the costs and technological advancements for conducting genetic analysis of tissue samples.	As soon as practical	Australia
Seek IMO numbers for all Authorised CCSBT Vessels that meet the requirements of the updated IMO numbering scheme.	Before CC14	Indonesia
Contact the relevant Indonesian authorities to resolve the under-representation of Indonesia SBT exports in the GTA database compared to CDS figures	Before CC14	Indonesia
Members and Non-Members investigate likely errors in the Global Trade Atlas relevant to them and report back.	As soon as practical	Australia, EU, USA
Develop a paper on a draft compliance assessment process for the CCSBT	Before CC14	Australia with assistance from the Secretariat
Develop a proposal to enhance education on and the implementation of, ERS measures and seek funding for this from external sources.	As soon as practical	Members / Secretariat / BirdLife
Subject to EC approval, notably on funding, undertake Year 1 of the enhancements to the TUFMAN 2 data project.	Before CC 14	Secretariat / consultant

Agenda Item 10. Other business

10.1. Use of AIS data to assess risks of undeclared SBT transshipments at sea and of IUU fishing for SBT

112. The Secretariat presented paper CCSBT-CC/1810/23, which provided two project proposals for the analysis of AIS data. The Secretariat noted that it seemed clear that some level of IUU fishing for SBT is occurring and that the purpose of these proposals is to gain an improved understanding of the risk of potential IUU fishing for SBT. The first proposal involved using AIS data to identify the occurrence of a range of activities that could be indicative of IUU SBT fishing such as non-authorised vessels fishing in SBT fishing grounds and non-authorised transshipments from vessels that have been fishing in SBT fishing grounds. This project was costed at 85,000 euros and the Secretariat suggested that the timing of this project would be dependent on the availability of external funds. The second project involved ad-hoc analysis of AIS data and vessel company relationship data to investigate reports that may be provided to the Secretariat on suspicious fishing activity. This project was estimated to cost about \$20,000 and it has tentatively been included in the CCSBT's draft budget for 2019.
113. Extensive discussion was held in relation to the importance of these projects and the suitability of AIS data for examining IUU fishing. Some Members considered that either one or both projects were extremely important to the work of the CC and that analysis of AIS data and company relationships was a useful approach to examining potential infringements of CCSBT CMMs and the risks of IUU fishing. Other Members considered that AIS data were not suitable for examining IUU fishing or that the benefits of the projects were not sufficient for the costs involved.
114. There was no consensus to include either project in the CC's workplan, but the Secretariat was asked to monitor the availability of external funds for AIS risk analysis.

Agenda Item 11. Recommendations to the Extended Commission

115. The CC made the following recommendations to the EC:
- The proposed 2019 Workplan for the CC be approved.
 - That the EC agree to the changes to the Compliance Plan including the additional risks identified in the current review process and that a new Compliance Action Plan for 2021-2023 be developed.
 - That the revised:
 - Port Inspection Resolution be adopted;
 - Minimum Performance Requirements be adopted;
 - Corrective Actions Policy be adopted;
 - MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy be adopted; and
 - Annual Report template to the CC/EC be adopted.

- That a QAR of the European Union be undertaken in 2019 comprising a Phase 1 & 2 review of the European Commission and a phase 1 review of Spain and Portugal.
- That a Technical Working Group be convened immediately prior to CC14.
- That USA, Singapore, China and Mauritius be invited to attend future CC meetings.
- That the EC Chair write again to China requesting that China participate in CCSBT meetings or become a Member of the CCSBT.
- That the Secretariat work with Members and BirdLife to develop a proposal to enhance the implementation of ERS measures through outreach/education and to verify compliance with measures. Funding for this be sought from external sources.
- That the EC considers the development of the TUFMAN 2 data project over the next three years at an estimated total cost of \$74,800.

116. The CC suggests that the EC notes the following:

- There were no items raised which required the application of the Corrective Actions Policy.
- That a decision on amending the CCSBT's Authorised Vessel Resolution to take advantage of new provisions allowing more fishing vessels to acquire IMO numbers was deferred and will be considered in 2019.
- The Committee deferred consideration of enhancements to CCSBT's VMS Resolution pending work being undertaken on VMS in IOTC. The IOTC work will be completed in mid-2019 and should be available for consideration by the Committee next year. Possible changes to the VMS Resolution will therefore be deferred until 2020.
- The good cooperation of Members in sharing MCS information in relation to recent suspected IUU fishing activity, including work with the IOTC Secretariat, and Singaporean and Mauritian authorities.
- That the Committee considered a paper prepared by New Zealand which proposed enhanced arrangements for CC operation. Two options were considered with a preference for option 2. It was agreed to try and cost this option for consideration by the EC this year.
- The Committee made limited progress on the development of a Compliance Assessment Process. Information was provided by Australia on the process developed in SIOFA and it was agreed that Australia would work with assistance from the Secretariat to distribute a discussion paper intersessionally.

Agenda Item 12. Conclusion

12.1. Adoption of meeting report

117. The report was adopted.

12.2. Close of meeting

118. The meeting closed at 6:28 pm on 13 October 2018.

List of Attachments

Attachment

- 1 List of Participants
- 2 Agenda
- 3 List of Documents
- 4 Port Inspection Resolution (Annex B only)
- 5 Compliance Plan
- 6 Minimum Performance Requirements
- 7 Corrective Actions Policy
- 8 MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy
- 9 Template for the Annual Report to the CC and EC

List of Participants
The Thirteenth 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								
Laura	TIMMINS	Ms	Director	Department of Agriculture and Water Resources	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 62716 359		laura.timmins@agriculture.gov.au
Matthew	DANIEL	Mr	Manager	Australian SBT Fishery Fisheries Management Authority	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6225 5338		Matthew.Daniel@afma.gov.au
Neil	HUGHES	Mr	Assistant Director	Department of Agriculture and Water Resources	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	PO Box 1146, Port Lincoln, SA, 5606, Australia	61 (0) 419 840 299		austuna@bigpond.com
Andrew	WILKINSON	Mr	General Manager	Tony's Tuna International P/L	Pine Freezer Road, Port Lincoln, 5606, SA	61 (0) 8 8682 2266		andrew@tonystuna.com.au
EUROPEAN UNION								
Orlando	FACHADA	Mr	Head of EU Delegation	European Union	Rue de la Loi 200 (J99-3/46), 1000 Brussels, Belgium	32 2299 0857		Orlando.Fachada@ec.europa.eu

