

Commission for the Conservation of  
Southern Bluefin Tuna



みなみまぐろ保存委員会

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

**8 – 10 October 2020**

**Online**

## **Fifteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee**

**8 – 10 October 2020**

**Online**

### **Agenda Item 1. Opening of meeting**

#### ***1.1. Welcome***

1. The Chair of the Compliance Committee (CC), Mr Frank Meere, welcomed participants and opened the meeting. The Chair advised that the meeting this year is being held as a video conference (VC) due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and that discussion for some agenda items had commenced in advance of the meeting by correspondence. The Chair thanked participants for their cooperation with this special arrangement.
2. Members and observers introduced their key speakers of their delegations to the meeting. It was noted that South Africa did not attend the meeting. The list of participants is shown at **Attachment 1**.

#### ***1.2. Adoption of agenda***

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

#### ***1.3. Meeting arrangements***

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

### **Agenda Item 2. Overview of Compliance with CCSBT Conservation and Management Measures**

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

6. Discussion for this agenda item commenced by correspondence in advance of the CC meeting.

#### ***SBT Related Measures***

7. The Secretariat submitted paper CCSBT-CC/2010/04 which summarised compliance with CCSBT Management Measures by Members. The main points to note from this paper were:
  - There were three reported over-catches in the 2019 and 2020 fishing seasons:
    - 2019: Australia: Reported SBT mortalities exceeded Total Available Catch by 40.291 t
    - 2019: Indonesia: Reported SBT mortalities exceeded Total Available Catch by 181.916 t

- 2020: Indonesia: Reported SBT mortalities to date (up until August 2020) exceed the reduced Total Available Catch by 232.76 t.
  - During 2020, some Members had not authorised fishing vessels by the start of their fishing seasons and requested retrospective authorisation of large numbers of fishing vessels more than 6 months after the commencement of their respective fishing seasons.
  - For the 2019 fishing season/year:
    - South Africa has not submitted some Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) forms (CMFs and REEFs) and there are discrepancies between data submitted from different sources;
    - Indonesia has not been tagging all SBT at the time kill and has advised of some exceptional circumstances;
    - No notice of a transshipment nor transshipment documentation was submitted by Taiwan for a small at-sea transshipment of SBT<sup>1</sup>;
    - South Africa and Taiwan did not submit port inspection reports within the required 14-day timeframe specified in the Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port Resolution; and
    - Some Members are persistently not submitting copies of all expected import copies of CDS documents to the Secretariat.
8. Key responses to issues raised in the Secretariat's paper by correspondence were:
- Australia advised that:
    - It has taken action to repay its over-catch by reducing the quota amounts available to some fishers who had overcaught during 2018/19; and
    - Regarding not submitting all expected import CDS forms, that there is a flaw in its current system, and it is looking at interim measures that will improve compliance in this area, while it pursues a long-term solution.
  - Indonesia:
    - Acknowledged its 2019 over-catch and that it should pay back its over-catch in the following year but noted that, "due to the COVID-19 pandemic that had a great impact on the economy, the fisheries sector in Indonesia changes its strategy to operate almost their entire fleet and increasing operation days. These changes have an impact on Indonesia so that Indonesia cannot make a payback on the over catch in 2019 and 2020. Indonesia would like to ask the CC and other Members to understand this situation and consider the over-catch as an exceptional circumstance and not categorised as non-compliance finding";
    - Regarding exceptional tagging circumstances where during 2019 some SBT were again<sup>2</sup> tagged at landing rather than at the time of kill, noted it had provided advice on this matter in March 2020<sup>3</sup>, and that the proportion of SBT catch being tagging in port was 5.01% (equal to 60.47 t); and

---

<sup>1</sup> Three SBT.

<sup>2</sup> Indonesia also tagged some SBT at landing rather than at the time of kill during 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Attachment D of paper CCSBT-CC/2010/04 .

- Advised that of its total 2019 SBT catch of 1,206 t, approximately 800 t of that catch would be exported during 2020 based on market demand and the rest would go onto the domestic market.
  - Taiwan:
    - Advised that a Taiwanese-flagged fishing vessel, under IOTC<sup>4</sup> ROP observer monitoring (IOTC Observer Report No. 507-18), accidentally transhipped 3 tagged SBTs to a carrier vessel on August 13, 2018.
    - Advised that its late submission of four port inspection reports during 2019 was due to its misunderstanding the requirements of the, “*Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port*”.
9. It was noted that the objective of this paper is for the Secretariat to provide information about the implementation of and compliance with measures. Consideration of corrective action is a separate matter which is discussed by the CC under agenda item 2.4 of the meeting.

### ***ERS Related Measures***

10. The Secretariat submitted paper CCSBT-CC/2010/05 (Rev.2) which is the annual report on Members’ implementation of Ecologically Related Species (ERS) and performance with respect to. This report was prepared in accordance with paragraph 7 of the Resolution to Align CCSBT’s ERS measures with those of other tuna RFMOs and paragraph 71 of CCSBT 25 report. The main issues to note from this paper were:
- Two Members (Indonesia and New Zealand) did not achieve the overall scientific observer effort coverage target of 10%. Another Member (South Africa) did not submit the data necessary to determine its scientific observer coverage. Furthermore, four Members (Australia, Indonesia, New Zealand and Taiwan) only achieved a 50% representativeness (or less) for their observer coverage<sup>5</sup>.
    - It was noted that the less than 100% representivity for Australia may be due to zero observer coverage in certain strata where there is probably a low level of fishing effort and there may be value in adjusting the representivity statistic to exclude strata with a low level of fishing effort
  - Japan, New Zealand and Taiwan reported some observed sets that used only a single seabird mitigation measure in areas where two or more mitigation measures are required by the CCSBT. For Japan, over two-thirds of the observed sets used only a single mitigation measure where two measures were required. For Taiwan, 8.6% and 6.4% of sets in Statistical Areas 3-10 and 2/14 respectively use only a single or no mitigation measures. New Zealand used only a single mitigation measure for 1% of its observed sets.

---

<sup>4</sup> Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.

<sup>5</sup> Although there is currently no mandatory requirement on representativeness of observer coverage, the CCSBT’s Effectiveness of Seabird Mitigation Measures Technical Group (SMMTG) recommended that spatial-temporal representativeness is an important metric of observer program data and agreed on the method for calculating a measure of “representativeness”. A representativeness of 100% means that the target of 10% observer coverage was achieved for all statistical areas that were fished, while a representativeness of 50% means that the target observer coverage was only achieved for half of the areas that were fished.

- There was a large magnitude of difference each year between those Members with low rates of seabird kills and those with high rates of seabird kills. Japan and New Zealand had substantially higher observed rates of seabird mortalities than the other Members.
  - With the exception of South Africa which did not submit ERS data in 2020, most Members complied well with the ERS Data Exchange requirements and with their annual reporting requirements to the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) and Annual CC and Extended Commission (EC) meetings. There were some exceptions that are noted in the paper.
11. There were six main themes of discussion related to this paper, these being: Observer coverage and representativeness; Electronic monitoring; Future improvement in implementation of seabird measures; Species level reporting of seabirds; Seabird interactions/mortality rates; and Shark mortality.

#### ***Observer coverage and representativeness***

12. Those Members that did not meet the overall scientific observer effort coverage target of 10% or did not achieve full representativeness of their observer coverage provided more detail concerning the associated circumstances.
13. Australia advised that it used electronic monitoring which it considers provides a much more reliable and representative sample of seabird interactions.
14. A large portion of the observer coverage for New Zealand was attained during the 2018 portion of the 2018/19 financial year, which then reduced the coverage attained during the 2019 portion of that financial year and resulted in the less than 10% observer coverage in the 2019 calendar year. New Zealand plans to observe 10% of effort in all areas.
15. Indonesia noted that reaching the 10% target observer coverage is difficult for Indonesia due to the large number of vessels operating, together with human resources and budget constraints. Indonesia is currently focusing on improving data quality from its electronic logbook. The effort on improving the accuracy of e-logbook is being conducted by cross-validation with other data sources such as catch landing, port sampling and VMS data. In the future, Indonesia will seek to develop another monitoring approach (i.e. video/video monitoring onboard) as a supplement to the onboard observer program.
16. Taiwan advised that the representativeness of its observer coverage in 2019 was at 50% due to all Taiwanese seasonal targeting vessels operating in the Indian Ocean. With limited resource, Taiwan needed to concentrate its observer capacity to the “hot zone” of SBT fishery in the Indian Ocean.
17. ACAP commented that action is urgently needed to improve the overall levels of observer coverage and the representativeness of this coverage.

#### ***Electronic monitoring (EM)***

18. New Zealand advised that the overlap of its surface longline fleet with vulnerable seabird species has prioritised the aimed rollout of EM across this fleet and that monitoring of protected species interactions, including mitigation use, has been highlighted as an EM priority for this fleet.

### ***Future improvement in implementation of seabird measures***

19. Those Members that reported some fishing effort without full implementation of the required seabird mitigation measures described their plans for future improvement.
20. Japan advised that it has implemented corrective actions on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures since 2020 and that the details are provided in the 1<sup>st</sup> page of Japan's national report (CCSBT-CC/2010/SBT Fisheries-Japan (Rev.2)). Japan advised that it will continue these corrective actions until it sees full implementation of the seabird bycatch mitigation measures.
21. Taiwan commented that it complies with RFMO measures, it has made relevant domestic regulations accordingly and it will continue to promote seabird bycatch measures to the relevant industry in the future. Taiwan also advised that its SBT fishing vessels only operated in Statistical Areas 2, 8, 9, 14 and 15 in 2019. It noticed that observers reported vessels operating with a single seabird mitigation measure in areas where two or more mitigation measures are required by the CCSBT. Taiwan advised that it shall conduct further investigation and, if necessary, sanction those vessels.
22. New Zealand advised that since 2016, the Protected Species Liaison Officer Programme has been working with the surface longline fleet to assist fishers in setting up effective and compliant mitigation practices. Since the introduction of the programme, observed compliance with mitigation measures has improved, to 99% of effort in the 2019 calendar year.
23. ACAP, BirdLife, HSI and Pew all commented that they were very concerned about the low levels of implementation of the required seabird bycatch mitigation measures by some fleets. ACAP further commented that:
  - Such non-compliance will certainly contribute to, and drive, increased levels of seabird bycatch, and needs urgently to be addressed; and
  - It appears that in some cases, vessels with relatively high levels of compliance with bycatch mitigation measures continue to record high levels of seabird bycatch, which raises the question of whether these measures need to be strengthened.
24. HSI and TRAFFIC suggested that consideration be given to decrements of National Allocations of SBT for cases of non-compliance with ERS measures to incentivise improved implementation of ERS measures.

### ***Species level reporting of seabirds***

25. BirdLife commented that it was pleased to see that most Members are reporting seabird bycatch to species level. It noted that Japan has not, and Australia has only partially reported to species level, and asked about plans to report to species level in future.
  - Australia advised that it is happy to report to a species level where it is possible to do so. Australia also noted that it has implemented conditions that make it compulsory for boats to collect feather samples from dead birds that are bought on board the boat and has put in place mechanisms to determine species from genetic samples.

- Japan advised that its understanding is that species level data submission is not a minimum requirement of the CCSBT's data exchange for seabirds.

#### ***Seabird interactions/mortality rates***

26. NZ commented that the high rate of its observed seabird mortalities, despite most effort observed effort using multiple mitigation measures, was because as indicated by the Southern Hemisphere Risk Assessment presented by New Zealand to the ERWSG in 2019, New Zealand is an area with a high number of seabirds, and therefore the risk of incidental capture is significantly higher than in other fisheries. New Zealand further advised that as part of its revised NPOA for seabirds 2020, mitigation standards have been developed for its surface longline fishery. Additionally, New Zealand continues to investigate new mitigation technologies. During 2020, assistance was provided to encourage uptake of hook-shielding devices, which a number of vessels began to use, and a stage 1 trial for an underwater bait setter has been completed.
27. Several questions were asked of Indonesia in relation to high rates of raised seabird mortalities that the Secretariat calculated for Indonesia. Both Indonesia and the Secretariat noted that the raised mortalities of seabirds for Indonesia was unreliable due to low observer coverage. In future Secretariat will not provide raised estimates when the overall observer coverage is less than 5%. There was however misreporting on Indonesia's national report (CCSBT-CC/2010/SBT Fisheries-Indonesia (Rev.1)) which states "During 2019, there was no interaction between longliner and seabird in observed longline fisheries." It should be reported there are five seabird mortalities for 2019.
28. ACAP, BirdLife, HSI, Pew and TRAFFIC commented that they were concerned or very concerned about the high levels of seabird bycatch reported by some Members. ACAP further commented that bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries represents one of the greatest threats to albatrosses and petrels listed by ACAP, and these levels of bycatch exacerbate the conservation crisis faced by ACAP species.

#### ***Shark mortality***

29. Australia noted that shark interactions, particularly for blue and shortfin mako sharks, continue to remain high and asked Members what plans are in place to reduce interactions.
  - The EU advised that its vessels fully comply with shark protection measures in force in other tuna RFMO and that it has no vessels fishing for SBT.
  - Indonesia noted that it has a NPOA on shark and rays and that the NPOA regulates the action plan to reduce the shark bycatch from tuna fisheries. Indonesian longline fleets have been using the circle hook to replace wire hook to reduce shark bycatch as a part of mitigation. There were also several workshops conducted for fishers to strengthen awareness for improved data collection relating to shark bycatch and awareness to retain the catch until the fishing port.
  - Japan advised that its SBT longline fishing vessels are obliged to comply with respective rules of each tuna RFMO when fishing in those areas. Japan also questioned the logic that shark interactions should be reduced, particularly for blue shark. Japan commented that as long as the stock is healthy, it should be able to be utilised.

