Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna

みなみまぐろ保存委員会

CCSBT-CC/2510/10 – Rev 2

Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures

1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides a summary of the operation of some of CCSBT's main Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) measures, which have either not been discussed in other papers, or for which additional supplementary information is available.

The Nineteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC19) agreed that, for future meetings, the Secretariat reporting on CPG5 implementation would be moved to the standing agenda items and discussed if, and where, updated information is available. So, reporting on CPG5 implementation is no longer included in this paper.

The measures and guidelines discussed here are:

- The Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS);
- The Transhipment Monitoring Program;
- Records of Authorised Vessels and Farms;
- The Vessel Monitoring System (VMS);
- CCSBT IUU Vessel List; and
- Minimum Standards for Inspections in Port.

2. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS)

CDS compliance issues have already been summarised in the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures paper[1], and are generally not discussed in further detail here. This section of the paper only includes information on Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs), including those that are voluntarily cooperating with the CDS.

2.1. NCNMs

2.1.1. Cooperation with USA

The USA is not a Member of the CCSBT but continues to cooperate voluntarily with the CDS and submissions of SBT CDS import information continue to be received quarterly. The Secretariat received its first import submission from the USA in late April 2016 (for the 2015 year). As summarised in 2023[2], and 2024[3] the USA's voluntary cooperation with the CDS is becoming more important as there are an increasing number of export Catch Monitoring Forms (CMFs) and Re-export/ Export

[1] Paper CCSBT-CC/2510/04

[2] Paper CCSBT-CC/2310/08 (Rev.1) and CCSBT–CC/2310/14 and

[3] Paper CCSBT-CC/2410/08 (Rev 1)

after Landing Forms (REEFs) recording exports to the USA. Exports to the United States recorded on CMFs and REEFs increased from 796.87 (t) in the 2022 calendar year, to 932.32 (t) in the 2023 calendar year, and in 2024 they increased further to 1268.25 (t). This is the highest annual total of SBT exports to the USA recorded to date. CC19 agreed to a Secretariat proposal to give the USA official access to the eCDS to assist with managing SBT imports to the USA, and this decision continues to be important for maintaining the effectiveness of the CDS.

2.1.2. Increasing SBT exports to China

As reported in **Attachment C** to **CCSBT-CC/2510/04**, SBT exports to China increased significantly in 2024 to 909t, up from 157.5t in 2023. This represents 8% of the total SBT exports reported in CDS documents that occurred during 2024. The CCSBT Strategic Plan includes an action to "encourage non-Members to increase engagement in CCSBT processes, including joining the CCSBT and utilising the CDS". The increased level of SBT exports to China, along with continued vessel activity by Chinese longline vessels in areas consistent with reported SBT catches[4], mean that China's engagement with the CDS will likely become even more important to ensure that SBT caught through illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) activities is unable to enter markets.

2.2. Challenges Reconciling Processed SBT on REEFs

As reported in papers **CCSBT-CC/2510/04** and **CCSBT-CC/2510/06**, the Secretariat has recommenced examining REEFs for potential overutilisation[5]. This examination is undertaken as part of the Executive Secretary's Six Monthly/Annual Reports to the Extended Commission that are outlined in Appendix 3 to the CDS Resolution. As discussed in paper **CCSBT–CC/2510/06,** the Secretariat had not produced reports on REEF overutilisation in previous iterations of the Six Monthly/Annual CDS reports since 2014. This was due to challenges in reconciling the data where multiple documents may be listed as contributing to a REEF and/or where exports may occur across different fishing seasons[6]. These challenges still remain when completing analysis of certain REEFs, however the prevalence and scale of these issues does appear to have diminished somewhat in recent years. This allows the Secretariat to analyse a greater quantity of REEFs with more certainty.

The Secretariat would encourage Members to continue improving the accuracy of the reporting of preceding documents in REEFs so that more comprehensive CDS data reconciliation can be undertaken by the Secretariat on behalf of Members. During the eCDS Working Group meetings held in 2025, participants also agreed to make available to importing Members limited catch tagging data[7] in the eCDS following implementation.

---

[4] Discussed in paper CCSBT-CC/2510/17.

[5] Where subsequent exports/re-exports of fish from the CMF have exceeded the original quantity of fish reported on the CMF.