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
FISHING ENTITY OF TAIWAN								
Ming-Fen	WU	Mr.	Senior Technical Specialist	Fisheries Agency of Taiwan	8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 2383 5873	886 2 2332 7396	mingfen@msl.f.a.gov.tw
Ming-Hui	HISH	Mr.	Specialist	Fisheries Agency of Taiwan	8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 2383 5872	886 2 2332 7396	minghui@msl.f.a.gov.tw
TsungYueh	TANG	Mr.	Secretary	Overseas Fisheries Development Council	3F, No.14, Wenzhou St., Da'an Dist., Taipei 106, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 2368 0889	886 2 2368 6418	tangty@ofdc.org.tw
Winston Yu-Tsang	WU	Dr.	Assistant Professor	Soochow University, Taiwan	70, Linhsi Road, Shihlin, Taipei 111, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 2881 9471	886 2 2881 2437	ytwchc@gmail.com
Kuan-Ting	LEE	Mr.	Secretary	Taiwan Tuna Association	3F-2, No.2, Yu Kang Middle 1st Rd, Kaohsiung, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 7 841 9606	886 7 831 3304	simon@tuna.org.tw
INDONESIA								
Trian	YUNANDA	Mr	Deputy Director for Fish Resource 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	62 21 34530 08	tryand_fish@yahoo.com sdi.djpt@yahoo.com
Zulkarnaen	FAHMI	Mr	Head of Research Institute for Tuna Fisheries	Research Institute for Tuna Fisheries	Jl. Mertasari No. 140, Br Suwung Kangin, Sidakarya, Denpasar, Bali 80224, Indonesia	62 361 72620 1		fahmi.p4ksi@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
JAPAN								
Takahiro	ARA	Mr	Assistant Director	Fisheries Agency of Japan	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907	81 3 3502 8459	81 3 3504 2649	takahiro_ara020@maff.go.jp
Teruo	KITADE	Mr	Assistant Director,	Fisheries Agency of Japan	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8907	81 3 6744 2364	81 3 3591 5824	teruo_kitade850@maff.go.jp
Yuichiro	KIRIKI	Mr	Official	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan	2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8919	81 3 5501 8338	81 3 5501 8332	yuichiro.kiriki@mofa.go.jp
Shun	OGAWA	Mr.	Deputy Director	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry of Japan	1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo	81 3 3501 0532	81 3 3501 6006	ogawa-shun@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@affrc.go.jp
Kiyoshi	KATSUYAMA	Mr	Special Advisor	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
Nozomu	MIURA	Mr	Manager	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
Satoru	SHIMIZU	Mr	Secretary	National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association	Coop Bldg 7F, 1-1-12, Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8503	81 3 3294 9634	81 3 3294 9607	s-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
NEW ZEALAND								
Dominic	VALLIÈRES	Mr.	Highly Migratory Species Manager	Fisheries New Zealand	Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140	64 04 819 4654		dominic.vallieres@mpi.govt.nz
Arthur	HORE	Mr.	Manager, Offshore Fisheries	Fisheries New Zealand	Auckland MPI Centre, 17 Maurice Wilson Avenue, PO Box 53030, Auckland 2022	64 09 820 7686	64 09 820 1980	arthur.hore@mpi.govt.nz
Jo	LAMBIE	Ms	Fisheries Analyst	Fisheries New Zealand	Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140	64 04 894 0131		jo.lambie@mpi.govt.nz
Sophie	KALDERIMIS	Ms	Legal Adviser	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	195 Lambton Quay, Private Bag 18901 Wellington 6160	64 04 439 8070		sophie.kalderimis@mfat.govt.nz
REPUBLIC OF KOREA								
Chan Soo	PARK	Mr	Deputy Director	International Cooperation Division, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	Government Complex Sejong, 94 Dasom 2-ro, Sejong Special Self-governing City, 30110, Republic of Korea	82 44 200 5339	82 44 200 5349	parkchansoo@korea.kr
Zang Geun	KIM	Dr	Invited Scientist	National Institute of Fisheries Science	216 Gijang-Haeanro, Gijang-eup, Gijang-gun, Busan, 46083, Republic of Korea	82 51 720 2333	82 51 720 2337	zgkim5676@gmail.com
Ayoung	KIM	Ms	Policy Analyst	Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center	6th FL, S Building, 253, Hannuri-daero, Sejong, Republic of Korea	82 44 868 7832	82 51 720 2337	aykim@kofci.org
Miyoung	CHOI	Ms	Inspector	Quarantine and Inspection Division, National Fishery Products Quality Management Service, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	337 Haeyang-ro, Yeongdo-gu, Busan, The Republic of Korea	82 51 400 5741	82 51 400 5745	choimi@korea.kr

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
SOUTH AFRICA								
Mandisile	MQOQI	Mr	Deputy Director	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Vlaeberg, 8018 Republic of South Africa	27 21 402 3342	27 86 661 9505	MandisileM@daff.gov.za
Aphiwe	NONKENEZA	Mr	Senior Administration Officer	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Vlaeberg, 8018 Republic of South Africa			AphiweN@daff.gov.za
Thabiso	MARATSANE	Mr	Assistant Director	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Vlaeberg, 8018 Republic of South Africa			ThabisoMAR@daff.gov.za
Buyekezwa	MAMAILA	Ms	Chief Marine Conservation Inspector	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Vlaeberg, 8018 Republic of South Africa			BuyekezwaP@daff.gov.za
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								
Kihua	TEH	Mr	Senior Executive Manager	Fisheries & Port Management Department, Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority	35 Fishery Port Road, Singapore 619742	65 6265 5052		TEH_Kihua@ava.gov.sg
Cheryl	GOH	Ms	Deputy Director	Fisheries & Port Management Department, Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority	35 Fishery Port Road, Singapore 619742			Cheryl_GOH@ava.gov.sg
BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL								
Stephanie	WINNARD	Ms.	International Marine Project Manager	BirdLife International	The Lodge, Sandy, Beds, SG19 2DL, UK	44 1767 69036 3	n/a	stephanie.winnard@rspb.org.uk
HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL								
Alistair	GRAHAM	Mr	Adviser, international conservation	Humane Society International	PO Box 439, Avalon NSW 2107	61 2 9973 1728	61 2 9973 1729	alistairgraham1@bigpond.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
WWF								
Aiko	YAMAUCHI	Dr	Oceans and Seafood Group Leader	WWF Japan	Mitakokusai Bldg 3F, Mita 1-4-28, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-0073, Japan	81 3 3769 1718		ayamauchi@wwf.or.jp
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

**Agenda
Thirteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee
11 – 13 October 2018
Noumea, New Caledonia**

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

- 2. Overview of Compliance with CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures**
 - 2.1 Report from the Secretariat
 - 2.2 Annual Reports from Members
 - 2.3 Assessment of compliance with CCSBT Management Measures
 - 2.3.1 Compliance of Members
 - 2.3.2 Application of the Corrective Actions Policy

- 3. Operation of CCSBT Measures: Issues & Updates**

- 4. CCSBT Resolutions: Review and Revision**
 - 4.1 Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)
 - 4.2 Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Resolution
 - 4.3 Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution

- 5. CCSBT Plans, Policies & Arrangements: Review, Revision & Progress Reports**
 - 5.1 Compliance Plan
 - 5.2 CPG1: Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs)
 - 5.3 CPG3: Corrective Actions Policy
 - 5.4 CPG4: MCS Information Collection and Sharing
 - 5.5 Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs)
 - 5.6 Template for Annual Report to the CC and EC
 - 5.7 Transshipment MoC with WCPFC
 - 5.8 International Networks and Bilateral Arrangements
 - 5.9 Compliance Committee Arrangements

- 6. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan**
 - 6.1 Review of Compliance Risks
 - 6.2 Potential Formalised Compliance Assessment Process
 - 6.3 Standing Agenda Items

- 7. Review of the implementation of the ERS Recommendation**

- 8. Proposed On-line Data Submission/ Data Access Project**

- 9. Work Program for 2019**

- 10. Other business**
 - 10.1. Use of AIS data to assess risks of undeclared SBT transshipments at sea and of IUU fishing for SBT

- 11. Recommendations to the Extended Commission**

- 12. Conclusion**
 - 12.1. Adoption of Meeting Report
 - 12.2. Close of Meeting.

List of Documents
The Thirteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee

(CCSBT-CC/1809/)

1. Provisional Agenda
2. List of Participants
3. List of Documents
4. (Secretariat) Compliance with CCSBT Management Measures
(CC agenda item 2.1)
5. (CCSBT) Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. Member Report: South Africa
(CC agenda item 2.2)
6. (Secretariat) Operation of CCSBT Measures
(CC agenda item 3)
7. (Secretariat) Update on the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme (and possible revisions to CCSBT's Authorised Vessel Resolution)
(CC agenda item 3)
8. (Secretariat) CCSBT's Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)
(CC agenda item 4.1)
9. (Secretariat) Information Gaps in the CCSBT's Current VMS Arrangements
(CC agenda item 4.2)
10. (Secretariat) Review of CCSBT's Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution (*and consideration of options to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures*)
(CC agenda item 4.3)
11. (Secretariat) Draft Revised CCSBT Compliance Plan and Review of Compliance Risks
(CC agenda item 5.1, 6.1)
12. (Secretariat) Draft Revised Minimum Performance Requirements
(CC agenda item 5.2)
13. (Secretariat) Draft Revised Corrective Actions Policy (CPG3)
(CC agenda item 5.3)
14. (Secretariat) Draft Revised MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy (CPG4)
(CC agenda item 5.4)