30. TRAFFIC commented that it is concerned by the very high level of mortality of blue shark in the Japanese fishing activity and subsequent discarding. TRAFFIC further noted that a number of CCSBT Members have high levels of shark mortality and suggested that the next ERSWG meeting examine the extent to which discarding of dead sharks is occurring and examine the inclusion of mitigation methods to reduce the occurrence of this. Japan commented that this should be discussed at EC, not CC.

## ***2.2. Annual Reports from Members***

31. The Secretariat informed the meeting of the status of the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) of the EU. The review is essentially finished and is at the final checking stage. The draft will be sent to the EU soon. The next steps are for the EU to review the QAR and provide comments to the review team for its consideration. The delay in completing the QAR, is because it took longer than expected to finalise the methodology, and to formulate and receive responses to questions, which was partially due to COVID-19. The main body of the QAR work then fell into the busiest part of the Review Team's year. The QAR has also involved more work and time than the Secretariat had anticipated.
32. Members submitted their National Report using the new reporting template agreed in 2019. Most discussion for this agenda item was conducted by correspondence in advance of the CC meeting. This provided the opportunity for detailed questions and answers on reports.
33. A summary of important responses and comments are provided below.

### ***Recreational and customary fisheries***

34. New Zealand clarified that its overall estimate for recreational catch is based on data from a boat ramp survey, amateur charter vessel records, reporting of recreational activity from commercial vessels and New Zealand sport fishing club records. This is described in greater detail in New Zealand's 2020 report to the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC). A link to its national survey of recreational fishing for SBT is provided in that report and can be found here: <https://fs.fish.govt.nz/Doc/24783/FAR-2020-02-Recreational-catch-Southern-Bluefin-Tuna.pdf.ashx>.
35. Australia advised that its recreational SBT catch survey was completed earlier this year, and peer reviewed internationally (see [https://imas.utas.edu.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/1331796/National-Survey-of-Rec-Fishing-for-SBT-in-Australia.pdf](https://imas.utas.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1331796/National-Survey-of-Rec-Fishing-for-SBT-in-Australia.pdf)). In summary:
- The peer reviewer accepted the methodology and findings;
  - 270 tonnes was the estimated recreational catch during the survey period;
  - The Australian government has agreed to set aside 5% of its allocation, which equates to 308 tonnes currently; and
  - The additional allowance provides for some fluctuation in recreational catch between years, some growth in recreational catch, and recreational catch discard mortality.



36. Australia noted that the Australian Government is not aware of any previous customary or traditional fishing for SBT. There is some participation in the commercial fishery by indigenous Australians.

***Scientific observers and electronic monitoring (EM)***

37. Australia clarified that its audit of EM is at least 10% of fishing events recorded on logbooks. The Australian e-monitoring system only records video footage during setting and hauling events as detected through hydraulic and drum monitors.
38. Japan stated that the unilateral introduction of EM is not consistent with current agreed measures in CCSBT.
39. The EU noted that the CCSBT Scientific Observer Program does not apply to EU surface longliners, which are not targeting SBT and SBT is not a substantial by-catch. However, the EU surface longline fleet, entering in the SBT distribution area, comply with the observer's requirements of the relevant tuna RFMO (IOTC, ICCAT<sup>6</sup> and WCPFC<sup>7</sup>). In 2019, the observer coverage of these vessels was 5.4% in the WCPFC, 5.4% in IOTC and about 7% in ICCAT.

***Bycatch and mitigation measures***

40. Australia advised that provision has been made for a hook shielding device to be used by its fishers. A "hook shielding device" with a cap and weighing at least 38g may be deployed directly at the hook as an alternative measure.
41. Australia commented that several studies have been done to determine the impact of live bait on sink rates and the results of these studies have indicated that 40g weights, even close to the hook, are not sufficient to achieve appropriate sink rates with live bait. Therefore, all of its boats that use live bait are required to use at least 60g weights.
42. Australia noted that it has had no reported bycatch of turtles in its fisheries.
43. Japan advised that scientific observers onboard some of its SBT vessels are tasked to record the use of seabird mitigation measures.
44. Korea stated that its bycatch logbook template has a specific section for seabird mitigation measures and each fishing vessel is supposed to fill in the section. This is in addition to any reports made by observers.

***Mortalities from SBT discards***

45. Australia advised that fish with a poor chance of survival are not permitted to be released in its fisheries. Prior to the start of the 2019/20 fishing season Australia amended the Southern Bluefin Tuna Statutory Fishing Right Conditions to allow operators to discard dead SBT only in cases when they have been damaged by sharks.
46. Australia will continue to deduct quota from fishers where dead SBT have been discarded that are not shark damaged. Australia would welcome a dialogue with other Members to determine how to account for mortality of depredated catch

---

<sup>6</sup> International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

<sup>7</sup> Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.

(e.g. what happens when only a head or badly damaged carcass comes up) and how to calculate a weight for these fish.

47. The EU stated that it requires its vessels to record interactions with SBT in logbooks and SBT discards are not allowed. The discarding of species subject to a quota is forbidden. SBT mortalities are also verified using landing declarations and sales notes' information. In addition, the calculation of the EU's 'Attributable SBT catch' also takes into account information from scientific observers, flag State inspections, port State inspections/reports and any related information provided by third countries, including those having fisheries agreements with the EU.
48. Japan advised that its discard mortalities (33t) are sum of dead discard and estimated post-release mortality from live release, and that the numbers of fish of live releases and dead discards are reported by three body weight categories. It calculates the total weight with average body weight in each of the categories. The assumed post-release mortality rate in the estimation is 9%, which is the value based on pop-up archival tag survey (CCSBT-ESC/1309/34).
49. Korea clarified that its logbook data reported zero non-retained SBT, while observers reported 15 depredated SBT. The fishing vessels had recorded those fish as other species. Korea also mentioned that it was still examining the case and would update its national report if necessary. Korea reminded the meeting that it had allocated 5 t of its TAC for possible discards, and/or releases and counted this 5 t against its 2019 TAC, considering that there could have been unintended misreporting or mistaken identification.
50. Taiwan clarified that the estimated attributable catch of 10 t in its national report does not further distinguish the discarding status as dead or alive.

#### ***Indonesia SBT allocation and over-catch***

51. Indonesia clarified that its SBT Quota is allocated to fisheries associations, who distribute those quotas to their members. All Indonesian SBT reported catch is from eligible vessels who are also members of those associations.
52. Regarding its over-catch in 2019, Indonesia advised that its catch data validation and the closing of the quota block system in its CDS is conducted during February, to allow fishing vessels to catch until the end of December from the previous year. The 2019 over-catch occurred at the end of the year, therefore Indonesia could not notify fisheries associations as quota holders through an early warning scheme on that CDS system.
53. Indonesia advised that the following measures will minimise the chance that its SBT allocation will be exceeded in the future:
  - It will implement a quota block that will deduct over-catch for the following year within the Indonesia CDS system. Associations and fishing companies will be informed of the fishing capacity reduction before the next harvesting year;
  - It will regularly notify associations and fishing companies of the SBT utilisation status as an early monitoring system to avoid over-catch; and
  - It is committed to maintaining the catch so that it does not exceed the national quota and will recompense the exceeded quota from the past two years. The catch limitation will be effectively implemented in 2021. Thus

Indonesia would like to request that over-catches in 2019 and 2020 are not considered as non-compliance finding and would not intend to payback the over-catches with the consideration to support the economy and food security in Indonesia during the economic recession situation due to the COVID19 pandemic.

### ***Inspections***

54. Australia advised that AFMA officers visit processing / export facilities and physically inspect SBT product numbers and weights against CDS documentation randomly throughout the season.
55. Japan advised that it conducts genetic tests for declared bigeye and yellowfin tuna which are imported. In the 2019/2020 fishing season, 3,566 samples were tested and did not find any disguised SBT.
56. Japan clarified that all SBT caught by Japanese vessels are inspected by government officials at the time of landing in Japan. If a discrepancy of more than 2 % is found between the weight at landing inspection and reported weight in CMF, additional investigation is conducted.

### ***Other matters***

57. The EU commented that a large majority of the EU longliners that intermittently enter the SBT distribution area mainly fish in subtropical fishing grounds outside the SBT distribution area. All of those longliners use selective gears and fishing techniques (depth and bait) to target swordfish. The EU has decided to forbid its vessels to target SBT in order to minimise the potential by-catch of this species. It considers the risk of potential misreported SBT by-catches to be very low and potential incidents are very marginal.
58. Indonesia advised that the obligation to install VMS in Indonesia applies to all vessels > 30 GT or fishing vessels with fishing permits to operate in high seas.
59. There was discussion on whether depredation should be included in Members' Attributable SBT Catch. The Secretariat read out the CCSBT's definition of the Attributable SBT Catch. It was noted that the definition includes "*the total Southern Bluefin Tuna mortality resulting from fishing activities within its jurisdiction or control*". However, the inter alia examples provided in the definition did not include depredation. The meeting agreed that depredation had not been contemplated when the definition of the Attributable SBT Catch was adopted and that it is uncertain as to whether depredation should be included. It was further agreed that there should be consistency amongst Members and New Zealand volunteered to lead an intersessional discussion group to address this issue.
60. South Africa was asked a series of questions on its national report during pre-meeting discussion but South Africa did not engage in this discussion and did not provide any responses.

## ***2.3. Consideration of COVID-19 related issues***

### ***2.3.1. Action taken by Members***

61. Members were requested to report on any departures from the usual operation of CCSBT Compliance measures that have resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic which have not been approved by the EC.
62. Japan provided updates during the pre-meeting discussion for the two following cases of departure from the usual operation of CCSBT compliance measures that resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic:
  - Transshipment at-sea without an observer: In response to suspension of deployment of IOTC-ROP observers, Japan notified the application of “force majeure” in accordance with paragraph 20 of the CCSBT’s Transshipment Resolution<sup>8</sup> in relation to upcoming at-sea transshipments. As of September 11, there were 7 SBT transshipment cases conducted without ROP observers, involving 407.7 t of SBT in total. Of these, 95.9 t of SBT from 2 transshipments had already been landed at Japan, all of which were physically inspected and the quantities were verified by government officials. No possible infractions were detected. The remaining transhipped SBT without ROP observers will also be physically inspected by government officials when they are landed at Japanese ports.
  - Use of paper tags instead of plastic tags: Due to logistical constraints worldwide caused by COVID-19, as of September 11, 1 SBT fishing vessel has been forced to use paper tags instead of CCSBT centralised CDS tags for 276 SBT fish totalling 14.5 t. The SBT products will be physically inspected and the quantities will be verified by government officials at Japanese ports when they are landed.
63. Korea advised that it notified the Executive Secretary yesterday (7 October 2020) of four at-sea transshipments by Korean longliners without observers aboard the carrier vessels due to COVID-19. The notifications were not timely due to an administrative oversight. However, transshipment details were provided to the IOTC and to the observer consortium and were authorised by Korea. Further transshipments at sea will be assessed on a case by case basis to determine if Force Majeure applies and the Executive Secretary will be notified in a timely manner. To minimise risks for at-sea transshipments without observers, Korea will examine all relevant data (e.g. catch report, VMS data, transshipment declarations and landing report) and will conduct inspections at the landing site to the extent possible.
64. New Zealand noted that during its 4.5 week COVID-19 lockdown it did not have observers on longline vessels that were fishing, and it did not conduct vessel inspections. However, those activities resumed once the lockdown finished.
65. Taiwan advised that it notified the Executive Secretary on 30 Apr 2020 that it considers transshipments at-sea without observers during the COVID-19 pandemic to qualify as Force Majeure. Taiwan continues to submit transshipment declarations to the CCSBT Secretariat and requires its vessels to land in

---

<sup>8</sup> Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels.

designated ports and it conducts 100% inspection of its vessels in those ports. Taiwan will continue to conduct these alternative measures during the pandemic. In addition, Taiwan dispatched its own observers in April 2020, but due to scheduling and other constraints, this ceased in May 2020.

66. There was considerable discussion of the alternative actions being undertaken to minimise the risks of not having observers on board carrier vessels during the pandemic, and whether these actions were sufficient. No agreement was reached. Some Members noted that electronic monitoring (EM) could assist to minimise the risks, although this is a longer term approach and it is partially dependent on progress with EM in other RFMOs. Some Members also requested more frequent reporting of alternative action taken.
67. Indonesia advised that its over-catch in 2020 was due to the national policy in order to increase/maintain the agriculture and fisheries sector's capacity and production. Both sectors are the surviving basic sectors to support the national economy, especially during this economic recession due to the COVID 19 pandemic. Moreover, both sectors are labour-intensive and provide enormous job opportunities.

#### *2.3.2. Guidelines on principles and types of actions to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances*

68. The Secretariat introduced paper CCSBT-CC/2010/07 which contains a draft Compliance Policy Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances. The draft guideline was prepared following one round of informal intersessional consultation with Members. During the pre-meeting discussion, Japan submitted further revisions in response to guidance from the Chair and the Secretariat.
69. Additional revisions to the guidelines were drafted by several Members. The meeting agreed to the revised guidelines provided at **Attachment 4**.
70. Some Members highlighted that the “force majeure” clause (para 20 of the Transshipment Resolution) does not prohibit transshipments at-sea even without CCSBT regional observers as long as due notification is made to the Executive Secretary, and that it does not require Members to obtain pre-approvals by the EC. Japan further pointed out that CMMs for SBT management are not limited to deployment of transshipment observers, and there are other broad CMMs to follow.
71. One Member pointed out that if the EC has to trust the unambiguity of the mentioned duly notification, it is expected that Members, benefitting from the application of the “force majeure” clause, implement remedial measures to minimise risks resulting from the application of this clause. It is also expected that the same Members undertake all possible efforts to comply with the obligations set in the program for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels.
72. The same Member highlighted that it would also be suitable that Members, applying the “force majeure” clause, report periodically on how the implementation of this clause has been monitored. This reporting would include information on the measures that have been undertaken and on the expected involvement of the situation that triggered the “force majeure” clause. It was

suggested that the actions to be taken and periodical reports are thoroughly identified in the Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances.