[6] The challenges in reconciling REEFs was outlined in Circular #2013/063 and a solution was proposed at this time. However there was no agreement reached in relation to the solution proposed.

[7] This will be limited to the same data fields that CCSBT 31 agreed to make publicly available as part of an open-access SBT tag search function on the CCSBT website, The proposed data to be visible to importing Members in the eCDS would be the Tag Number, Month of Catch/Harvest, CCSBT Statistical Area and Fishing method (Gear Code).

This was contingent on the visibility of this data being constrained to the importing Member only and that commercially confidential tagging information within the forms was secured and protected. This visibility to importing Members of limited tagging information may also assist Members in improving the reporting of preceding documents in REEFs, especially in circumstances where SBT from multiple CMF may be stored in large facilities. This also reinforces the importance of this development in the eCDS in supporting this ongoing monitoring work of the Secretariat.

Another challenge that the Secretariat has identified in completing the reconciliation of REEFs with preceding documents, is the lack of agreed CCSBT conversion factors for many of the processed states in which SBT can be exported. In some cases, the default conversion factors that the Secretariat currently uses may also not accurately reflect the conversion factor that results from the product being further processed[8]. It is recommended that, to support the more effective and comprehensive reconciliation of REEFs and preceding documents by Members and the Secretariat, CC20 may wish to consider defining agreed conversion factors for specific processed codes (or groups of processed codes) that are currently used in the CDS. Given the technical nature of these discussions, CC20 may wish to consider if intersessional work by the Technical Compliance Working Group (TCWG) may be beneficial and also whether assistance from the CCSBT Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) may be required. Should CC20 agree to further work by the TCWG, Members should consider whether there are other broader compliance needs related to the use of conversion factors by CCSBT that may benefit from discussion by this group[9]. However, it is proposed that any work on conversion factors would only inform the reconciliations undertaken by the Secretariat (and Members in their own monitoring), and should consider, but will not impact, the conversion factors currently used by CCSBT Members that have been notified to the Secretariat[10].

It is also recommended that CC20 may also wish to identify priority tasks and processed codes to direct this work. The table at **Attachment A** summarises the number of times that specific processed codes have been used in CMFs and REEFs and also includes the total weight reported for each of the processed codes. Members may wish to use this information to prioritise the review of individual processed codes. Should Members agree to undertake further work in this area, CC20 should also discuss and consider opportunities to group processed states, to reduce the number of processed codes and conversion factors that are currently used.

[8] This was highlighted at ECS30 in Paper ESC 30 – 37 South Africa's Conversion Factor of Southern Bluefin Tuna from Processed Weight to Whole Weight.

[9] As an example, processed codes were discussed at the eCDS working group meetings in May 2025. This discussions centred on the codes that would be used in the eCDS following Members decision to use specific processed codes in the eCDS, rather than the current practice of using OT (Other) and providing a product description. No decision was made on this as some Members noted broader compliance concerns related to the use of processed codes and conversion factors and indicated that these would be better discussed at CC.

[10] Also noting that conversion factors used by Members and notified to the Secretariat primarily apply to those processed states reported on CMFs, not REEFs.

3. TRANSHIPMENT MONITORING PROGRAM

The CCSBT has a transhipment monitoring program for monitoring at-sea and in-port transhipment of SBT by its Members. The program requires the CCSBT Secretariat to maintain an up-to-date Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels (CVs), as well as manage the supporting documentation such as deployment requests, transhipment declarations and observer reports.

3.1. Operational Issues

3.1.1. *Indonesia not Fully Meeting CCSBT's Transhipment Resolution Obligations*

From 1 November 2023, a trial at-sea programme commenced for SBT transhipments to specified wooden Indonesian-flagged carrier vessels carrying national observers commenced. Further discussion on Indonesia's compliance with the Transhipment Resolution obligations and the data and information provided under this trial programme to date are included in papers **CCSBT–CC/2510/12** and **CCSBT–CC/2410/21**, so have not been reported in this paper.

3.1.2. *General Issues*

In cases where transhipment observers were successfully deployed, the Secretariat notes the same main issues with operation of the Transhipment Resolution as in previous years. These issues relate to difficulties regarding:

- identifying SBT during multi-species transhipments, and
- ascertaining the species of tuna (specifically SBT) based solely on transhipment observer photographs. While it is essential to have observer photographs on record, it appears almost impossible to identify the species of tuna with any certainty (especially when frozen, gilled and gutted) based on photographs alone.