15. (CCSBT) Final Report on the Overall 2018 QAR Programme
(CC agenda item 5.5)
16. (Secretariat) Proposed Revision of the Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission
(CC agenda item 5.6)
17. (Secretariat) Update on the Transshipment Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the WCPFC
(CC agenda item 5.7)
18. (Secretariat) Update on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMCSN), the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN), (Inter-)Governmental Bodies and Other Organisations
(CC agenda item 5.8)
- ~~19. (Secretariat) Compliance Assessment Process
(CC agenda item 6.2)~~
20. (Secretariat) Potential Non-Member Fishing Activity & Trade/ Emerging Markets (Rev.1)
(CC agenda item 6.3)
21. (Secretariat) Review of the Implementation of the ERS Recommendation (Rev.1)
(CC agenda item 7)
22. (Secretariat) Proposal to Upgrade CCSBT's Databases and Develop On-line Data Submission/Data Access Facilities for Members
(CC agenda item 8)
23. (Secretariat) AIS Analysis Project Proposal
(CC Agenda item 10.1)
24. (New Zealand) Review of Compliance Committee Arrangements
(CC Agenda item 5.9)
25. (Australia) WCPFC's progress on the development of e-monitoring standards
(CC Agenda item 6.3)

(CCSBT- CC/1810/BGD)

1. (Secretariat) Draft Revision of the CCSBT's Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) Resolution (*Previously* CCSBT-CC/1710/08 Rev.1)
(CC Agenda item 4.1)
2. (Japan) Monitoring of Southern Bluefin Tuna trading in the Japanese domestic markets: 2018 update (*Previously* CCSBT- ESC/1809/30)
(CC Agenda item 2.2)

3. (Secretariat) Consolidation and Revision of CCSBT's Two VMS Resolutions
(*Previously* CCSBT-CC/1710/09)
(CC Agenda item 4.2)
4. (Australia) Japan Market Update 2018 (*Previously* CCSBT-ESC/1809/16)
(CC Agenda item 2.2)

(CCSBT-CC/1810/SBT Fisheries -)

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

(CCSBT- CC/1810/Info)

2. (BirdLife International) Monitoring compliance with seabird mitigation measures through port inspection- determining minimum standards
(CC Agenda item 4.3)
3. (BirdLife International) A new method using AIS data to obtain independent compliance data to determine mitigation use at sea (Rev.1)
(CC Agenda item 7)

(CCSBT-CC/1810/Rep)

1. Report of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2018)
2. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (March 2018)
3. Report of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2017)
4. Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2017)
5. Report of the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2017)
6. Report of The Twelfth Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (March 2017)
7. Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2016)
8. Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2016)
9. Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (April 2016)

Report of the results of the inspection

Where applicable, verify to the extent possible, that the details noted during the inspection, e.g. vessel identifiers/other vessel details, authorisations and SBT quantities are true, complete, correct and consistent with the information provided in accordance with the port entry request form (Annex A).

1. Inspection report no ¹ 検査報告番号				2. Port State 寄港国			
3. Inspecting authority 検査当局							
4. Name of principal inspector 主任検査官の名前				ID 身分証明書			
5. Port of inspection 検査港							
6. Commencement of inspection 検査の開始日時			YYYY 年	MM 月	DD 日	HH 時	
7. Completion of inspection 検査の終了日時			YYYY 年	MM 月	DD 日	HH 時	
8. Advanced notification received 事前通報の受領				Yes 有		No 無	
9. Purpose(s) ² 目的	LAN 陸揚げ	TRX 転載	PRO 加工	OTH (specify) その他 (特定)			
10. Port and State and date of last port call 最終寄港地、国及び日付		YYYY 年	MM 月	DD 日			
11. Vessel name 船名							
12. Flag State 船籍国							
13. Type of vessel 船舶の種類							
14. International Radio Call Sign 国際無線呼出符号							
15. Certificate of registry ID 登録番号							
16. Lloyd's IMO ship ID, if available IMO船舶番号 あれば							
17. External ID, if available ³ IMO船舶番号 あれば							
18. Port of registry 登録港							
19. Vessel owner(s) 船主							
20. Vessel beneficial owner(s), if known and different from vessel owner 船舶実質所有者 (船主と異なり、わかる場合)							
21. Vessel operator(s), if different from vessel owner 船舶の運航者 (船主と異なる場合)							
22. Vessel master name and nationality 船長の名前及び国籍							
23. Fishing master name and nationality 漁労長の名前及び国							
24. Vessel agent 船舶の代理人							
25. VMS ⁴ 船舶監視システム	No 無	Yes:National 有:国	Yes:RFMO s	Type: 種類			

¹ Provide a unique reference number for this inspection report.

² Record the purpose of entry into Port by circling the relevant option(s): LAN – landing, TRX – transshipment, PRO – processing, OTH - other. For 'OTH', specify what this signifies, for example re-fuelling, re-supplying, maintenance, and/or dry-docking, etc.

³ Record details of any external vessel markings e.g. registration and identification numbers that are additional to the information already provided on this form.

⁴ Circle the correct option(s) to indicate what type of VMS is on board the vessel: Circle 'No' if no VMS unit on board, 'Yes: National' if the vessel has a VMS that transmits to a Flag State, and/or 'Yes: RFMO(s)' if the vessel has a VMS that transmits to

26. CCSBT Authorised Vessel list						
CCSBT Registration Number:						
27. Relevant fishing authorization(s) 関係する漁業の当局						
Identifier ⁵ 確認者	Issued by 発行者	Validity ⁶ 効力	Fishing area(s) 操業海域	Species (FAO 3- Alpha code) 魚種	Gear 漁具	
				SBT(SBF)		
28. Relevant transshipment authorization(s)/Transshipment declaration(s) 関係する転載の当局						
Identifier ⁷ 確認者		Issued by 発行者		Validity ⁸ 効力		
Identifier ¹³ 確認者		Issued by 発行者		Validity ¹⁴ 効力		
29. Transshipment information concerning donor vessels 提供船舶に関する転載情報						
Name 船名	Flag State 旗国	ID no 登録番号	Species (FAO 3-Alpha code)	Type of Product 製品形態	Catch area(s) 漁獲海域	Quantity (in kg) 数量
			SBT(SBF)			
			SBT(SBF)			
30. Evaluation of offloaded catch (quantity) 荷卸された漁獲物の推定 (数量)						
Species (FAO 3- Alpha code) 魚種	Type of Product 製品形態	Catch area(s) 漁獲海域	Quantity declared (in kg) 申告数量	Quantity retained(in kg) 保持数量	Difference between quantity declared and quantity determined, if any(in kg) 申告数量と確定数量の差 (も し、あれば)	
SBT(SBF)						
31. Catch retained onboard (quantity) 船上保持漁獲物 (数量)						
Species(FAO 3- Alpha code) 魚種	Type of Product 製品形態	Catch area(s) 漁獲海域	Quantity declared(in kg) 申告数量	Quantity retained(in kg) 保持数量	Difference between quantity declared and quantity determined, if any(in kg) 申告数量と確定数量の差 (も し、あれば)	
SBT(SBF)						
32. Examination of logbook(s) and other documentation 操業日誌及びその他の文書の調査				Yes 有	No 無	Comments コメント
33. Compliance with applicable catch documentation scheme(s) 漁獲証明制度の遵守				Yes 有	No 無	Comments コメント
34. Type of gear used		使用された漁具の種類				
35. Fishing Gear examined 調査された漁具				Yes 有	No 無	Comments コメント
36. Compliance with Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Measures (longline vessels only) 海鳥混獲緩和措置の遵守状況 (はえ縄漁船のみ)						
a) Tick which Convention Areas this vessel fished for SBT in: 当該船舶がSBTを漁獲した条約水域をチェックすること。						
ICCAT (South of 25S) <input type="checkbox"/>		IOTC (South of 25S) <input type="checkbox"/>			WCPFC (south of 30S) <input type="checkbox"/> (南緯30度以南)	
b) provide information on which mitigation measures were used and effectively implemented (including night settings) and any comments on seabird mitigation measures used.						
< Translation of the above >						

RFMO(s); for 'Type': Provide the type and model of any VMS unit(s) on board.