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

### ***2.4.1. Compliance of Members***

73. The meeting discussed Indonesia's over-catch of 181.92t for 2019 and estimated 777t for 2020, in particular how it was planning to pay back the over-catch and what measures it would take to ensure it did not exceed its allocation in the future.
74. Indonesia stated that:
- It was a developing coastal state;
  - Its fleet consisted of mostly small-scale vessels operating in CCSBT Statistical Area 1, that were not targeting SBT and caught it as bycatch;
  - Its fleet has attempted to reduce its catch of SBT by raising hook lines;
  - It is currently suffering from an economic recession due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its tuna fishery is important to the economy;
  - Its management measures include a stringent VMS and CDS application system, and its over-catch should not be considered to be due to it not having appropriate management measures; and
  - It predicts that its final catch in 2020 will be between 1600 and 1800 t, which would result in its over-catch for the 2019 and 2020 years combined being between approximately 760 t to 960 t greater than its Total Available Catch for 2019 and 2020 combined.

In this context, Indonesia stated that:

- It would try to increase the global production of the agriculture and fisheries sectors in order to increase/maintain a substantial part of the national labour force and to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the national economy. Consequently, Indonesia would not be decreasing its fishing capacity; and
  - It requests that the meeting consider its over-catch as exceptional circumstances and not require Indonesia to pay back its over-catch for 2019 and 2020.
75. The meeting noted that Indonesia had changed its response to this issue since the pre-meeting discussions. Members agreed that remaining within a Member's allocation of the SBT TAC was an important obligation of Members, especially in the context that the stock is in rebuilding process. Members were sympathetic to Indonesia's economic problems and agreed to be flexible, but asked that Indonesia:
- Commit to paying back the over-catch, gradually and when its economic situation due to the pandemic has improved; and
  - Provide a concrete commitment to improve its management of SBT catch and remain within future allocations.

76. Indonesia committed to remain within its TAC for 2021. Other Members expressed concern that Indonesia's current management measures may not be sufficient to achieve that, especially given the over-catch in 2019.
77. The meeting noted the issues and non-compliance that South Africa has had with its CDS. Australia offered assistance to South Africa and would follow up with South Africa and report back to next year's CC meeting. New Zealand also extended its previous offer of assistance.
78. The meeting noted the retrospective vessel authorisations by South Africa and the EU. The EU stated that the reason for the delay in authorising its vessels was that the vessels were authorised with other RFMOs and its Member States had assumed that this would cover the CCSBT. The EU will remind its member States of their obligations so that they provide and renew CCSBT authorisation appropriately in the future.
79. With respect to the issue of persistently not submitting copies of all expected import copies of CDS documents to the Secretariat:
  - Australia advised that it did not consider this compliance issue to be a persistent issue. This is because Australia is amending its regulatory framework to address the problem and it takes time to amend regulations. Australia is also looking at interim measures to address the issue in the shorter term.
  - Korea recognised the importance of its CDS issue where some import documents were not being returned. It has been trying to improve its internal CDS management system in consultation with all relevant authorities and stake holders. In future it will provide any missing documents as soon as they become available.
80. The meeting requested those Members with compliance issues to report back next year on how those issues have been rectified.
81. The CC tasked the Secretariat with preparing a possible revision of the CDS Resolution to extend the timeframe for reporting exceptional circumstances related to attachment of tags from seven days to an annual reporting requirement. The revision will be considered at next year's CC meeting.

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

82. With respect on Indonesia's over-catch, the meeting concluded that:
  - Indonesia has been non-compliant in relation to abiding by its allocation of the TAC in 2019 and 2020;
  - The EC should be flexible in deciding the timeframe for the over-catch payback; and
  - Indonesia's current management measures need to be improved in respect to controlling its catch.
83. Indonesia agreed to provide a plan to CCSBT 27 to ensure that its catch in 2021 is within its allocation of the TAC.
84. The meeting agreed to refer the application of the corrective actions policy, with respect to Indonesia's over-catch, to the EC.

### **Agenda Item 3. Review of Progress on CC14's 2020 Workplan Items**

85. The Secretariat provided paper CCSBT-CC/2010/08 (Rev.1) which gives a progress report on some items of the CC's 2020 Workplan that were allocated either to the Secretariat, or to Members and the Members concerned provided information in advance of CC15. More substantive 2020 WorkPlan items are reported in separate agenda items and papers. The Workplan elements reported on in this paper are:
- A response to the request that the Secretariat follow up with the IOTC transshipment observer regarding the circumstances which led to suspected SBT being reported on board a Chinese-flagged Carrier Vessel/ transhipped from various Chinese fishing vessels;
  - Results from the request for the Secretariat to check ICCAT records for any newly reported SBT catch;
  - Responses from Australia and the EU (a response from Indonesia was not available prior to paper finalisation; South Africa has not responded) regarding the Workplan request to investigate apparent discrepancies between UN COMTRADE data and exports/ imports reported to the CCSBT (through the CDS) as well as a voluntary response from the USA; and
  - An update on the operationalisation of the transshipment Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the WCPFC.
86. During the pre-meeting discussion:
- Regarding section 3a of paper CCSBT-CC/2010/08 (Rev.1), Australia noted that its COMTRADE figures have been amended and are now close to being consistent with CDS records;
  - Regarding section 3b) of paper CCSBT-CC/2010/08 (Rev.1), the EU reiterated its preference that the Secretariat should primarily use trade data provided by DG MARE and not COMTRADE data. The EU also provided additional information that following further investigations, it confirmed that there were no exports and imports of SBT into the EU during the 2016 to 2018 period. The erroneous information recorded on COMTRADE can be explained by miscoding, specifically that Atlantic Bluefin Tuna was miscoded as SBT.
87. Indonesia provided a response into its initial investigations into data discrepancies between CDS and COMTRADE trade data (COMTRADE data under-represents its SBT exports in each year between 2016 to 2018 inclusive) in paper CCSBT-CC/2010/18. Indonesia articulated various points including that:
- Trade of a country group could be understated in COMTRADE due to unavailability of some country data; and
  - COMTRADE does not contain estimates for data of countries which do not report in the most recent commodity code classification.



The paper concluded that:

- Indonesia does not have the mandate to submit its data to COMTRADE therefore those data do not describe the total volume or value of Indonesia's SBT export data; and
  - Indonesia needs more time to investigate the data discrepancy between COMTRADE records and its national data.
88. In addition, based on Appendix 1 of its paper, Indonesia noted there appear to be issues with both export and import information of SBT traded by Indonesia recorded on COMTRADE. Indonesia advised that it will provide further results of its investigation into discrepancies between COMTRADE and CDS data to CC16.
89. The meeting:
- Discussed COMTRADE data further and agreed that COMTRADE data would be prepared and presented by the Secretariat for each Member in future years and that, in addition, the EU and Indonesia should each provide the best available annual trade data summaries from their own national databases to the Secretariat in advance of the CC meeting so that these are available to be compared to the COMTRADE summaries;
  - Noted the EU's advice that the trade figures for the EU provided by DG MARE should be considered as being the correct figures for the EU;
  - Noted South Africa's lack of response concerning its investigations into CDS/COMTRADE data discrepancies (this item was carried forward into the 2021 WorkPlan); and
  - Thanked the Secretariat for paper CCSBT-CC/2010/08 (Rev.1) and Indonesia for paper CC/2010/18.

#### **Agenda Item 4. Operation of CCSBT Measures: Issues & Updates**

90. The Secretariat provided paper CCSBT-CC/2010/09 which gives an update on the operation of CCSBT's key measures. The Secretariat highlighted the following items:
- Attachment A of the paper provides summary tables on the volume of transshipments occurring at-sea and in-port, including the number of known at-sea transshipments of SBT (to date) that occurred during the first half of 2020 where transshipment observers were not on board Carrier Vessels due to the COVID-19 situation (Table 2b);
  - New CCSBT IMO number requirements will take effect for wooden and fibreglass fishing vessels of at least 100 gross tonnage in size from 1 January 2021 onwards; and
  - Following the CCSBT agreeing to cross-list IUU vessels with eight other RFMOs in 2019, the CCSBT IUU Vessel List was established in February 2020 and currently includes 116 cross-listed IUU vessels. It is expected that the list will be updated soon as other RFMOs hold their respective Commission meetings.

91. Some Members took the opportunity to express their support of the CCSBT's IUU cross-listing initiative as a positive step forward.
92. In the pre-meeting discussion Indonesia noted that:
  - Out of a total of 183 vessels that are eligible to have IMO numbers according to the IMO Resolution, 177 vessels already have IMO numbers due to voluntary implementation by the vessel owners concerned. Several owners are still in the registration process;
  - In 2020 it issued a Ministerial Regulation on the PSMA and it is in the technical preparation process of implementing this regulation; and
  - It will provide a further update in 2021.
93. Pew Charitable Trusts offered to assist any interested CCSBT Members to obtain IMO numbers if needed.
94. In relation to the recommendations to tranship SBT separate to other tuna-like species and Member monitoring of the potential to use of on-site genetic testing kits in future (section 3), Korea noted that it reserved its position on these recommendations and wished to discuss the technical implications with its stakeholders.
95. The meeting acknowledged the voluntary cooperation of the USA with the CCSBT's CDS Resolution, particularly its continued provision of quarterly CDS submissions, and thanked the Secretariat for the paper.

## **Agenda Item 5. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan**

### ***5.1. Potential Formalised Compliance Assessment Process***

96. CC14 agreed that Australia would lead an intersessional correspondence group that will work towards developing a compliance assessment process for the CCSBT and report the outcome to CC15.
97. Australia provided the following update on the intersessional group's progress during the pre-meeting discussion:
  - The Compliance Assessment Process Correspondence Group carried out its work during 2019/20;
  - In October 2019 Australia sought nominations of participants for the group as well as comments on paper CCSBT-CC/1910/16;
  - Following receipt of nominations and comments on Australia's paper CCSBT-CC/1910/16, Australia circulated a summary of views and suggested areas it considered might be usefully considered further by the correspondence group - some Members commented on these areas;
  - In general Members appeared to support only limited modifications to the existing compliance assessment process and viewed the existing process as effective;
  - Several proposed changes were considered by the group, but consensus on changes could not be found, with some Members noting parallel activity in the context of the Compliance Action Plan, and possible implications of the planned CCSBT Performance Review; and

- Australia proposed that the group continues and formally reports back to CC16.
98. The meeting recommended that this group continue its discussions on the potential development of a more formalised Compliance Assessment Process during 2021, and formally report back any outcomes to CC16. Members also agreed that all comments provided to the group would be shared.
  99. The meeting thanked Australia for leading this intersessional correspondence group.

## ***5.2. Standing Agenda Items***

100. The Secretariat provided paper CCSBT-CC/2010/10 on Potential Non-Member Fishing Activity & Non-Member Compliance Interactions. This paper:
  - Reports that the Secretariat has not requested any ad-hoc analyses to be conducted by Trygg Mat Tracking (TMT) during 2020 and that the operating fund held by TMT has not yet been utilised;
  - Provides an update on contact made with various Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs) regarding trade of SBT and CCSBT's Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) - Canada, Lebanon, Namibia and the USA. It also notes that the USA continues to cooperate with the CCSBT's CDS by providing quarterly reports of available SBT CDS import documents and following up with respect to some missing import documents; and
  - Notes that the Secretariat is not providing a summary of trade data from the UN COMTRADE in 2020 since compliance resources were instead prioritised to do the additional work associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and the QAR of the European Union.
101. The meeting agreed to recommend continuation of the operating fund held by TMT to facilitate ad-hoc analyses of Automatic Identification System (AIS) data and vessel company relationships upon request at short notice should the Secretariat receive any information of suspicious fishing activity occurring in SBT fishing grounds.
102. The meeting noted that there have been unfortunately a number of cases where no meaningful response is obtained from NCNMs despite the outreach effort by the Secretariat, and that this issue should be somehow addressed in the next CC and EC meetings in 2021 when results of more interactions with NCNMs become available.
103. The meeting agreed to recommend to the EC that the following countries be invited to next year's CC meeting: China, Mauritius, Namibia, Singapore and the United States, and thanked the Secretariat for its outreach work.
104. The Secretariat submitted paper CCSBT-CC/2010/11 on Proposed Revisions to the Template for the Annual Report to Compliance Committee and Extended Commission. This paper proposed several minor corrections and clarifications only. Australia proposed a further revision to section 2.1.3 during the pre-meeting discussion process. In response to a query, it was confirmed that Australia's towing mortalities of SBT are reported separately to the Secretariat.

105. The meeting agreed to accept all proposed changes suggested by the Secretariat. The agreed template for the Annual Report to the CC and EC is shown at **Attachment 5**.
106. The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew) submitted paper CCSBT-CC/2010/17 on a 2018 Comparative Analysis of AIS Data with Reported Transshipments in the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna Statistical Areas. It was noted that this document was submitted to the CC through the process for review of external documents including possible non-compliances of Members, which was adopted by CCSBT 26.
107. Some Members noted that there are lawful reasons for fishing vessels to interact with carrier vessels that do not involve transshipment, such as transfer of bait or supplies. Korea stated that, as far as the specific cases related to Korean vessels are concerned, it did not believe that the incidents mentioned in the paper are potential non-compliance issues and does not believe that the information in the paper is a reasonable ground for believing that the cases have reasonable and reliable evidence of illegal activities because the only information provided in the paper regarding the cases was that there were encounters between fishing vessels and carrier vessels, and that there were no notifications for transshipments, so it did not conduct any investigations.
108. During the pre-meeting discussion, Japan commented that:
- As attached to the CCSBT-CC/2010/17, Japan conducted factual investigation in cooperation with Japanese private companies operating 10 out of 20 carrier vessels detected by AIS, which covers 98 cases out of 190 detected “Encounter” events. As a result, there was no sign of any illegal practice related to at-sea transshipment. Most (92 out of 98) cases related to the 10 carrier vessels were properly monitored by ROP observers onboard. All the rest 6 cases were meetings for other activities than transshipment of fish.
  - With regard to the “Process for Review of external Documents including possible non-compliances of Members” under which Members’ comments to the paper were sought, Japan found it extremely difficult to meet the current deadline (20 days) for Member’s initial response, from experience of actual implementation of the process. This is the case especially when the external paper contains a variety of data for a number of cases. For example, the paper submitted this year contained 1,438 cases of suspected at-sea transshipment and port visits after suspected at-sea transshipment, involving 279 cases to which Japanese private companies were related. This difficulty will be even more severe if multiple external papers are submitted at the same time. The current 20 days deadline will need to be reconsidered in future based on such practical difficulties.
109. Indonesia commented during the pre-meeting discussion that it encourages that any meeting paper should have sufficient confirmation and achieve ethical clearance from the relevant Flag State before discussing it in the plenary compliance meeting.
110. The Secretariat advised that the Russian Federation’s Annual Fishing/Capacity Management Plan for Tropical Tunas that Russia submitted to ICCAT refers to “Longline vessels of the Russian Federation equipped for southern bluefin tuna

(SBT) fishing ...”. The Secretariat recommended that it write to Russia for clarification. The meeting agreed with the Secretariat’s recommendation.

**Agenda Item 6. CCSBT Plans, Policies & Arrangements: Review, Revision & Progress Reports**

***6.1. Compliance Action Plan (CAP): Review of Risks and Consideration of a CAP for 2021 to 2025***

111. The Secretariat provided paper CCSBT-CC/2010/12 on a Review of Compliance Risks and Consideration of a Draft Compliance Action Plan for 2021-2025. This paper was developed through intersessional discussion with Members and the CAP was further updated through the pre-meeting discussion process.
112. This paper:
  - Outlines the steps that occurred during the intersessional correspondence group process;
  - Provides a proposed draft CAP for 2021 to 2025; and
  - Provides an update on what has been done to mitigate or better quantify existing compliance risks.
113. The Secretariat noted that some additional proposed revisions to the CAP were provided during the pre-meeting discussion process and so therefore the meeting would be considering that further revised proposed CAP instead of the version attached to the Secretariat’s paper.
114. The meeting first considered Attachment A which includes proposed revisions to the list of identified compliance risks and associated preambulatory text. Various points were discussed including that:
  - One Member was of the view that ranking compliance risks is important and would help bring more structure to the process of formulating an Action Plan, but another Member did not find pressing necessity to do such exercise as it would invite quite time-consuming discussion; and
  - The list of compliance risks should guide the development of the action items included within the CAP.
115. The meeting did not agree a revised set of compliance risks and as a result decided not to consider future project and maintenance action items during CC15.
116. The meeting agreed to recommend to EC that:
  - The current CAP be retained until CC16 and that any relevant action items from the current CAP are undertaken before CC16; and
  - The revision of the CAP should not be considered further intersessionally but should instead be considered at the next appropriate face-to-face meeting.

## ***6.2. Update on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with other Organisations***

117. The Secretariat provided paper CCSBT-CC/2010/13 on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with Other Organisations. This paper provides an update on compliance relationships with the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network, the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN), relevant RFBs/ RFMOs, and also relationships with INTERPOL, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Global Fishing Watch (GFW) and the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation. Highlights include:
- A TCN initiative to set up an informal IUU Vessel List update notification system between compliance colleagues in all tuna RFMOs and also many non-tuna RFMOs - it includes all the RFMOs CCSBT cross-lists with. This informal process is helping to ensure that any de-listings or newly listed vessels (on other RFMOs' lists) are not inadvertently missed and are actioned swiftly and appropriately now that cross-listing is in place; and
  - Signing of a transshipment letter of agreement (to replace the previous MoU) between the CCSBT and the IOTC.
118. The Secretariat was encouraged to progress its work to operationalise the Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) on at-sea transshipment with WCPFC as soon as possible.
119. The meeting thanked the Secretariat and noted the paper.

## **Agenda Item 7. On-line Data Submission/ Data Access Project and Development of a Trial eCDS**

120. The Secretariat submitted paper CCSBT-CC/2010/14, which provides progress updates on the CCSBT's Online Data Submission / Access and Trial eCDS.
121. The monthly catch reports and authorised validators features of the Online Data Submission/Data Access project are currently undergoing evaluation by Members. Work remaining for 2020 includes the bulk upload facility for authorised vessels and an automated reminder tool, which will be evaluated by the Secretariat before being trialled by Members. The planned budget for 2021 is to cover the cost of deploying the system to the production environment for 'live' use by Members, and maintenance / bug fixes as required.
122. The trial eCDS project has progressed well with most of the online CDS forms ready to be tested by the Secretariat. To date \$44,550 has been used of the maximum \$150,000 that was budgeted. The next step is to create detailed rules for form validation / certification, data quality checks, and user access rules. For these, the Secretariat requires some input from Members and recommends that an online working group be formed to provide some guidance. In addition, the Secretariat seeks guidance from Members on how and when discussion and demonstration of the current version of the eCDS can take place.
123. In response to the questions, the Secretariat advised that:
- Deployment of the production version of the Online Data Access Tools project is likely to be in the middle of 2021;

- Some elements of the eCDS development can continue, but the Secretariat requires input from Members; and
  - Integration with Members' national systems into the eCDS is possible but will require a separate project once the trial eCDS is completed.
124. Some Members commented that the structure and functionality of the trial Online Data Access Tools software was looking good, and they will continue to evaluate it and provide feedback to the Secretariat.
125. The meeting recommends to the EC that:
- Development of the trial eCDS should continue; and
  - An online working group be formed to provide guidance to the Secretariat during the development of the trial eCDS.
126. It was noted that the eCDS is a trial and that there are two fundamental issues that need to be resolved before it could progress beyond a trial, these being neutrality of validators and whether or not tagging forms need to be attached.
127. Japan commented that formation of the working group does not prejudice future introduction of the eCDS.

#### **Agenda Item 8. Proposal to enhance the implementation of seabird measures**

128. BirdLife International (BirdLife) presented two papers as an update to its 2019 paper (CCSBT-CC/1910/15 (Rev.1)) on project proposals for enhancing education on and implementation of Ecologically Related Species seabird measures within CCSBT fisheries. The proposal has been further developed, in consultation with Members, since it was presented to the October 2019 meeting of the CC. The proposal has also been split into two separate proposals with the same activities, but with different funding streams, depending on Members' eligibility for GEF funding. The project involves education and outreach to industry, capacity building to enhance monitoring, innovation of automated systems to allow managers to automatically monitor vessel-level implementation of bycatch mitigation measures, and an update of the global seabird bycatch estimate.
129. Minor changes to the proposal were suggested by some Members during the meeting. Birdlife has incorporated these changes in the revised papers CCSBT-CC/2010/15 (Rev.2) and 16 (Rev.2).
130. The meeting endorsed the project proposals for enhancing education on and implementation of ERS seabird measures.
131. It was agreed that the intersessional seabird correspondence group would continue to further refine the project activities and develop the budgets of the project and prepare for the project commencing at the end of 2021 or start of 2022.

#### **Agenda Item 9. Work Program for 2021**

132. The CC developed the following workplan for 2021. Annual tasks of an ongoing nature are not shown unless they are new for 2021.

	Approximate Period	Resource
Provide the plan to remain within Indonesia's TAC for 2021.	To EC27	Indonesia
Develop a proposal for a possible modification of the CDS Resolution (paragraph 1.9) to change the 7-day notification requirement to report annually in CC/EC National reports.	Before CC16	Secretariat
Finalise and circulate QAR of the EU	As soon as practical	Consultant/ Secretariat/EU
Members with non-compliant issues outlined in paper CCSBT-CC/2010/04 relating to vessel authorisation, CDS and port inspection reports to report in their national report on progress with actions taken to rectify non-compliance.	Before CC16	Relevant Members
Implement any outstanding project action items of the Compliance Action Plan and continue with maintenance action items.	Before CC 16	Members / Secretariat
Continue work with the WCPFC to operationalise the transshipment MoC with the WCPFC.	As soon as practical	Secretariat
Investigate the trade data discrepancies reported on page 4 of CC/1910/10. (carried over from 2020 Workplan).	Before CC16	South Africa
Indonesia to provide further results of its investigation into discrepancies between COMTRADE and CDS data.	Before CC16	Indonesia
The EU and Indonesia to provide the best available annual trade data summaries (volumes of fresh/frozen SBT exported/imported in tonnes) from their own national databases to the Secretariat (for the years 2018, 2019 and 2020).	Before CC16	EU/Indonesia
Write to the Russian Federation to seek clarification relating to its notification to ICCAT that it intends to fish for SBT.	As soon as practical	Secretariat
Invite the USA, Singapore, China, Mauritius and Namibia to participate as observers at CC 16.	Before CC 16	Secretariat
Discussion of SBT markets other than Japan to be an agenda item, subject to further discussion at EC27.	CC16 / EC28	Members
Intersessional correspondence group led by Australia to continue considering the need for a more formalised compliance assessment process.	Before CC 16	Australia/other Members/Secretariat



	Approximate Period	Resource
Continue the intersessional seabird correspondence group to support development of project proposals for funding.	Before CC 16	Members, Secretariat, BirdLife
The Secretariat to continue eCDS development work with Member's cooperation and feedback through an online working group.	Before CC 16	Secretariat/Members
Undertake on-line data submission and access work scheduled for 2021.	Before CC 16	Secretariat/Members
Convene an intersessional correspondence group to discuss how depredation of fish should be covered in the application of Attributable SBT Catch.	Before EC28	NZ/Members
Prepare for a TCWG meeting to discuss the market research proposal and tagging improvements (subject to EC's approval of this project), Compliance risks (CAP) and the eCDS	Before CC16	Members/Secretariat
Provide support to South Africa as required to help resolve CDS issues.	Before CC16	Australia and New Zealand

#### **Agenda Item 10. Other business**

133. The CC agreed to recommend that a Technical Compliance Working Group (TCWG) meeting be held immediately prior to the 2021 CC meeting. It was recommended that the TCWG meeting could consider the revised Compliance Action Plan, eCDS and CDS tag attachment improvements under Japan's market proposal. The TCWG may supplement its physical meeting with virtual meeting(s) with the timing of the virtual meeting(s) to be decided.
134. The meeting did not have sufficient time to consider whether changes could be made to the pre-meeting discussion process to refine the process in case another virtual meeting is required. Members agreed to provide suggestions on this matter intersessionally.

#### **Agenda Item 11. Recommendations to the Extended Commission**

##### ***Recommendations***

135. The Compliance Committee made the following recommendations to the Extended Commission:
  - That it considers Indonesia is non-compliant with respect to its Total Available Catch which it significantly over-caught in both 2019 and 2020 – there is a total over-catch of 232.76 t for 2019 and 2020 combined as at 10/10/2020. Indonesia has indicated that it does not intend to reduce its fishing capacity to address this over-catch and does not intend to use the payback mechanism outlined in the Corrective Actions Policy. Indonesia

advises that it is currently expecting to catch between 1,600 and 1,800 tonnes of SBT in 2020 which could potentially result in an over-catch of approximately 950 tonnes of SBT for 2019 and 2020 combined.

- With respect to Indonesia's over-catch, the meeting advised the EC to consider the following CC discussion:
  - Indonesia has been non-compliant in relation to abiding by its allocation of the TAC in 2019 and 2020;
  - The EC should be flexible in deciding the timeframe for the over-catch payback (Indonesia has advised that it is willing to gradually pay back its over-catch following an increase in the global TAC in the future);
  - Indonesia's current management measures need to be improved in respect to controlling its catch; and
  - Indonesia agreed to provide a plan to CCSBT 27 to ensure that its catch in 2021 is within its allocation of the TAC.
- The proposed 2021 Workplan for the Compliance Committee be approved.
- That the EC agree to the roll-over of the current Compliance Action Plan for one year. Work on a new five-year plan (with annual review) for 2021-2025 could not be concluded in time for the new Plan to be submitted to the Extended Commission for approval.
- That the \$20,000 contingency fund to access Trygg Mat Tracking services if and when needed be continued.
- That the revised template for the Annual Report to the CC/EC be adopted.
- That the guidelines on principles and types of actions to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances be adopted.
- That a Technical Compliance Working Group meeting be convened prior to the CC16 in 2021. A number of topics were identified for consideration including: Improvements to tag attachment under Japan's market research proposal, the new Compliance Action Plan, and remaining eCDS issues.
- That USA, Singapore, China, Mauritius and Namibia be invited to attend future Compliance Committee meetings.
- That the Secretariat send a letter to the Russian Federation to clarify Russia's Annual Fishing/Capacity Management Plan for Tropical Tunas that Russia submitted to ICCAT which referred to "Longline vessels of the Russian Federation equipped for southern bluefin tuna (SBT) fishing".
- That development of the trial eCDS be continued, and an online working group be formed to provide guidance to the Secretariat during the development of the trial eCDS.