⁵ Note the Flag State CCSBT fishing authorization reference number(s), e.g. fishing licence number, and the CCSBT Registration Number for this vessel (if applicable).

⁶ Record the dates for which the CCSBT fishing authorisation(s) is/are valid (if applicable)

⁷ For transshipment authorisations record "Authorisation" and the authorisation reference number(s) if available; for transshipment declarations record "TD"

⁸ For transshipment authorisations, provide the dates for which the CCSBT authorisation(s) is/are valid (if applicable); for transshipment declarations, record the transshipment date.

37. Findings by inspector(s)⁹ 検査による所見
38. Apparent infringement(s) noted including reference to relevant legal instrument(s) 関連する法律文書に明記されている明白な違反
39. Comments by the master 船長のコメント
40. Action taken¹⁰ とられた措置
41. Master signature 船長の署名
42. Inspector signature 検査官の署名

⁹ Record whether there is any evidence to indicate that this vessel is/was involved in any SBT IUU fishing and/or fishing-related activities.

¹⁰ Record any evidence collected and/or seized in relation to suspected SBT IUU fishing or fishing-related activities, for example any photos or samples taken, and any seizure of gear, materials or documents. In addition, record measures that could potentially be taken to address any apparent infringements detected, as well as any relevant authorities/officials contacted.

CCSBT Compliance Plan

(Revised at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting: 18 October 2018)

Purpose

The Compliance Plan supports the CCSBT Strategic Plan, approved in October 2015. Specifically, it supports the vision for Category C:

“Members are actively participating in management of SBT through the Commission and implementing its decisions”.

The purpose of the Compliance Plan is to provide a framework for the Commission and Members to improve compliance, and over time, achieve full compliance with their CCSBT conservation and management measures.

The Compliance Plan includes a Three-Year Action Plan to address priority compliance risks. The action plan will be reviewed and confirmed or updated at least every three years. The action plan is therefore a ‘rolling’ document and over time its emphasis will change.

Throughout this document references to Members include Cooperating Non-Members of the Extended Commission (CNMs), and all references to the Commission include the Extended Commission (EC).

Structure

This plan is in five parts:

1. Goals and Strategies
2. Compliance Principles
3. Roles and Responsibilities
4. Plan implementation and review
5. Three -Year Action Plan (Appendix 1).

Part 1: Goals and Strategies

Goals

The CCSBT Strategic Plan identifies four goals concerning participation and implementation by Members (Category C):

- ***Monitoring, control, and surveillance (Goal 8)***
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.
- ***Members' obligations (Goal 9)***
All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.
- ***Supporting developing countries (Goal 10)***
Developing country Members are able to comply with the Commission's management measures and other requirements.
- ***Participation in the CCSBT (Goal 11)***
Ensure that all States and Regional Economic Integration Organisations (REIOs) and entities catching SBT are incorporated in the Commission and engaged in the cooperative management of SBT. Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements

Strategies

Strategies are the suggested approach to achieve the goals and are numbered according to their corresponding goal.

The strategies below are based on the strategies set out in the CCSBT Strategic Plan (pages 15-16). In some cases the titles have been modified, and the descriptions elaborated. Strategy 8.4 has been expanded to explicitly cover monitoring of IUU fishing by non-members.

8.1 Implementation by Members of agreed MCS measures

The Compliance Committee will monitor Members' implementation of CCSBT conservation and management measures. This will include maintaining a comprehensive list of conservation and management measures, and Members regularly reporting against their obligations under these measures. Members' reports will be analysed by the Compliance Committee, and Members will be questioned and provided with feedback on their reports. Independent audits will also be conducted (refer to strategy 9.1).

The Compliance Committee will continue to develop¹ and regularly review existing compliance policies so that these clearly specify Members' obligations and associated performance requirements, e.g. the document, "Minimum Performance Requirements to Meet CCSBT Obligations". Compliance policies will be adopted following agreement by the Commission.

¹ Compliance policy guidelines have been developed for minimum performance requirements (CPG1), corrective actions (CPG3), and information collection and sharing (CPG4).

8.2 Implement Compliance Plan

New measures may be needed to address emerging compliance risks or replace ineffective or inefficient measures. The Compliance Committee will adopt a risk-management approach when developing measures and obligations to recommend to the Commission. This includes:

- a) assessing the necessity of additional MCS measures and/or improvement of agreed MCS measures to meet Commission objectives; and
- b) identifying any gaps between MCS measures in place and any improvements or additional measures required and a process to implement these.

Recommendations for changes or additions to conservation and management measures will also include performance requirements.

8.3 Strengthen Members' compliance

Continue to strengthen efforts by Members to ensure sufficient compliance at each stage of SBT fisheries, from catch grounds to markets, including transshipment, farming and trade.

The Compliance Committee will continue to develop policies and guidelines to assist Members to plan and implement effective MCS systems and the cost-efficient delivery of compliance services. These policies and guidelines will be based on Members' obligations and be focussed on how best to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risks of not meeting obligations.

As part of this strategy, the Port State Inspection Resolution should be reviewed, taking into account the FAO Port State Measures Agreement and each Member's domestic laws and regulations.

8.4 Monitoring expansion of SBT markets

The Commission and Members will actively monitor any possible SBT catch/ mortalities by Non-Cooperating Non-members (NCNMs) and/or the expansion of their SBT markets. This will include monitoring by MCS activities and regular review of SBT trade data.

Non-members and port States that are facilitating any fishing for SBT that is inconsistent with CCSBT obligations will be encouraged to cooperate with CCSBT measures. Action will be taken against IUU SBT fishing including the use of trade and market measures consistent with international law.

8.5 Exchange of compliance data

The Compliance Committee will continue to review policies and rules to facilitate exchange and sharing of MCS information among Members, and with port, market and coastal States as appropriate. This will include reviewing any necessary data confidentiality rules.

The Compliance Committee will promote the sharing of information amongst Members; other interested parties such as port States, market States, coastal States, other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and NGOs and the public. This will include actively removing barriers to information sharing, developing systems to lower the costs of information sharing, and adopting policies that maximise open access to Commission information.

8.6 Secretariat MCS services

The Secretariat will provide the Compliance Committee with compliance policy and process advice and assist with the specification and purchasing of shared compliance services.

This will include:

- a) conducting analyses of MCS data submitted, and reporting, on an annual basis, trends in MCS data;
- b) assessing the effectiveness of existing MCS measures based on data submitted to the Secretariat;
- c) managing and monitoring the CCSBT's compliance initiatives; and
- d) administration of compliance systems and programmes (for instance the Catch Documentation Scheme and reporting).

Subject to funding decisions, the Secretariat may provide the Commission with MCS services in circumstances where these can be provided cost-effectively and without conflicting with its core roles of Commission support, facilitation and information management. Such services may be provided through dedicated staff or contracted services.

8.7 Research & development

The Compliance Committee will recommend the commissioning of research on new technologies and methods aimed at facilitating implementation of MCS systems. Promising technologies will be trialled to assess their practicality and cost-effectiveness. Allocation of costs for such trials should be based on compliance risks and benefits. Depending on the technology and its application, trials may be funded by individual Members or collectively.

9.1 Auditing Members MCS systems and processes

Members' implementation, enforcement, and compliance with conservation and management measures and international obligations as they relate to CCSBT will be routinely audited.

The Compliance Committee will require Members to have their SBT MCS systems independently audited. These audits will focus on the systems and processes that each Member has implemented to meet its CCSBT obligations as defined by Compliance Policy Guideline 1, the Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs). Audit reports will be made available to all Members. The purpose of these audits is to give the Member assurance on the adequacy of their MCS systems, identify areas of improvement, and assure the Commission that the Member is meeting its obligations.

9.2 Corrective action and remedies

The Compliance Committee will apply the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy to breaches in the rules of the CCSBT and establish incentives to promote compliance with CCSBT obligations.