#### ***Items to Note***

136. The Compliance Committee suggests that the Extended Commission notes the following:

- That the QAR of the EU has not been finalised and so was not considered by the CC but is nearing completion and will be considered at the next meeting.
- Indonesia has agreed to provide a plan on how it will remain within its TAC for 2021 to the EC 27 meeting.

- That there were a number of issues of non-compliance by Members which were considered minor in nature and which the CC considered did not require the application of the Corrective Actions Policy. These included the late submission and retrospective fishing vessels authorisations, continued minor issues with non-submission of CDS documents and very late submission of port inspection reports. The CC asked the Members involved that have not yet reported, to report back to the next meeting on how these matters have been rectified.
- The intersessional working group convened by Australia to continue considering the need for a more formalised compliance assessment process and report to CC16.
- The CC's endorsement of the joint BirdLife International and CCSBT proposal to enhance education on, and implementation of, Ecologically Related Species seabird measures, noting that work will continue to refine the proposals and secure external funding.
- The paper submitted to the Compliance Committee by the Pew Charitable Trusts/Global Fishing Watch on Transshipment.
- The progress with the online data submission/data access project and eCDS trial project, both of which are on time and within budget and that further work will continue as planned during 2021.
- That New Zealand will convene an intersessional group to allow Members to discuss how depredation of fish should be covered in the application of Attributable SBT Catch and report back to the Committee in 2021.
- South Africa did not respond to any of the Pre-Meeting document questions and did not participate in the substantive CC discussions. With respect to continuing CDS issue including non-compliance issues, Australia will offer assistance to South Africa and will report back on this item in 2021. New Zealand has offered to assist.

## **Agenda Item 12. Conclusion**

### ***12.1. Adoption of meeting report***

137. The report was adopted.

### ***12.2. Close of meeting***

138. The meeting closed at 8:56 pm (Canberra time) on 10 October 2020.

## **List of Attachments**

### **Attachment**

1. List of Participants
2. Agenda
3. List of Documents
4. Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances
5. Template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission

**List of Participants**  
**The Fifteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee**

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
<b>COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR</b>								
Frank	MEERE	Mr			AUSTRALIA			fmeere@aapt.net.au

<b>EXTENDED COMMISSION CHAIR</b>								
Ichiro	NOMURA	Dr			JAPAN			inomura75@gmail.com

<b>MEMBERS</b>
----------------

<b>AUSTRALIA</b>								
George	Day	Mr	A/g Assistant Secretary	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 62716 466		george.day@awe.gov.au
Matthew	DANIEL	Mr	Manager SBT Fishery	Australian 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, Water and the Environment	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6271 6306		neil.hughes@awe.gov.au
Anne	SHEPHERD	Ms	Manager Licencing and Data Services	Australian Fisheries Management Authority	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6225 5361		Anne.Shepherd@afma.gov.au
Alice	MORAN	Ms	Assistant Director	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6272 3715		alice.moran@awe.gov.au
Tristan	DEWICK	Mr	Policy Officer	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Australia	61 2 6271 6349		Tristan.dewick@awe.gov.au
Brian	JEFFRIESS	Mr	Chief Executive Officer	Australian SBT Industry Association Ltd	PO Box 416, Fullerton, SA, 5063, Australia	61 419 840 299		austuna@bigpond.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Terry	ROMARO	Mr	Managing Director	Ship Agencies Australia	PO Box 1093, Fremantle, WA. 6160	61 (0) 8 9335 5499		terryromaro@aol.com
Andrew	Wilkinson	Mr	General Manager	Tony's Tuna International P/L	Pine Freezer Road, Port Lincoln, SA. 5606	61 (0) 8 8682 2266		andrew@tonystuna.com.au
Marcus	STEHR	Mr	Managing Director	Stehr Group	PO Box 159, Port Lincoln SA 5606	61 41780 6883		marcus@stehrgroup.net
Kylie	PETHERICK	Ms	Chief Financial Officer	Stehr Group	PO Box 159, Port Lincoln SA 5606	61 40016 0465		kylie@stehrgroup.net
Nicola	SONDERMEYER	Ms	Researcher	Atlantis Fisheries Group	10 Warleigh Grove, Brighton VIC 3186	61 439 311 362		nicola@atlantisfcg.com
Marcus	TURNER	Mr	Manager	Sarin group	PO Box 1073, Port Lincoln SA 5606	61 45533 1904		marcus@saringroup.com.au
Lukina	LUKIN	Ms	Managing Director	Tuna Farmers Pty Ltd	PO Box 2013, Port Lincoln, SA 5606	61 40022 1996		lukina@dinkotuna.com
Anthony	CICONTE	Mr	Director	Pescatore di Mare	10 Warleigh Grove, Brighton VIC 3186	61 43868 4999		anthony@atlantisfcg.com
<b>EUROPEAN UNION</b>								
Orlando	FACHADA	Mr	Head of EU Delegation	European Union	Rue de la Loi 200 (J99-3/46), Belgium	32 2299 0857		Orlando.Fachada@ec.europa.eu

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
<b>FISHING ENTITY OF TAIWAN</b>								
Tien-Hsiang	TSAI	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 23835 900	886 2 23327 395	ted@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 23835 872	886 2 23327 396	minghui@msl.f.a.gov.tw
Tsung-Yueh	TANG	Mr.	Secretary	Overseas Fisheries Development Council of the Republic of China	3F., No. 14, Wenzhou Street, Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C)	886 2 23680 889 ext 153	886 2 23686 418	tangty@ofdc.org.tw
Huang-Chih	CHIANG	Dr.	Professor	National Taiwan University, Taiwan	No.1, Sec. 4, Roosevelt Road, Taipei City, 10617, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 33668 900 ext 68919	886 2 33668 904	hcchiang@ntu.edu.tw
Po-Hsiang	LIAO	Mr.	Project Assistant	National Taiwan University, Taiwan	No.1, Sec. 4, Roosevelt Road, Taipei City, 10617, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 33668 900 ext 68919	886 2 33668 904	R05A21091@ntu.edu.tw
Zhi-Kai	WANG	Mr.	Secretary	Fisheries Agency of Taiwan	8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan (R.O.C.)	886 2 23835 891	886 2 23327 396	zhikai0420@msl.f.a.gov.tw
<b>INDONESIA</b>								
Trian	YUNANDA	Mr	Director of Fish Resources Management	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	tryand_fish@yahoo.com
Putuh	SUADELA	Mrs	Deputy Director for Fish Resources Management in IEEZ and High Seas, Directorate of Fish Resources Management	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	putuhsuadela@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Riana	HANDAYANI	Mrs	Head of Section for Fish Resources Governance in IEEZ and High Seas, Directorate of Fish Resources Management	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	daya139@yahoo.co.id
Zulkarnaen	FAHMI	Mr	Head of Research Institute for Tuna Fisheries	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Mertasari No. 140, Br. Suwung Kangin, Sidakarya, Denpasar Selatan, Denpasar 80223	62 361 72620 1	62 361 72620 1	fahmi.p4ksi@gmail.com
Syahril Abd	RAUP	Mr	Deputy Director for Fish Resources Management Monitoring and Analysis, Directorate of Fish Resources Management	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	chaliarrauf@yahoo.com
Muhammad	ANAS	Mr	Head of Sub Division for Data, Secretariat of Directorate General Capture Fisheries	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	mykalambe@yahoo.com
Satya	MARDI	Mr	Capture Fisheries Production Management Officer of Directorate General of Capture Fisheries	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	satyamardi18@gmail.com
Saut P.	HUTAGALUNG	Mr	Senior Fisheries Inspector of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	saut.p.hutagalung@gmail.com
Reza Shah	PAHLEVI	Mr	Senior Fisheries Inspector of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	pahlevi.reza.nrmp@gmail.com



First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Muhammad	RIDWAN	Mr	Senior Controllers of Fish Pest and Disease of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	muhammadridwan05343@gm ail.com
Asep Dadang	KOSWARA	Mr	Head of Legal, Cooperation and Public Relations Division of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	ad_koswara@yahoo.co.id
Mochamad Aji	PURBAYU	Mr	Head of Cooperation Sub Division of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	kerjasamabkipm@gmail.com
Aris	SASONO	Mr	Head of Sub Division for Product Certification of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	sasonofish@gmail.com
Handito Aji	PRASTYO	Mr	Junior Fisheries Inspector of Fish Quarantine, Quality Control and Security of Fishery Products Agency	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	hand.cito@gmail.com
Sitti	HAMDIYAH	Mrs	Head of Division of Regional and Multilateral Cooperation	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	sh_diyah@yahoo.com
Hendri	KURNIAWAN	Mr	Head of Subdivision of Regional Cooperation	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	hendrikur16@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Alza	RENDIAN	Mr	Regional Cooperation Analyst	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	alzarendian@gmail.com
Yayan	HERNURYADI N	Mr	Marine and Fisheries Analyst, Directorate of Fish Resources Managemet	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	yhernuryadin@gmail.com
Rennisca	DAMANTI	Mrs	Head of for Statistical Data Division	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	rennisca@kkp.go.id
Susiyanti	SUSIYANTI	Mrs	Head of Sub Division of Data Processing and Statistics	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	susiyantidjpt@kkp.go.id
Rikrik	RAHARDIAN	Mr	Head of Sub Division of Statistics Data	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	rikrik.rahadian@kkp.go.id
Dwi Agus Siswa	PUTRA	Mr	Chair II	Indonesia Tuna Long Line Association	Jl. Ikan Tuna Raya Timur, Pelabuhan Benoa, Denpasar – Bali, Indonesia	62 361 72739 9	62 361 72509 9	atli.bali@gmail.com
Ivan Hans	JORGIH	Mr	Head of the Domestic and Foreign Trade Sector	Indonesian Longline Tuna Association	Jl. Ikan Tuna Raya Timur, Pelabuhan Benos, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia	62 811 386 289		jorgih@indo.net.id
Hitler	SUMAH	Mr	Fisheries Inspector of Directorate General of Capture Fisheries	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Pelabuhan No. 1 Pengambangan, Kec. Negara, Kab. Jembrana, Bali, Indonesia	62 853 3744 1820		hitler.sumah1@gmail.com
Andi	MANNOJENGI	Mr	Head of Pengambengan Fishing Port	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Pelabuhan No. 1 Pengambangan, Kec. Negara, Kab. Jembrana, Bali, Indonesia	62 365 42968 42968	62 365 42968	luhputuari.widiani@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Nilanto	PERBOWO	Mr	Senior Capture Fisheries Production Management Officer of Directorate General of Capture Fisheries	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Indonesia	Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16, Jakarta, Indonesia	62 21 34530 08	62 21 34530 08	perbowon@kkp.go.id
Bram	SETYADJI	Mr	Scientist	Research Institute for Tuna Fisheries - Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries	Jl. Mertasari No. 140, Br Suwung Kangin, Sidakarya, Denpasar, Bali 80224, Indonesia	62 361 72620 1	62 361 84974 47	bram.setyadji@gmail.com
<b>JAPAN</b>								
Yuki	MORITA	Mr	Assistant Director	Fisheries Agency Government of JAPAN	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-city, Tokyo 100-8907, Japan	81-3-3591-1086	81-3-3504-2649	yuki_morita470@maff.go.jp
Takeshi	MIWA	Mr	Assistant Director	Fisheries Agency Government of JAPAN	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-city, Tokyo	81-3-6744-2364	81-3-3504-2649	takeshi_miwa090@maff.go.jp
Mako	IIOKA	Ms.	Assistant Chief	Fisheries Agency Government of JAPAN	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-city, Tokyo	81-3-3591-1086	81-3-3504-2649	mako_iioaka540@maff.go.jp
Takatsugu	KUDOH	Mr	Officer	Fisheries Agency Government of JAPAN	1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-city, Tokyo	81-3-6744-2364	81-3-3504-2649	takatsugu_kudo250@maff.go.jp
Tomoyuki	ITOH	Dr	Chief Scientist	Fisheries Resources Institute, Japan Fisheries Research and Education Agency	5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu, Shizuoka 424-8633, Japan	81 54 336 6000	81 543 35 9642	itou@fra.affrc.go.jp
Kotaro	NISHIDA	Mr.	Advisor	National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association	1-1-12 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 〒101-0047	81-3-3294-9633	81-3-3294-9607	k-nishida@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp
Michio	SHIMIZU	Mr.	Executive Secretary	National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association	1-1-12 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 〒101-0047	81-3-3294-9633	81-3-3294-9607	mic-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Kiyoshi	KATSUYAMA	Mr.	special adviser to the president	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	katsuyama@japantuna.or.jp
Hiroyuki	YOSHIDA	Mr.	Deputy Director	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	yoshida@japantuna.or.jp
Nozomu	MIURA	Mr.	Assistant Director	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	miura@japantuna.or.jp
Hiroyuki	IZUMI	Mr.	chief manager	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	izumi@japantuna.or.jp
Daisaku	NAGAI	Mr.	Assistant Chief	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association	31-1, Eitai 2-chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	nagai@japantuna.or.jp
Yuji	UOZUMI	Dr	Advisor	Japan Tuna Fisheries Association	31-1, Eitai 2 Chome, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-0034, Japan	81 3 5646 2382	81 3 5646 2652	uozumi@japantuna.or.jp