The Compliance Committee will recommend an investigation where it has reasonable cause to believe that a Member is not complying with core conservation and management measures and obligations, in particular Catch Management Measures and MCS Measures. The results of an investigation will be considered by the Commission.

10.1 Assist developing country Members, and where appropriate Non-members, to comply with Commission requirements

The Compliance Committee will recommend that the Commission provide technical and financial assistance for Members to develop and implement MCS systems to meet their CCSBT obligations. Assistance may include:

- education, training and extension services
- technical consultancies
- sharing of services
- financial assistance.

The Compliance Committee will work with developing country Members to:

- a) identify areas where assistance would be beneficial to ensure they meet CCSBT obligations;
- b) identify ways in which assistance may be provided (e.g. up-skilling, secondments, workshops etc); and
- c) develop and implement a programme to assist developing countries with Commission requirements.

11.1 Inclusive cooperation

To promote broader implementation of CCSBT management measures, the Compliance Committee will:

- a) identify any NCNM SBT catches/ mortalities, and recommend that the cooperation of the relevant entities be sought;
- b) investigate and recommend ways of providing for the participation and/or cooperation of a wider range of actors such as Carrier Vessel Flag States that do not fish for SBT; and
- c) identify non-member States that have, or are likely to become, important port, market or coastal States for SBT. These States will be nominated to the Commission for it to consider whether to seek their cooperation with CCSBT management measures.

Part 2: Compliance Principles

In implementing this plan, decisions will be guided by the following principles:

Encouraging compliance: Members should be encouraged to comply with their CCSBT obligations through implementation of effective compliance systems.

Deterrence: Effective deterrence should be used to detect and apply sanctions against IUU fishing.

Accountability: Members should be held publicly accountable for meeting their CCSBT obligations.

Openness and transparency:

- a) Compliance information should be available to all Members.
- b) Discussions should be inclusive of all Members.
- c) All compliance reporting documents should be publicly available as soon as practicable (subject to Rule 10 of CCSBT Rules of Procedure).

Cooperation and collective action: Members should cooperate, including through collective action, to facilitate effective monitoring and improve levels of compliance.

Incentives: Positive incentives should be used to encourage Members to monitor and improve their compliance systems.

Efficiency: Compliance obligations should be able to be met cost-effectively, and not impose unreasonable costs on Members.

Risk management: A risk management approach should be used to determine changes or additions to conservation and management measures, and the systems and processes to support those measures.

Part 3: Roles and Responsibilities

Members

- Actively participate in the Commission's decision-making processes relating to policy, planning, and establishing conservation and management measures.
- Meet obligations and ensure compliance with the measures agreed to by the Commission.
- Maintain effective fisheries MCS systems and ensure that nationally-flagged vessels and authorised farms comply with the Member's rules.²
- Report to the Compliance Committee on the implementation of measures and obligations and any areas where improvement is needed to achieve effective compliance with measures and obligations.
- Report any material non-compliance detected and remedial action taken.
- Implement any corrective actions or remedies agreed by the Commission.

Commission

- Approve Compliance Plan and Three-Year Action Plan.
- Determine any corrective actions and remedies.
- Consider recommendations from the Compliance Committee and make final determinations.

Compliance Committee

- Recommend policy frameworks, guidelines, and technical assistance, to facilitate effective and consistent implementation of CCSBT measures by Members.
- Monitor the performance of Members' implementation of CCSBT measures.
- Carry out an annual compliance risk assessment.
- Review the Three-Year Action Plan (Appendix 1), based on identification of compliance risks, and recommend any updates.
- Recommend additions or changes to CCSBT obligations to address compliance risks.
- Review audit reports and recommend compliance audits.
- Recommend investigations of alleged serious non-compliance and, if necessary, recommend corrective actions or remedies.

Secretariat

- Facilitate constructive working relationships between Members.
- Facilitate inclusive, participative and transparent decision-making processes.
- Manage and distribute information that supports the role and responsibilities of Members and the Commission.
- Facilitate provision of educational, extension and technical services to support effective implementation of Commission measures.
- Prepare summary and discrepancy reports for the Compliance Committee.

² "Rules" include laws, regulations, and conditions on permits, licenses or authorisations.

- Provide advice to the Compliance Committee on compliance/ MCS policy, plans, guidelines and services.

Part 4: Plan Implementation and review

Implementation responsibilities

The Compliance Committee will be responsible for managing implementation of this plan under the direction and oversight of the Commission. This will include:

- annual review of compliance risks, and
- 3-yearly review and update of the Three-Year Action Plan.

The Compliance Committee will make recommendations on updates to the Action Plan, new obligations, policies, or other actions for consideration and determination by the Commission.

The Secretariat will provide technical and administrative support, and compliance policy advice, to both the Compliance Committee and the Commission.

Review

The Commission will review the Compliance Plan whenever the CCSBT Strategic Plan is reviewed. The Three-Year Action Plan (Appendix 1) will be reviewed by the Compliance Committee at least every three years.

Appendix 1. Three-Year Action Plan (2018-2020)

This Plan sets out actions under each Compliance Goal and Strategy for the period 2018 – 2020.

In October 2010 the Extended Commission (EC) agreed that the Compliance Plan should place special emphasis on managing specific compliance risks identified by the Compliance Committee on the basis of a risk assessment.

CC11 reviewed previously identified compliance risks and produced the following revised list of compliance risks that should be considered when developing the 2018-20 Compliance Action Plan (CAP) – the risks are listed in no particular order:

- 1) Non-compliance or incomplete implementation of the CDS;
- 2) Members not fully implementing the agreed Conservation and Management Measures of the CCSBT;
- 3) 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;
- 4) 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;
- 5) SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species;
- 6) Catches of SBT by Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs);
- 7) Expansion of markets for SBT that are not cooperating with the provisions of the CCSBT's CDS;
- 8) Incomplete or inaccurate reporting of non-SBT bycatches, including sea birds;
- 9) Limited ability of some RFMOs to share relevant compliance information with each other due to confidentiality constraints and/or lack of relevant data exchange/ cooperation agreements; and
- 10) Limited information regarding fleet compliance with respect to binding and recommendatory ERS measures.

Table 1 lists Project Action Items. The shaded cells in Table 1 on the following pages represent the year(s) in which the actions are planned to be undertaken.

Table 2 lists ongoing Maintenance Action Items.

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2018	2019	2020
8.2 Develop and implement MCS strategy	1	Review areas of greatest compliance risk in order to facilitate a consistent and coordinated approach to compliance/MCS planning and prioritisation by Members and the Compliance Committee	Members	On-going		
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	2	Review the Compliance Plan	Members/ Secretariat			
	3a	CDS Resolution: a) It was agreed that the remaining issues in the draft revised CDS Resolution (of 2016) could be addressed intersessionally during 2018. If these issues have not been resolved, then consider rejecting the 2016 draft revised Resolution and decide whether to identify and incorporate any of the already agreed revisions (and/or any additional proposals) into a newly revised draft of the CDS Resolution for consideration	Members			
	3b	b) While reviewing the existing systems, determine and document future work priorities with respect to the CDS Resolution, in particular how the CCSBT plans to reduce the cost of introducing an eCDS in future, and when to commence its introduction.	Members			

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2018	2019	2020
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services) contd.	4a	With regard to VMS information: a) Identify information gaps where, enhanced CCSBT VMS arrangements are necessary to strengthen CCSBT's existing Conservation and Management Measures, <i>e.g.</i> the ability to cross-reference VMS data against operational fishing data, including CDS and transshipment data, and	Members/ Secretariat			
	4b	b) Determine and implement appropriate VMS arrangements to make available Members' VMS data to address information gaps identified in a), and review CCSBT's VMS Resolution(s) and revise accordingly	Members/ Secretariat			
	5a	Review and revise the following CCSBT Resolutions as appropriate: a) the Resolution on Minimum Standards for Inspections in Port	Members/ Secretariat			
	5b	b) CCSBT's IUU Vessel Resolution, particularly the cross-listing provision, in order to facilitate the implementation of cross-listing with other tRFMOs/relevant organisations on a case by case basis as agreed by the Extended Commission	Members/ Secretariat			
	6	Consider options to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures, including during inspections in port (Members) and as part of the transshipment observation programme (Secretariat)	Members/ Secretariat			

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)						
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2018	2019	2020
8.5 Sharing compliance data	7	Review CCSBT’s MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy (Compliance Policy Guideline 4) to ensure that it includes an efficient process by which available information/ intelligence that will assist with the identification of IUU fishing can be shared with the Secretariat and/or Members in a timely and secure manner	Members/ Secretariat			
8.7 Research & development	8	Regular report-backs on R and D on new technologies & tools to aid observers, certifiers, and validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed) to be provided by Members, in particular developments in the effectiveness and availability of practical on-site genetic testing kits for tuna species identification	Members			

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 9— Members’ obligations						
All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2018	2019	2020
9.1 Auditing Members’ systems and processes	9a	Continue to implement an integrated programme for conducting regular Quality Assessment Reviews (QARs) for each Member, as well as conducting ad hoc targeted QARs based on risk assessment advice: a) i) Aim to conduct at least 1 QAR each year until the initial round of QARs has been completed, and ii) request the Secretariat to research and draft a potential CCSBT Compliance Assessment process (and accompanying Measure) which distinguishes between trivial/non-trivial compliance matters, for future use alongside the existing QAR process, and which may be conducted independently.	Members/ Secretariat			
	9b	b) Once all of the initial round of on-site QARs have been completed, review the value of the information obtained and any remedial actions taken by Members, and determine whether to continue with the QAR process	Members			
	9c	c) If continuing with a new round of QARs: i) Review and revise the QAR terms of reference as appropriate to define: - which CCSBT measures should be assessed by future QARs, - a concise format for the presentation of future QAR executive summary information, ii) Determine whether any targeted ³ QARs need to be conducted	Members/ Secretariat			
9.2 Corrective action and remedies	10	Refine the corrective actions policy, for example by considering and then determining whether the policy should be further revised to publicly record instances of non-compliance identified (other than associated with the global SBT TAC) and the corrective action taken in response	Members/ Secretariat			

³ A ‘targeted’ QAR may be conducted in cases where there are concerns about a specific Members' systems and processes, in which case that Member may be nominated to participate in an ad hoc and specifically targeted QAR

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries						
Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission’s management measures and other requirements.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2018	2019	2020
10.1 Compliance Assistance	11	Targeted analysis of capacity building needs and Compliance "missions" to assist developing State Members	Members/ Secretariat	As requested		

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance			
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility
8.1 Implementing agreed MCS measures	12	Continue to implement adopted Resolutions and Decisions	Members/ Secretariat
	13a	Maintain and enhance: a) the agreed list of conservation and management measures	Secretariat
	13b	b) the already developed Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs), in particular the Routine Reporting Measures as existing Resolutions are revised, as well as developing new MPRs for any newly adopted Resolutions (e.g. the Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing)	Secretariat
	13c	c) the associated consolidated national report template in which Members report their performance against the obligations and agreed MPRs	Secretariat
	14	Performance reporting system in place (the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures and Operation of CCSBT Measures reports)	Secretariat
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	15	Maintain and strengthen relationships with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and international networks (such as the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network)	Secretariat

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)			
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission’s goals are met.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility
8.4 Monitoring expansion of SBT markets	16	Regular monitoring for emerging SBT markets, including reviews and trend analysis of SBT trade/market data.	Members/ Secretariat
8.5 Sharing compliance data	17	Share catch and effort data, and any other available information/ intelligence that will assist with the identification of IUU fishing	Members/ Secretariat - as required
8.6 Secretariat MCS Services	18	Analyse MCS data and report on trends (annually), as well as assessing the effectiveness of MCS measures based on the data submitted. These analyses should include an annual summary of any non-compliance detected with respect to the collection and provision of non-SBT bycatch information.	Members/ Secretariat
	19	Ensure all transshipment observers are trained in CCSBT obligations (in the event that SBT is involved), including any cross-endorsed WCPFC ROP transshipment observers	Secretariat

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 9— Members’ obligations			
All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility
9.2 Corrective action and remedies	20	Update CCSBT's public website with details of any instances of non-compliance with a Member's/CNM's allocation of the global SBT TAC, and the corrective action(s) that was/were taken by the Member/ CNM concerned	Secretariat

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries			
Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission’s management measures and other requirements.			
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility
10.1 Compliance Assistance	21	Ongoing identification and sharing of best practice and information for MCS systems	Members/ Secretariat

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 11: Participation in the CCSBT			
Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility
11.1 Inclusive cooperation	22	Identify (using trade and market analyses), as well as any other information supplied by Members, e.g. evidence of IUU SBT fishing, non-member port and market States whose cooperation should be sought	Members/ Secretariat
	23	As appropriate, nominate such States to the Commission	Members/ Secretariat

1.1 Compliance with National Allocations (Decisions)

Title: There is no official title for this measure, so “Compliance with National Allocations” will be used.

Links: https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_Allocation.pdf

https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_Limited_Carry_forward.pdf

Details of the decision on the common definition of the Attributable SBT Catch and on the Principle and Action points in relation to implementing the Attributable SBT Catch definition are at paragraphs 50 - 53 of the CCSBT 21 report:

https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/default/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/meetings/meeting_reports/ccsbt_21/report_of_CCSBT21.pdf

Note: Obligations relating to this measure are subject to regular allocation decisions of the Extended Commission (EC). The limited carry-forward process can only be utilised by Members and not by CNMs.

CCSBT has agreed that the “catch” of a Member/CNM that is to be counted against its allocation of the global SBT Total Allowable Catch is called the “Attributable SBT Catch” and that the Attributable SBT Catch is defined as follows:

A Member or CNM’s attributable catch against its national allocation is the total Southern Bluefin Tuna mortality resulting from fishing activities within its jurisdiction or control¹ including, inter alia, mortality resulting from:

- *commercial fishing operations whether primarily targeting SBT or not;*
- *releases and/or discards;*
- *recreational fishing;*
- *customary and/or traditional fishing; and*
- *artisanal fishing.*

¹ Except where a vessel is chartered to a person or entity of another Member or CNM, and if a catch is attributable to that Member or CNM

1.1 Compliance with National Allocations	
Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<p>i. Each Member and CNM shall ensure that its total Attributable SBT Catch for a quota year shall not exceed its Effective Catch Limit² as prescribed by the EC for that quota year, plus any amount of unfished allocation formally carried forward by the Member/CNM to that quota year (<i>i.e.</i> shall not exceed its total available catch).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rules in place to ensure that the total “Attributable SBT Catch” of each Member/ CNM does not exceed the Member’s/ CNM’s Total Available Catch Limit³ for the relevant period. 2. Operating systems and processes established to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. implement annual catching arrangements, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Specification of allocations by company, quota holder or vessel; ii. Arrangements for daily recording of all catches; and iii. Weekly reporting of catches by large scale tuna longliners and monthly reporting of catches by coastal fishing vessels. b. Monitor all fishing-related mortality of SBT. c. Ensure accuracy of the “Attributable SBT Catch”, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. For fishing Members/CNMs, a physical inspection regime of SBT caught by the Member’s/CNM’s fishing vessel; and ii. For farming Members/CNMs, monitoring the method used for estimating the weight of the SBT catch and adjusting/ re-calibrating where necessary. 3. All fishing-related SBT mortality is reported annually to the Extended Scientific Committee, for incorporation into stock assessment analysis, and to the Commission. 4. Operating systems and processes applied to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. monitor compliance with annual catching arrangements; and b. impose sanctions or remedies where necessary.

² The Effective Catch Limit is the Member’s National Allocation plus or minus any agreed short-term changes to that allocation, for example temporary transfers

³ Total Available Catch Limit means a Member’s Effective Catch Limit allocation for that quota year plus any amount of unfished allocation carried forward to that quota year.