#### NEW ZEALAND

Dominic	VALLIÈRES	Mr	Highly Migratory Species Manager	Fisheries New Zealand	Charles Fergusson Building, 32 Bowen Steet, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	64 4 819 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, New Zealand	64 9 820 7686		arthur.hore@mpi.govt.nz
Jo	LAMBIE	Ms	Senior Fisheries Analyst	Fisheries New Zealand	Charles Fergusson Building, 32 Bowen Steet, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	64 4 894 0131		jo.lambie@mpi.govt.nz
Hilary	AYRTON	Ms	Fisheries Analyst	Fisheries New Zealand	Charles Fergusson Building, 32 Bowen Steet, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	64 4 831 3058		Hilary.Ayrton@mpi.govt.nz

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Clifford	BAIRD	Mr	Compliance Adviser	Ministry for Primary Industries	Charles Fergusson Building, 32 Bowen Street, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	64 4 831 3435		Clifford.baird@mpi.govt.nz
Richard	MARTIN	Mr	Compliance Adviser	Ministry for Primary Industries	Charles Fergusson Building, 32 Bowen Street, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6011, New Zealand	66 4 819 4210		Richard.Martin@mpi.govt.nz
Sarah	RENOUF	Ms	Senior Legal Adviser	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	195 Lambton Quay, Private Bag 439 18901 Wellington 6160, New Zealand	64 4 439 8070		Sarah.renouf@mfat.govt.nz
Te Aomihia	WALKER	Ms	Policy Analyst	Te Ohu Kaimoana	Te Ohu Kiamoana, PO Box 3277, Level 4, Woolstore Professional Centre, 158 The Terrace, Wellington, New Zealand	64 27 70062 32		TeAomihia.Walker@teohu.maori.nz

## REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Jung-re, Riley	KIM	Ms	Policy Officer/Lead Negotiator	Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	Government Complex Building 5, #94, Dasom 2-ro, Sejong City	82 44 200 5398	82 44 200 5349	riley1126@korea.kr
Min-ju	JANG	Ms	Assistant Director	Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	Government Complex Building 5, #94, Dasom 2-ro, Sejong City	82 44 200 5347	82 44 200 5349	minju122122@korea.kr
Il-kang	NA	Mr	International Cooperation Specialist	Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	Government Complex Building 5, #94, Dasom 2-ro, Sejong City	82 44 200 5377	82 44 200 5349	ikna@korea.kr
Sung Il	LEE	Dr	Scientist	National Institute of Fisheries Science	216, Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-eup, Gijang-gun, Busan, 46083	82 51 720 2330	82 51 720 2337	k.sungillee@gmail.com

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Jung hyun	LIM	Dr	Scientist	National Institute of Fisheries Science	216, Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-eup, Gijang-gun, Busan, 46083	82 51 720 2331	82 51 720 2337	jhlml1@korea.kr
Jae geol	YANG	Mr	Policy Analyst	Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center	S-Building 6th floor, 253, Hannuri-daero, Sejong, Korea	82 44 868 7364	82 44 868 7840	jg718@kofci.org
Sun kyoung	KIM	Ms	Policy Analyst	Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center	S-Building 6th floor, 253, Hannuri-daero, Sejong, Korea	82 44 868 7833	82 44 868 7840	sk.kim@kofci.org
Jin seok	PARK	Mr	Deputy General manager	Sajo Industries co.,ltd	107-39, Tongil-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, KOREA	82 2 3277 1651	82 2 365 6079	goodtime9@sajo.co.kr
Seung hyun	CHOO	Mr	Manager	Sajo Industries co.,ltd	107-39, Tongil-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, KOREA	82 2 3277 1655	82 2 365 6079	shc1980@sajo.co.kr
Deok lim	KIM	Mr	Assistant Manager	Sajo Industries co.,ltd	107-39, Tongil-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, KOREA	82 2 3277 1652	82 2 365 6079	liam@sajo.co.kr
Chan won	JO	Mr	Senior Staff	Sajo Industries co.,ltd	107-39, Tongil-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, KOREA	82 2 3277 1656	82 2 365 6079	cwjo@sajo.co.kr
Jung hoon	HWANG	Mr	Manager	Dong Won Fisheries Co., Ltd.	685, Eulsukdo-daero, Saha-gu, Busan, Korea	82 10 6680 2871	82 51 207 2715	jhh@dwsusan.com
Sung jun	KANG	Mr	Staff	Dong Won Fisheries Co., Ltd.	685, Eulsukdo-daero, Saha-gu, Busan, Korea	82 10 3116 0704	82 51 207 2715	dwsjk@dwsusan.com
Ho jeong	JIN	Mr	Deputy General manager	Korea Overseas Fisheries Association	6th Fl. Samho Center Bldg."A" 83, Nonhyeon-ro, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Korea	82 2 589 1613	82 2 589 1630	jackiejin@kosfa.org
Bong jun	CHOI	Mr	Assistant manager	Korea Overseas Fisheries Association	6th Fl. Samho Center Bldg."A" 83, Nonhyeon-ro, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Korea	82 2 589 1614	82 2 589 1630	bj@kosfa.org

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Sang jin	BAEK	Mr	Staff	Korea Overseas Fisheries Association	6th Fl. Samho Center Bldg."A" 83, Nonhyeon-ro, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Korea	82 2 589 1615	82 2 589 1630	sjbaek@kosfa.org
Seek	YOO	Mr	Assistant Director	Fisheries Monitoring Center, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	638 Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-eup, Busan, 46079, Republic of Korea	82 51 410 1410	82 51 410 1409	fmc2014@korea.kr
Seunghyun	KIM	Mr	Assistant Director	Fisheries Monitoring Center, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	638 Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-eup, Busan, 46079, Republic of Korea	82 51 410 1421	82 51 410 1409	whizksh@korea.kr
Suyeon	KIM	Ms	Advisor	Fisheries Monitoring Center, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries	638 Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-eup, Busan, 46079, Republic of Korea	82 51 410 1423	82 51 410 1409	shararak@korea.kr

#### SOUTH AFRICA

Saasa	PHEEHA	Mr	Acting Chief Director: Marine Resources Management	Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries	Private Bag X2 Vlaeberg, 8018 Republic of South Africa	27 21 402 3574		SaasaP@daff.gov.za
Amanda	DE WET	Ms		Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries	Foretrust Building, Martin Hammerschlag Way, Foreshore, Cape Town, 8000			amandadw@daff.gov.za
Buyekezwa	POLO	Ms		Department of Environment, Forestry & Fisheries	Foretrust Building, Martin Hammerschlag Way, Foreshore, Cape Town, 8000			BuyekezwaP@daff.gov.za

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
<b>OBSERVERS</b>								
<b>THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>								
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
<b>SINGAPORE</b>								
Lai Kim	TAN-LOW	Mrs	Senior Specialist	Regulatory Policy Department, Food Regulatory Management Division	52 Jurong Gateway Road, JEM Office Tower, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6805 2788		TAN-LOW_Lai_Kim@sfa.gov.sg
Ivan	TAN	Mr	Deputy Directory	Ops Planning & Contingency Department, Joint Operations Division	52 Jurong Gateway Road, JEM Office Tower, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6805 2866		Ivan_TAN@sfa.gov.sg
Kihua	TEH	Mr	Team Lead	SFA Southwest Regional Office	52 Jurong Gateway Road, JEM Office Tower, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6265 5052		TEH_Kihua@sfa.gov.sg
Felicia	LOH	Ms	Manager	Regulatory Policy Department, Food Regulatory Management Division	52 Jurong Gateway Road, JEM Office Tower, #14-01, Singapore 608550	65 6805 2892		Felicia_LOH@sfa.gov.sg
<b>AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS</b>								
Anton	WOLFAARDT	Dr	Representative	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)	ACAP Secretariat, 119 Macquarie St, Hobart, TAS 7000, Australia	27 71622 9678		acwolfaardt@gmail.com
<b>BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL</b>								
Stephanie	PRINCE	Mrs	High Seas Programme Manager	BirdLife International	RSPB The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, UK			stephanie.prince@rspb.org.uk
Stephanie	BORRELLE	Dr.	Marine & Pacific Regional Coordinator	BirdLife International	75 Domain Crescent, Muriwai, New Zealand 0881	64 21 13625 31		stephanie.borrelle@birdlife.org



First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
Yasuko	SUZUKI	Dr.	Marine Programme Officer	BirdLife International	Japan, 〒131-0014 Tokyo, Chuo City, Nihonbashikakigaracho, 1 Chome-13-1			yasuko.suzuki@birdlife.org
Alan	MUNRO	Mr	Marine Programme Policy Officer	BirdLife International	RSPB The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, UK			alan.munro@rspb.org.uk
<b>HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL</b>								
Alexia	WELLBELOVE	Ms	Senior Campaign Manager	Humane Society International	PO Box 439 Avalon NSW 2107 Australia	61 2 9973 1728		alexia@hsi.org.au
Nigel	BROTHERS	Mr	Seabird consultant	Humane Society International	PO Box 439 Avalon NSW 2107 Australia	61 2 9973 1728	61 2 9973 1729	brothersbone1@gmail.com
<b>PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS</b>								
Glen	HOLMES	Dr	Officer, International Fisheries	The Pew Charitable Trusts	241 Adelaide St, Brisbane, Qld 4000, Australia	61 419 79153 2		gholmes@pewtrusts.org
Alyson	KAUFFMAN	Ms	Senior Associate, International Fisheries	The Pew Charitable Trusts	901 E Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20004 USA	1 202 54067 56		akauffman@pewtrusts.org
<b>TRAFFIC</b>								
Glenn	SANT	Mr	Senior Advisor, Fisheries Trade and Traceability	TRAFFIC	c/o: University of Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia	61 41841 6030		glenn.sant@traffic.org
Markus	BURGENER	Mr	Programme Coordinator	TRAFFIC	CBC Building, Kirstenobosch Gardens, Rhodes Drive, Cape Town, South Africa	27 21 799 8673		markus.burgener@traffic.org
Simone	LOUW	Ms	Project Support Officer	TRAFFIC	CBC Building, Kirstenobosch Gardens, Rhodes Drive, Cape Town, South Africa	27 79 689 8105		simone.louw@traffic.org
<b>WWF</b>								
Marcel	KROESE	Mr	Global Tuna Lead	WWF	Cape Town, South Africa	27 82 55768 79		mkroese@wwf.org.za

First name	Last name	Title	Position	Organisation	Postal address	Tel	Fax	Email
<b>INTERPRETERS</b>								
Kumi	KOIKE	Ms						
Yoko	YAMAKAGE	Ms						
Kaori	ASAKI	Ms						
<b>CCSBT SECRETARIAT</b>								
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**  
**Fifteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee**  
**8 – 10 October 2020**  
**Online**

- 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 Consideration of COVID-19 related issues
    - 2.3.1 Action taken by Members
    - 2.3.2 Guidelines on principles and types of actions to be taken in relation to exceptional circumstances
  - 2.4 Assessment of compliance with CCSBT Management Measures
    - 2.4.1 Compliance of Members
    - 2.4.2 Application of the Corrective Actions Policy
- 3. Review of Progress on CC14's 2020 Workplan Items**
- 4. Operation of CCSBT Measures: Issues & Updates**
- 5. Implementation of the CCSBT Compliance Plan**
  - 5.1 Potential Formalised Compliance Assessment Process
  - 5.2 Standing Agenda Items
- 6. CCSBT Plans, Policies & Arrangements: Review, Revision & Progress Reports**
  - 6.1 Compliance Action Plan (CAP): Review of Risks and Consideration of a CAP for 2021 to 2025
  - 6.2 Update on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with other Organisations
- 7. On-line Data Submission/ Data Access Project and Development of a Trial eCDS**
- 8. Proposal to enhance the implementation of seabird measures**
- 9. Work Program for 2021**
- 10. Other business**
- 11. Recommendations to the Extended Commission**
- 12. Conclusion**
  - 12.1. Adoption of Meeting Report
  - 12.2. Close of Meeting.

**List of Documents**  
**Fifteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee**

**(CCSBT-CC/2010/)**

1. Provisional Agenda
2. List of Participants
3. List of Documents
4. (Secretariat) Compliance with CCSBT Management Measures  
(CC agenda item 2.1)
5. (Secretariat) Annual Report on Members' implementation of ERS measures and performance with respect to ERS (Rev.2)  
(CC agenda item 2.1)
- ~~6. (CCSBT) Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. Member Report: EU  
(CC agenda item 2.2)~~
7. (Secretariat) Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances  
(CC agenda item 2.3.2)
8. (Secretariat) Progress Report on 2020 Compliance Committee WorkPlan Items (Rev.1)  
(CC agenda item 3)
9. (Secretariat) Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures (Rev.1)  
(CC agenda item 4)
10. (Secretariat) Potential Non-Member Fishing & Non-Member Compliance Interactions  
(CC agenda item 5.2)
11. (Secretariat) Proposed Revised Template for the Annual Report to Compliance Committee and Extended Commission  
(CC agenda item 5.2)
12. (Secretariat) A Review of Compliance Risks and Consideration of a Draft Compliance Action Plan for 2021-2025  
(CC agenda item 6.1)
13. (Secretariat) Update on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with Other Bodies and Organisations  
(CC agenda item 6.2)

14. (Secretariat) Progress Update on the CCSBT's On-line Data Submission/ Access and Trial eCDS Projects  
(CC agenda item 7)
15. (BirdLife International) Project proposal for enhancing education on and implementation of Ecologically Related Species seabird measures within CCSBT fisheries - for FAO Funding (Rev.2)  
(CC agenda item 8)
16. (BirdLife International) Project proposal for enhancing education on and implementation of Ecologically Related Species seabird measures within CCSBT fisheries – for non-FAO funding (Rev.2)  
(CC agenda item 8)
17. (Pew Charitable Trusts) A 2018 Comparative Analysis of AIS Data with Reported Transshipments in the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna Statistical Areas  
(CC agenda item 5.2)
18. (Indonesia) In Respond to CCSBT-CC/1910/10 - 2020: Initial investigation of the data discrepancies market trade SBT Indonesia  
(CC agenda item 5.2)

**(CCSBT-CC/2010/ST Fisheries -)**

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

**(CCSBT-CC/2010/Rep)**

1. Report of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Scientific Committee (August/September 2020)
2. Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2019)
3. Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2019)
4. Report of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Scientific Committee (September 2019)
5. Report of The Thirteenth Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (May 2019)
6. Report of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Commission (October 2018)
7. Report of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2018)
8. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (March 2018)
9. Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (October 2017)

**Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken  
in relation to extraordinary circumstances**

***Compliance Policy Guideline 5***

*(adopted at the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting: 12-15 October 2020)*

**1. Introduction**

Within this policy, extraordinary circumstances are considered to be rare and unpredictable events or problems that prevent the normal operation of the CCSBT's measures and/or a fishing vessel. This compliance policy provides guidelines on principles for action and steps to be taken under such extraordinary circumstances.

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.

This policy does not override or change any existing or future decisions or Resolutions of the Commission. If a discrepancy exists between these guidelines and a decision or Resolution of the Commission, then the decision or Resolution of the Commission takes precedence<sup>1</sup>.

**2. Purpose of policy**

The purpose of this policy is to ensure, as far as practical, that extraordinary circumstances do not undermine the Commission's conservation and management measures, and that all Members understand how to respond to the Commission's expectations if extraordinary circumstances arise.

Extraordinary circumstances should not be used to justify non-compliance with measures when there are practical alternative means to achieve compliance, such as changing arrangements, or where reasonable foresight could have been used to ensure compliance.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, paragraph 1.7 – 1.9 and 4.1.2 - 4.1.3 of the "Resolution on the Implementation of a CCSBT Catch Documentation Scheme" specifies "exceptional circumstances" and paragraph 20 of the "Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels" specifies "force majeure". For such cases, Members should take action in accordance with decisions or Resolutions adopted by the Commission.

### 3. Principles to guide actions in extraordinary circumstances

The following principles should be taken into account to guide the alternative action(s) to be taken when extraordinary circumstances occur:

- Action should be taken to minimise the risks<sup>2</sup> resulting from non-compliance with or reliance on exemptions<sup>3</sup> from CCSBT measures where:
  - Extraordinary circumstances prevent the normal operation of CCSBT's measures; and
  - Extraordinary circumstances are expected to affect either
    - multiple events<sup>4</sup>, or
    - a single event where it is practical to take action later<sup>5</sup>.
- Action(s) to be taken as a result of extraordinary circumstances should:
  - Be described in an unambiguous manner;
  - Be proportionate to the risks resulting from any non-compliance with or reliance on exemptions<sup>3</sup> from a measure and, when possible, implement remedial measures to minimize such risks;
  - Be otherwise consistent with international law;
  - Not unnecessarily undermine existing measures or the wider CCSBT management regime, and where possible, provide opportunities to improve the functioning of the CCSBT management regime and undertake all efforts to comply with the related CMM obligations;
  - Be of a nature that as far as possible avoids exacerbating the extraordinary circumstance being experienced; and
  - Be justified by the extraordinary circumstance and be temporary, with a clearly specified end (or review) date, or a clearly specified set of ending conditions.

### 4. Steps to take when extraordinary circumstances prevent full compliance with or full implementation of CCSBT measures

The following steps should be followed by Members in situations where extraordinary circumstances prevent full compliance with or require reliance on exemptions from CCSBT measures

---

<sup>2</sup> Such as IUU SBT fishing or trade by Members or Non-Members that result in excess catch being taken.

<sup>3</sup> In this context, "reliance on exemptions" refers to situations where a measure is only partially implemented, and that partial implementation occurred in accordance with exemptions within the measure which allow for extraordinary circumstances such as occurred in the COVID-19 pandemic, which prevented observer deployment for multiple transshipments at-sea.

<sup>4</sup> Such as occurred in the COVID-19 pandemic, which prevented observer deployment for multiple transshipments at-sea.

<sup>5</sup> For example, extraordinary circumstances during a single transshipment at-sea, could potentially be addressed later by conducting a port inspection of the transhipped SBT.



(1) In cases of non-compliance:

- Notify the Executive Secretary<sup>6</sup> of the extraordinary circumstance as soon as possible and no later than 10 working days after they are identified and provide the information and proposed actions to be taken in accordance with Annex 1.
- Such actions should include those in accordance with the principles described in Section “3”.
- If no Member objects to the proposed actions within 7 week days of the Executive Secretary circulating the notification of extraordinary circumstances, the proposed actions shall be deemed to have been authorised by the Commission and
  - If the proposed actions are not authorised by the Commission, the Member will continue to be considered as being non-compliant in relation to the relevant measure unless a meeting of the Commission decides otherwise.
- Record all instances of non-compliance with measures together with details of the action taken in each instance.
- Advise the Executive Secretary<sup>6</sup> of any changes in the extraordinary circumstance and/or the action taken as soon as practical after such changes.
- Provide a report to the next annual meeting of the Compliance Committee or within six months, whichever is first, containing the information specified in Annex 3<sup>7</sup>. In cases that go on beyond the year, Members should report back on a six monthly basis until the issue is resolved. The Member may make the report earlier and periodically. The Secretariat will share this information with all Members,
- The Compliance Committee will discuss the information provided, and make recommendations for future action, particularly if the specific extraordinary circumstance is ongoing or if action taken is not suitable.

(2) In cases of reliance on exemptions:

- Notify the Executive Secretary<sup>6</sup> of the extraordinary circumstance as soon as possible and no later than 10 working days after they are identified and provide the information specified in Annex 2;
- Such information should include actions taken or to be taken to minimise risks in accordance with the principles described in Section “3”;

---

<sup>6</sup> The Executive Secretary will circulate the notification including the relevant Annex to Members, as soon as possible after its receipt.

<sup>7</sup> Irrespective of whether the exceptional circumstance is continuing or has ended.

- If other Member(s) are concerned that the actions taken to minimise risks are not sufficient, the Compliance Committee will discuss the information provided, and make recommendations for future action as appropriate, particularly if the specific extraordinary circumstance is ongoing; and
- Provide a report to the next annual meeting of the Compliance Committee containing the information specified in Annex 3<sup>7</sup>.

## 5. Roles and responsibilities under this Policy

<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibility to:</i>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve policy</li> <li>• Consider/authorise action submitted in relation to “non-compliance”</li> <li>• Consider Compliance Committee’s recommendations</li> </ul>
Compliance Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If requested, consider the information provided in relation to cases of non-compliance and cases of reliance on exemptions</li> <li>• Make recommendations to the Commission on future action as appropriate for a particular extraordinary circumstance should it arise again or be ongoing</li> </ul>
Members facing extraordinary circumstances and non-compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify the Executive Secretary of the extraordinary circumstance and the proposed action to be taken</li> <li>• Report to the Compliance Committee on the extraordinary circumstance and the action(s) taken</li> </ul>
Members facing extraordinary circumstances and relying on exemptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify the Executive Secretary of the extraordinary circumstance and the action taken or to be taken</li> <li>• Report to the Compliance Committee on the extraordinary circumstance and the action(s) taken</li> </ul>
Other Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respond to the proposed action within 7 days in case of non-compliance</li> </ul>
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place this policy on the website</li> <li>• Circulate Annex 1 or Annex 2 notifications of extraordinary circumstances</li> </ul>

## **6. Policy review**

This policy should be reviewed after operational difficulties associated with the COVID-19 pandemic have been resolved to incorporate lessons learned during the crisis. The policy should then be reviewed every five years from the first review date. 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 Executive Secretary not less than 70 days before the date fixed for the opening of the next scheduled Compliance Committee meeting in accordance with Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure of CCSBT.

**Template for  
Notification of Non-Compliance due to the Extraordinary Circumstances and  
Proposed Action(s) to be taken**

<b>1. Date extraordinary circumstance commenced</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>
<b>2. Description of extraordinary circumstance</b>	<i>(provide details of the extraordinary circumstance)</i>
<b>3. Date Member recognised the extraordinary circumstance</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY (date when the Member became aware of this extraordinary circumstance)</i>
<b>4. Affected CCSBT measures</b>	<i>(specify the CCSBT measures for which the normal operation will be prevented (including related CCSBT Resolution/decision and paragraph etc.), and provide the extent to which the extraordinary circumstance will prevent full compliance with CCSBT measures)</i>
<b>5. Proposed Action(s) to be taken by the Member</b>	<i>(propose action(s) to be taken by the Member, including the nature and extent of the action(s) to be taken to minimise risks.</i>
<b>6. Proposed Start date of Action(s)</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY (propose the start date of action(s), or the date action(s) started)</i>
<b>7. Proposed Ending and Review conditions</b>	<i>(propose the conditions that need to be met for the action(s) to cease and normal operation of CCSBT measures to recommence. Also propose the conditions that would trigger a review of the action(s) if the ending conditions are not met for a prolonged period)</i>
<b>8. Propose the End date (if known)</b>	<i>(propose the end date of the action(s) and when normal operation of CCSBT measures recommenced or where possible, provide information on the progression of the situation that triggered the extraordinary circumstances)</i>
<b>9. Other</b>	<i>(if any)</i>

**Template for  
Notification of Reliance on Exemptions due to the Extraordinary Circumstance  
and Action(s) taken or to be taken**

<b>1. Date extraordinary circumstance commenced</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>
<b>2. Description of extraordinary circumstance</b>	<i>(provide details of the extraordinary circumstance)</i>
<b>3. Date Member recognised the extraordinary circumstance</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY (date when the Member became aware of this extraordinary circumstance)</i>
<b>4. Affected CCSBT measures</b>	<i>(specify the CCSBT measures for which the normal operation will be prevented (including related CCSBT Resolution/decision and paragraph etc.), and provide the extent to which the extraordinary circumstance required reliance on exemptions<sup>3</sup> from CCSBT measures)</i>
<b>5. Check with existing Resolutions</b>	<i>(specify relevant Resolutions which allow exemptions under extraordinary circumstance)</i>
<b>6. Action(s) to be taken by the Member</b>	<i>(specify action(s) taken or to be taken by the Member, including the nature and extent of the action(s) taken or to be taken to minimise risks.)</i>
<b>7. Start date of Action(s)</b>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY (the start date of action(s))</i>
<b>8. Ending and Review conditions</b>	<i>(specify the conditions that need to be met for the action(s) to cease and normal operation of CCSBT measures to recommence. Also specify the conditions that would trigger a review of the action(s) if the ending conditions are not met for a prolonged period or where possible, provide information on the progression of the situation that triggered the extraordinary circumstances)</i>
<b>9. End date (if known)</b>	<i>(specify the end date of the action(s) and when normal operation of CCSBT measures recommenced)</i>
<b>10. Other</b>	<i>(if any)</i>

**Template for  
the Report to the Compliance Committee on the  
Extraordinary Circumstance and the Action(s) taken**

<b>1. Circular Number</b>	<i>(the number of the Circular in which the first notification was provided)</i>
<b>2. Description of Extraordinary Circumstance</b>	<i>(provide details of the extraordinary circumstance, how it prevented full compliance with or full implementation of CCSBT measures, the date at which the extraordinary circumstance started, and the ending date if the circumstance has finished)</i>
<b>3. Start/End date of Action(s)</b>	From <b><i>DD/MM/YYYY</i></b> to <b><i>DD/MM/YYYY</i></b>
<b>4. Details of the action(s) taken</b>	<p><i>(Provide a breakdown, in Table 1 below, of the extent of non-complying events or reliance on exemptions <sup>3</sup> from measures due to the extraordinary circumstance and the actions actually taken.</i></p> <p><i>Provide any additional general information about Table 1 here and/or clarification of any terms used in Table 1 that are ambiguous. For example, if the term “inspection” was used, describe here what such an inspection involves.)</i></p>
<b>5. Assessment of impact</b>	<i>(provide an assessment of the impact of the extraordinary circumstance given the actions taken)</i>
<b>6. Other</b>	<i>(if any)</i>

### Annex 3 (continued)

**Table 1:** Details of non-compliance with and/or reliance on exemptions <sup>3</sup> from measures due to the extraordinary circumstance and the actions actually taken (*italicised text in the table are examples*).

Specific Date (if there are many dates, these may be grouped by month)	Extraordinary circumstance	Non-compliance or reliance on exemptions	Type of non-compliance or reliance on exemptions <sup>3</sup> from measures (specify the paragraphs of the relevant Resolutions)	Non-compliance or reliance on exemptions <sup>3</sup> from measures	Alternative action taken and for how many events	Assessment of the effectiveness of the alternative arrangements and whether there are any gaps
<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>	<i>COVID-19</i>	<i>Reliance on exemptions</i>	<i>Transhipments at-sea without an observer (paragraph 20 of the Transhipment Resolution)</i>	<i>5 transhipments at-sea involving 2,000 SBT (110,000kg) were conducted without an observer present</i>	<i>All SBT on all 5 vessels were inspected at ##### when the carrier vessel arrived in port</i>	
<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>	<i>COVID-19</i>	<i>Non-compliance</i>	<i>Use of non-compliant CDS tags (CDS tags could not be delivered to some vessels) (Paragraph 4.4 and Appendix 2 of the CDS Resolution)</i>	<i>500 SBT (27,500kg) from 3 vessels did not have a CDS compliant tag attached when killed</i>	<i>A paper tag was placed on all 500 SBT when they were killed, all SBT were inspected when landed at #####, and CDS compliant tags were attached to 400 of these SBT at this time</i>	

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

*(Revised at the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting: 15 October 2020)*

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.