1.1 Compliance with National Allocations	
Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<p>ii. Except in some situations when carry-forward procedures shall not be applied⁴ unless decided otherwise by the Extended Commission, if a Member's annual total available catch is under-caught, that Member may carry forward the unfished quota to the following quota year. However, the total quota carried forward from one year to the next shall not exceed 20% of that Member's Effective Catch Limit for the year from which the quota is being carried forward.</p> <p>iii. A Member's total available catch for a quota year shall not exceed the sum of its national allocation for that year plus an amount equal to 20% of its national allocation for the previous quota year.</p> <p>iv. Members that have elected to carry forward unfished quota shall provide confirmation to the Secretariat within 90 days of receipt of its confirmation request⁵, and shall include a</p>	<p>1. For Members that decide to adopt the carry-forward procedure (regardless of whether carry-forward was used in a particular year):</p> <p>a. Operating systems and processes must be in place to ensure that:</p> <p>i. an accurate, verified and robust figure for the final Attributable Catch is available before the Secretariat is notified of the carry-forward,</p> <p>ii. a report on the adoption and use of the carry-forward procedure, together with documentation on quantification and verification of the total Attributable SBT catch is included in each annual report to the Extended Commission;</p> <p>b. For Members intending to carry forward unfished quota to the next quota year, the Executive Secretary is formally notified of that Member's Total Attributable SBT Catch (in whole weight) for the concluded quota year together with the revised Total Available Catch Limit³ for the new quota year within 90 days of receiving the Secretariat's confirmation request.</p>

⁴ These include cases where: a) 'exceptional circumstances' exist and the Extended Commission (EC) agrees to reduce the global total allowable catch within a three year quota block, or b) the EC agrees within a three year quota block to reduce the national allocation of one or more Members (the Members concerned cannot carry-forward), or c) the Management Procedure recommends or the EC decides on a lower Global TAC, or d) a Member exceeds its national allocation for the 2017 fishing season or later without paying back its excess catch for those seasons

⁵ The Secretariat is required to seek confirmation from Members at the end of each quota year as to whether they intend to carry forward unfished quota to the next quota year

1.1 Compliance with National Allocations	
Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<p>revised Total Available Catch Limit³ for the new quota year.</p> <p>v. Members shall report on their use of the procedure in their annual reports to the Extended Commission, regardless of whether the procedure was in fact used by the Member during that quota year.</p>	

6.5 Annual Reporting to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission (Suite of Decisions/Resolutions/Recommendations)

Title: Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission⁶

Links: The following points provide the source of the associated obligations within this measure:

- i. Procedural Rule 10 of the Terms of Reference of the Compliance Committee:-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/default/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/basic_documents/terms_of_reference_for_subsidary_bodies.pdf
- ii. Paragraph 26 (and Attachment 5) of the CC7 report:-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/templates/Annual_CC-EC_Reporting_Template.docx
- iii. Paragraph 5 (a) of the Resolution on establishing the CCSBT vessel monitoring system:-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/default/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_VMS.pdf
- iv. Paragraph 31 of the Resolution on establishing a program for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels:-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/default/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_Transshipment.pdf
- v. Paragraph 4 of the Recommendation to mitigate the impact on ecologically related species of fishing for southern bluefin tuna:-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Recommendation_ERS.pdf
- vi. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Resolution on Reporting all Sources of Mortality of Southern Bluefin Tuna
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/operational_resolutions/Resolution_Reporting_on_all_Sources_of_Mortality.pdf
- vii. Paragraph 25 (and Attachment 5) of the CC7 report (best estimates of all sources of mortality):-
https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/default/files/userfiles/file/docs_english/meetings/meeting_reports/ccsbt_19/report_of_CC7.pdf

⁶ The reporting template can be found at the following link: https://www.ccsbt.org/sites/ccsbt.org/files/userfiles/file/templates/Annual_CC-EC_Reporting_Template.docx

6.5 Annual Reporting to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission

Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
<p>i. Each Member shall submit the above Annual Report to the Compliance Committee (CC) and Extended Commission (EC) in accordance with the agreed format for the template of the annual Report to the CC and EC⁶ four weeks prior to the convening of the Compliance Committee meeting.</p>	<p>1. The report is submitted electronically to Executive Secretary at least 4 weeks before the annual meeting of the Compliance Committee. No sections of the template should be left empty. If the required information is not collected, this should be stated rather than leaving a section empty. Similarly, if a section is not applicable to a particular fishery, this should be stated instead of leaving that section empty.</p>
<p>ii. Each Member should continue to improve the detail in its report to the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission⁶, and the report should be kept up to date and submitted to future annual meetings of the Compliance Committee.</p>	
<p>iii. Members shall provide VMS summary reports in advance of the Compliance Committee meeting.</p>	<p>1. Complete section II(1)(d): VMS of the Annual National Report template.⁶</p>
<p>iv. Members shall report the following to the Executive Secretary 4 weeks prior to the Annual Compliance Committee meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The quantities of SBT transhipped at sea and in port during the previous fishing season; ○ 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, and ○ 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. 	<p>1. Complete sections II(3)(a) i – iii of the Annual National Report template.⁶</p>

6.5 Annual Reporting to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission

Obligations	Minimum performance requirements
v. Members will report annually to the Compliance Committee on the action they have taken pursuant to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the Recommendation to mitigate the impact on ecologically related species of fishing for SBT.	1. Complete sections III(2)(a) – (d) of the Annual National Report template. ⁶
vi. All Members will report complete and accurate data on the quantity of all sources of southern bluefin tuna mortality. If the Member is unable to provide complete and accurate data, it will report annually a best estimate of all sources of Southern Bluefin Tuna mortality including recreational catch and discards.	1. Complete section III(3) of the Annual National Report template. ⁶

Corrective actions policy
Compliance Policy Guideline 3
(updated at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting: 18 October 2018)

1. Introduction

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

Apply the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy to breaches in the rules of the CCSBT and establish 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. Furthermore, if a Member exceeds its national allocation for the 2017 fishing season or later without paying back its excess catch for those seasons:

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

- the carry-forward procedures provided in CCSBT’s “Resolution on Limited Carry-forward of Unfished Annual Total Available Catch of Southern Bluefin Tuna” shall not be applied by that Member until those catches have been paid back, unless otherwise agreed by the Extended Commission; and
 - the Member is not eligible for an increase in its effective catch limit² until the excess catch has been paid back, unless otherwise agreed by the Extended Commission³.
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.

² The Effective Catch Limit is the Member’s National Allocation plus or minus any agreed short-term changes to that allocation, for example temporary transfers or quota pay-backs.

³ The Member’s national allocation may be increased but this increase may not be utilised until any excess catch has been paid back by the Member. Note for example that a 100t increase in the Members’ national allocation would result in a 200t excess catch being paid back in two years (assuming no further excess catches) since the Member’s effective catch limit would not increase during this time.

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; and
 - as agreed by the Extended Commission, other non-trivial instances of non-compliance with CCSBT obligations where corrective action has been specified, together with the corrective action taken.
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 five 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.

MCS information collection and sharing
Compliance Policy Guideline 4
(Revised at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting: 18 October 2018)

1. Introduction

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

2. Purpose of policy

The purpose of this policy is to promote confidential and prompt sharing of MCS information:

- a) among relevant Members;
- b) between Port States and relevant Members;
- c) between coastal States and relevant Members;
- d) between market States and relevant Members; and
- e) with the Secretariat.

3. Policy statement

All Members are expected to:

- a) share relevant MCS information promptly with other Members' national fisheries agencies and the Secretariat;
- b) Provide to the Secretariat a list of current contacts for MCS purposes which can be shared with all Members;
- c) conduct inspections and share port inspection information with the relevant Member where there are grounds for suspecting that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities for SBT;
- d) share other port inspection information with Members as relevant/ appropriate;
- e) advise relevant non-Member Port States, coastal States and/or market States of information Members would like to receive to ensure the integrity of the SBT management regime; and
- f) follow the confidentiality and use guidelines provided at Annex I.

It is intended that information from routine aerial surveillance, port inspections, at-sea inspections, market monitoring and other information sources (*e.g.* AIS) or investigations would be shared with relevant Members as appropriate. Members are expected to respond to any information received that indicates potential non-compliance, and advise the Member, Port State, coastal State or market State providing the information of the response taken.

To encourage MCS information sharing, the Compliance Committee may:

- i) identify the MCS information to be collected and shared by Members, Port States, coastal States and market States;
- ii) recommend standardised formats for collecting and sharing this information;
- iii) provide and review guidelines to ensure information confidentiality; and
- iv) request the Secretariat to analyse information it may receive and report on any trends or unusual variations as appropriate.

In the absence of guidance from the Compliance Committee on items i) – iv) above, Members should share MCS information amongst themselves and with the Secretariat on a case by case basis as appropriate.

Members are encouraged to participate in the current fisheries MCS network, including building on existing bilateral arrangements and international networks such as the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMCSN). The Secretariat should continue to be an active member of the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN)¹, including cooperating and liaising with other tuna RFMOs through the TCN as appropriate.

Over time, there may be a need to establish a formal compliance network among Members and with members of other RFMOs. A formal compliance network would include obligations to provide information and respond to information received and may include reciprocity of enforcement powers.

4. Roles and responsibilities under this Policy

<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibility to:</i>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve policy • Consider recommendations from Compliance Committee
Compliance Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend standardised MCS information to be collected and shared • Provide and review guidelines for information confidentiality • Review and revise policy
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a confidential pathway for information to be exchanged • Analyse information it may receive and report on trends and variations within confidentiality constraints
Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share information with relevant parties confidentially and as promptly as possible

¹ As long as the TCN continues to function

5. Policy review

This policy is to be reviewed five years from the date of its most recent revision. 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.

Annex I: Guidelines for Confidentiality and Use of MCS Information

1. MCS information is confidential and may only be provided or used as permitted by this Policy.
2. The Secretariat:
 - may only share the MCS information it receives if permitted to do so by the Member that provided the information;
 - may restrict the sharing of MCS information to relevant Members, as appropriate, and/or to Members specified by the information provider.
3. Members that receive MCS information from another Member will maintain the confidentiality of that information and may not use the information except as specified in this Policy. In particular, Members that receive MCS information may only provide that information to Member representatives and officials for the purposes outlined in paragraph 4 of this Annex.
4. Members may only use the MCS information to monitor compliance with CCSBT conservation and management measures.

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

(Revised at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting: 18 October 2018)

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. the EU), 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
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 Transshipment (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

I. Summary of MCS Improvements

(1) Improvements achieved in the current fishing season

Provide details of MCS improvements achieved for the current fishing season.

(2) Future planned improvements

Describe any MCS improvements that are being planned for future fishing seasons and the expected implementation date for such improvements.

II. SBT Fishing and MCS Arrangements

(1) Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna

(a) Specify the number of vessels that caught SBT in each sector (e.g. authorised commercial longline, authorised commercial purse seine, authorised commercial charter fleet, authorised domestic fleet) during the previous 3 fishing seasons.

Fishing Season <i>(e.g. 2011/12)</i>	Sector 1 <i>(please name)</i>	Sector 2 <i>(please name)</i>	Sector 3 <i>(please name)</i>
	Number of vessels	Number of vessels	Number of vessels

(b) Specify the Effective Catch Limit, together with any carry-forward of quota, and the total SBT mortalities counted against the national allowance for each sector (e.g. commercial longline, commercial purse seine, commercial charter fleet, commercial domestic fleet, recreational fishing, customary and/or traditional fishing, and artisanal fishing, including any releases and/or discards) in the following 2 tables. All figures should be provided in tonnes. :-

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Fishing Season	Effective Catch Limit ¹	Quota Carried Forward to this Fishing Season	Total Available Catch	Total of all mortalities attributed to the Member	Total amount of unfished quota Member will carry forward to next season ²	Utilisation of Allocation ³

¹ This is the Member's allocation plus any adjustments for agreed short term changes to the National Allocation. For example, see column 3 of Table 1 at paragraph 87 of the Report of CCSBT 24.

² This amount shall not exceed 20% of that Member's Effective Catch Limit for the year from which the quota is being carried forward.

³ A Member's allocation is fully utilised if the figure in this column (G) is the same as the Total Available Catch in column D. It's under-utilised if this column (G) is less than the Total Available Catch, and over-utilised if greater than the Total Available Catch.

Sector 1: <i>(please name)</i>		Sector 2: <i>(please name)</i>		Sector 3: <i>(please name)</i>		Sector 4: Discards	
National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)

(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 to⁴:- vi. What was the timeframe and method⁵ 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 information⁶:-

⁴ 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.

⁵ In particular, whether the information is submitted electronically from the vessel.

⁶ 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)⁴:-</i> <i>iv. What was the timeframe and method⁵ 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 information⁶:-</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="400 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>VMS</p> <p>The items of "ii" are required in association with the Resolution on establishing the CCSBT Vessel Monitoring System</p>	<p>For Member-flagged authorised carrier vessels and fishing vessels fishing for or taking SBT specify:</p> <p>i. Whether a mandatory VMS that complies with CCSBT's VMS resolution was in operation. If not, provide details of non-compliance and plans for further improvement:-</p> <p>ii. For the most recently completed fishing season, specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of its flag 1) fishing vessels (FVs) and 2) carrier vessels (CVs) that were required to report to a National VMS system:- 1) FVs: 2) CVs: • The number of its flag 1) fishing vessels (FVs) and 2) carrier vessels (CVs) that actually reported to a National VMS system:- 1) FVs: 2) CVs: • Reasons for any non-compliance with VMS requirements and action taken by the Member:- • 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:- • The procedures used for manual reporting in the event of a VMS failure (e.g. "manual position reporting on a 4 hourly basis"):- • 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:- <p>iii. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</p>
<p>At-Sea Inspections</p>	<p>Specify:</p> <p>i. The coverage level of at sea inspections (e.g. % of SBT trips inspected):-</p> <p>ii. Other relevant information⁶:-</p>
<p>Other (use of masthead cameras etc.)</p>	

(e) Report on the review of internal actions and measures taken in relation to the authorised vessel requirements provided at Attachment A, 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, validating⁷ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Farm Stocking Form, Farm Transfer Form):-

(e) Other relevant information⁶

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

(a) In accordance with the Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment 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 validating⁷ and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, Catch Tagging Form):-
- vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-
- vii. Other relevant information⁶:-

⁷ Including the class of person who conducts this work (e.g. government official, authorised third party)

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

- i. The rules and processes for authorising transshipments of SBT at sea and methods (in addition to the presence of CCSBT transshipment 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):-
- iv. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-
- v. Other relevant information⁶:-

(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 validating⁷ 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 information⁶:-*

(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 ⁸	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*

iii.

Calendar Year ⁸	Country / Fishing Entity 1	SBT Re-exported to						
		⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

(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:-*

⁸ “Calendar year” refers to the calendar year of the (re-)export date

- iv. Process for validating⁷ 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 information⁶:-

(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 ⁸	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 information⁶:-

(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 information⁶

(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 5.8⁹ 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 measures¹⁰ aimed at the protection of ecologically related species¹¹ 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:-*
 - CCSBT¹²:*
 - IOTC, for fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*
 - WCPFC, for fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*
 - ICCAT, for fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*

⁹ 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."

¹⁰ Relevant measures of these RFMOs can be found at: http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch_mitigation.php.

¹¹ Including seabirds, sea turtles and sharks.

¹² 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 possible¹³):

	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, commercial domestic fleet, recreational fishing, customary and/or traditional fishing and artisanal fishing) 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 all non-farming sectors, “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 possible, provide both the weight in tonnes and the number of individuals in square brackets (e.g. [250]) for each sector. 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 be available. If this is the case enter “?”, however, estimates are preferred over unknown entries wherever possible. 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.

¹³ Where species specific information is available, insert additional line(s) for each species below the relevant Seabird, Sharks, and/or Sea Turtles sub headings.

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 fulfil 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.