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1 Summary of Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Improvements</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Improvements achieved in the current fishing season	2
1.2 Future planned improvements	2
<b>2 SBT Fishing and MCS</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna	2
2.2 Monitoring catch of SBT	4
2.3 SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)	5
2.4 SBT transshipment (in port and at sea)	5
2.5 Port Inspections of Foreign Fishing Vessels/Carrier Vessels (FVs/CVs) with SBT/SBT Products on Board	6
2.6 Monitoring of trade of SBT	6
2.7 Coverage and Type of CDS Audit undertaken	7
<b>3 Changes to sections in Annex 1</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Annex 1. Standing items: details of MCS arrangements used to monitor SBT catch in the fishery</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1 Monitoring catch of SBT</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)	10
1.2 SBT Transshipment (in port and at sea)	10
1.3 Port Inspections of Foreign FVs/CVs with SBT/SBT Products on Board	11
1.4 Landings of Domestic Product (from both fishing vessels and farms)	11
1.5 Monitoring of trade of SBT	11
1.6 Other	12
<b>2 Additional Reporting Requirements Ecologically Related Species</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix 1. CCSBT Authorised Vessel Resolution</b>	<b>14</b>



# 1 Summary of Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Improvements

## 1.1 Improvements achieved in the current fishing season

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

## 1.2 Future planned improvements

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

# 2 SBT Fishing and MCS

## 2.1 Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna

### 2.1.1 Catch and allocation

Specify the Effective Catch Limit, carry-forward of quota, total available catch, and attributable catch for the three most recently completed fishing seasons in Table 1. All figures should be provided in tonnes.

**Table 1. Effective catch limit, carry-forward, total available catch, and attributable catch.**

A	B	C	D	E
Fishing Season	Effective Catch Limit <sup>1</sup> (tonnes)	Quota Carried Forward to this Fishing Season (tonnes)	Total Available Catch <sup>2</sup> (B+C) (tonnes)	Attributable catch <sup>3</sup> (tonnes)
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)				

### 2.1.2 Allowances and SBT mortality for each sector

Specify the allowances and SBT mortality for each sector during the three most recently completed fishing seasons in Table 2. If information on SBT mortality is not available for a particular sector, use the best estimates of catch. All figures to be provided in tonnes.

**Table 2. Allowances and SBT mortality for each sector.**

Sector	Commercial fishing operations whether primarily targeting SBT or not			
	Sector 1: (please name)		Sector 2: (please name)	
Fishing season	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)				

<sup>1</sup> Effective catch limit 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.

<sup>2</sup> Total available catch means a Member's Effective Catch Limit allocation for that quota year plus any amount of unfished allocation carried forward to that quota year.

<sup>3</sup> '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 control 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.'

Sector continued	Releases and/or discards		Recreational fishing		Customary and/or traditional fishing		Artisanal fishing	
	Sector 3:		Sector 4:		Sector 5:		Sector 6:	
Fishing season	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)	National allowance	Mortalities (tonnes)

### 2.1.3 SBT Catch (retained and non-retained)

For the three most recently completed fishing seasons, specify the weight (in tonnes) and number 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 Table 3. Provide the best estimate if reported data is not available. 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 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”.

**Table 3. SBT catch (retained and non-retained)**

Fishing Season	Retained and discarded SBT							
	Commercial sectors (all weights are in tonnes)							
	Sector 1 (please name)		Sector 2 (please name)		Sector 3: Recreational sector		Sector 4: Customary/artisanal sector	
	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)								

### 2.1.4 The number of vessels in each sector

Specify the fishing season and number of vessels that caught SBT in each sector during the three most recently completed fishing seasons in Table 4.

In cases where vessel numbers are not able to be provided, specify the best estimate.

**Table 4. Vessels by Sector**

Fishing season	Number of vessels			
	Commercial sectors		Sector 3: Recreational sector	Sector 4: Customary/artisanal sector
	Sector 1 (please name)	Sector 2 (please name)		
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)				

## 2.2 Monitoring catch of SBT

### 2.2.1 Daily logbooks

- i. If daily logbooks are not mandatory, specify the % of SBT fishing where daily logbooks were required.
- ii. Specify 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.

### 2.2.2 Additional reporting methods (such as real time monitoring programs)

- 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) then, for each reporting method, specify if it was mandatory, and if not, specify the % of SBT fishing the reporting method covered.

### 2.2.3 Scientific Observers

- i. Provide the percentage of the SBT catch and effort observed in the three most recently completed fishing seasons for each sector (e.g. longline, purse seine, commercial charter fleet, and domestic fleet) in Table 5. The unit of effort should be hooks for longline and sets for purse seine.

**Table 5. Observer coverage of SBT catch and effort**

Fishing season	Sector 1		Sector 2	
	% effort obs.	% catch obs.	% effort obs.	% catch obs.
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)				

- ii. 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 Members.

### 2.2.4 Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)

For the most recently completed fishing season for Member-flagged authorised carrier vessels and fishing vessels fishing for or taking SBT specify:

- i. Was a mandatory VMS that complies with CCSBT’s VMS resolution in operation?
- ii. If a mandatory VMS that complies with CCSBT’s VMS resolution was not in operation, provide details of non-compliance and plans for further improvement.
- iii. 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:
- iv. 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:

- v. Reasons for any non-compliance with VMS requirements and action taken by the Member.
- vi. 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.
- vii. 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.

### **2.2.5 At-sea inspections**

Specify the coverage level of at sea inspections of SBT authorised fishing vessels by Member's patrol vessels during the most recently completed fishing season (e.g. the percentage of SBT trips inspected).

### **2.2.6 Authorised vessel requirements**

Report on the review of internal actions and measures taken in relation to the authorised vessel requirements provided at Appendix 1, including any punitive and sanction actions taken.

### **2.2.7 Monitoring of catch of SBT from other sectors (e.g. recreational, customary, etc)**

Provide details of monitoring methods used to monitor catches in other sectors.

## **2.3 SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)**

- i. Specify the percentage of the tows that were observed and the percentage of the transfers of the fish to the farms that were observed during the three most recently completed fishing seasons in Table 6.

**Table 6. Observer coverage of towing and transfer to and between farms**

Fishing season	Observer coverage of tows (%)	Observer coverage of transfers (%)
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)		

- ii. Provide updates on plans to allow adoption of the stereo video systems for ongoing monitoring.

## **2.4 SBT transshipment (in port and at sea)**

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

- i. The quantities and percentage of SBT transhipped at sea and in port during the three most recently completed fishing seasons in Table 7.

**Table 7. SBT transshipment (in port and at sea)**

Fishing season	Kilograms of SBT transhipped at sea	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped at sea	Kilograms of SBT transhipped in port	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped in port
(e.g. April 2019 – March 2020)				

- ii. The list of the tuna longline fishing vessel with Freezing Capacity (LSTLVs) registered in the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List which have transhipped at sea and in port during the most recently completed 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 transshipments from their LSTLVs during the most recently completed fishing season.

## 2.5 Port Inspections of Foreign Fishing Vessels/Carrier Vessels (FVs/CVs) with SBT/SBT Products on Board

For the three most recently completed **whole calendar years**, 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 in Table 8.

**Table 8. Port inspections of foreign FVs and CVs with SBT/SBT products on board**

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
(e.g. 2019)				
	<b>TOTAL NUMBER</b>			

## 2.6 Monitoring of trade of SBT

For the most recently completed whole calendar year or fishing season:

- i. Record the calendar year/ fishing season.
- ii. Provide the percentage of landings of SBT that were inspected.
- iii. Provide the percentage of exports of SBT that were inspected.
- iv. Provide the percentage of imports of SBT that were inspected.

## **2.7 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 5.8<sup>4</sup> of the Resolution, and the level of compliance.

## **3 Changes to sections in Annex 1**

If this is not the first year of completing Annex 1, list any sections of Annex 1 that have changed since the previous year.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.”

## Annex 1. Standing items: details of MCS arrangements used to monitor SBT catch in the fishery

### 1 Monitoring catch of SBT

Describe the system used for controlling the level of SBT catch. For ITQ and IQ systems, this should include details on how the catch is 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 is monitored for determining when to close the fishery. The description provided here should include any operational constraints on effort (both regulatory and voluntary).

Complete the table below to provide details of methods used to monitor catching in the fishery. 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 1.1 of this Annex).

Monitoring Methods	Description
<i>Daily log book</i>	<i>Specify:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>i. Whether this was mandatory.</i></li><li><i>ii. The level of detail recorded (shot by shot, daily aggregate etc):-</i></li><li><i>iii. What information on ERS is recorded in logbooks:-</i></li><li><i>iv. Who are the logbooks submitted to<sup>5</sup>:-</i></li><li><i>v. What is the timeframe and method<sup>6</sup> for submission:-</i></li><li><i>vi. The type of checking and verification that is routinely conducted for this information:-</i></li><li><i>vii. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i></li><li><i>viii. Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-</i></li></ul>

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> In particular, whether the information is submitted electronically from the vessel.

<sup>7</sup> Including information on ERS, and comments on the effectiveness of the controls or monitoring tools and any plans for further improvement.

<i>Additional reporting methods (such as real time monitoring programs)</i>	<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"> <li><i>i. Whether this is mandatory.</i></li> <li><i>ii. The information that is recorded (including whether it relates to SBT or ERS):-</i></li> <li><i>iii. Who the reports are submitted to and by whom (e.g. Vessel Master, the Fishing Company etc)<sup>5</sup>:-</i></li> <li><i>iv. What is the timeframe and method<sup>6</sup> for submission:-</i></li> <li><i>v. The type of checking and verification that is routinely conducted for this information:-</i></li> <li><i>vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i></li> <li><i>vii. Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-</i></li> </ul>
<i>Scientific Observers</i>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. The system used for comparisons between observer data and other catch monitoring data in order to verify the catch data:-</i></li> <li><i>ii. What information on ERS is recorded by observers:-</i></li> <li><i>iii. Who are the observer reports submitted to:-</i></li> <li><i>iv. Timeframe for submission of observer reports:-</i></li> <li><i>v. Other relevant information (including plans for further improvement – in particular to reach coverage of 10% of the effort):-</i></li> </ul>
<i>VMS</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. For Member-flagged authorised carrier vessels and fishing vessels fishing for or taking SBT provide references to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i></li> </ul>
<i>Other (for example, use of electronic monitoring etc.)</i>	



## **1.1 SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)**

*(a) 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*
- ii. Monitoring systems for recording losses of SBT (in particular, SBT mortality).*

*(b) 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*
- ii. Monitoring system used for recording the quantity of SBT transferred:-*

*(c) For “a” and “b” above, describe the process used for completing, validating<sup>8</sup> and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Farm Stocking Form, Farm Transfer Form):-*

*(d) Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>*

## **1.2 SBT Transshipment (in port and at sea)**

*(a) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transshipments 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 transshipments of SBT are prohibited:-*
- ii. Flag State inspection requirements for in-port transshipments of SBT (include % coverage):-*
- iii. Information sharing with designated Port States:-*
- iv. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT transhipped:-*
- v. Process for validating<sup>8</sup> and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, Catch Tagging Form):-*
- vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*
- vii. Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-*

*(b) 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 information<sup>7</sup>:-*

---

<sup>8</sup> Including the class of person who conducts this work (e.g. government official, authorised third party)

### **1.3 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.*

- (a) Provide a list of designated ports into which foreign FVs/ CVs carrying SBT or SBT product may request entry:-*
- (b) 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:-*

### **1.4 Landings of Domestic Product (from both fishing vessels and farms)**

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

- (a) Rules for designated ports of landing of SBT:-*
- (b) Inspections required for landings of SBT.*
- (c) Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being landed as a different species:-*
- (d) Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT landed:-*
- (e) Process for validating<sup>8</sup> and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, and depending on circumstances, Catch Tagging Form):-*
- (f) Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*
- (g) Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-*

### **1.5 Monitoring of trade of SBT**

#### **1.5.1 SBT Exports**

*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:*

- (a) Inspections required for export of SBT -*
- (b) Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being exported as a different species:-*
- (c) Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT exported:-*
- (d) Process for validating<sup>8</sup> 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):-*
- (e) Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*
- (f) Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-*

### 1.5.2 SBT Imports

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

- (a) Rules for designating specific ports for the import of SBT:-*
- (b) Inspections required for imports of SBT*
- (c) Details of genetic testing conducted and any other techniques that are used to verify that SBT are not being imported as a different species:-*
- (d) Process for checking and collecting CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form and depending on circumstances, Re-export/Export after landing of domestic product Form):-*
- (e) Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*
- (f) Other relevant information<sup>7</sup>:-*

### 1.5.3 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 information<sup>7</sup>*

## 1.6 Other

*Description of any other MCS systems of relevance.*

## 2 Additional Reporting Requirements 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 measures<sup>9</sup> aimed at the protection of ecologically related species<sup>10</sup> 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:*

---

<sup>9</sup> Relevant measures of these RFMOs can be found at: [http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch\\_mitigation.php](http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch_mitigation.php).

<sup>10</sup> Including seabirds, sea turtles and sharks.

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:-*

- *CCSBT<sup>11</sup>:*
- *IOTC, for fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*
- *WCPFC, for fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*
- *ICCAT, for fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*

*(b) Mitigation – describe the current mitigation requirements:*

*(c) 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:*

---

<sup>11</sup> *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.*

## **Appendix 1. 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 anymore;
- 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.