To address these operational issues, the Secretariat continues to recommend that:

- SBT should be transhipped separately from other tuna and tuna-like species, in order to assist observers with identification, and
- Members should consider the use of genetic testing kits (for tuna species identification) for use by transhipment observers in the future. This is further discussed in paper **CCSBT–CC/2510/09**.

3.2. Authorised Carrier Vessels: IMO Number Requirement

Between 1 July 2024 and 30 June 2025, the Secretariat received authorisation notifications from Members that related to 41 carrier vessels. The vessel flags of the carrier vessels for which authorisations were notified during this period are shown in the table below:

CV Flag	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	Panama	Singapore	Taiwan
Total Vessels	20	6	3	4	2	6

IMO numbers have been provided for all CCSBT-authorised Carrier Vessels between 1 July 2024 and 30 June 2025.

3.3. Summary of Transhipment Data Received

A summary of transhipment declarations and/or observer reports/CDS forms received for Japan, Korea and Taiwan for 2024, and the first half of 2025 (aggregated by flag and product type) is provided at **Attachment A** (Tables 1 - 5). During 2024, there were 522 transhipment declarations received from Indonesia that reported SBT transfers totalling 595(t). **Attachment A** does not include information from the transhipment declarations received from Indonesia as part of the transhipment trial, because this is reported in papers **CCSBT-CC/2510/12** and **CCSBT-CC/2510/21**.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 of **Attachment A** provide information from at-sea transhipment declarations and observer reports received. In Table 1 of **Attachment A**, there sometimes appear to be significant discrepancies between transhipment declaration weights of SBT versus observer reported weights. The reason for these discrepancies is because many observer reports have often not included the weight of SBT transhipped for each individual vessel, but only the overall weight of all SBT over a series of transhipments. Tables 4 and 5 provide the same information for in-port transhipment/ CDS information received.

The following points summarise only the transhipment information received by the Secretariat for Japan, Korea and Taiwan for 2024 and the first half of 2025 and do not consider the at-sea transhipment declarations received from Indonesia:

- All of the at-sea transhipments were observed during 2024;
- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT were to be transhipped were received for all reported SBT transhipments at sea during 2024;
- There were 25 SBT transhipments at sea during the first half of 2025;
- The Secretariat received 50 transhipment declarations for transhipments at sea totalling 1,1191t during 2024;
- The Secretariat received 1 transhipment declaration for in-port transhipments during 2024 totalling 21.8t and 2 transhipment declarations for in-port transhipments that occurred during the first half of 2025. It is not yet possible to cross check any in-port transhipments during 2025 against CDS data, because CMFs for the 2nd quarter of 2025 are not due to be submitted to the Secretariat until 30 September 2025;
- Observer reports have been received for 100% of all reported 2024 at-sea transhipments; and
- Table 3 of **Attachment A** provides a summary of transhipment weights recorded on transhipment declarations, observer reports, and CDS information for the 2024 calendar year. To enable valid comparisons to be made, this table presents data for only those transhipments for which the Secretariat has received both transhipment declarations and observer reports and has been able to match these transhipments with CDS documents. When summed, the weights of transhipped SBT reported on transhipment declarations versus CDS documents differed from each other by 1.2%.

4. RECORDS OF AUTHORISED VESSELS AND FARMS

4.1. Authorised Farm and Vessel Records

The Secretariat continues to receive authorised farm and vessel updates approximately twice a week, with vessel updates containing up to eight hundred vessels. Upon receipt of this information, the Secretariat updates its authorised vessels/farms database as well as the CCSBT website.

4.1.1. *Authorised Fishing Vessels: IMO Number*

Paragraph 3 of the CCSBT's 'Resolution on a CCSBT Record of Vessels Authorised to Fish for Southern Bluefin Tuna', includes the following IMO numbering requirements:

> *3. Members and Cooperating Non-members shall ensure that the following categories of fishing vessels in the CCSBT Record of Authorised Vessels have IMO numbers issued to them:*
>
> - *all fishing vessels (except wooden and fibreglass vessels) flying their flag that are authorised to catch SBT, and that are at least 100 gross tonnage in size, and*
> - *effective from 1 January 2021, wooden and fiberglass fishing vessels flying their flag that are authorised to catch SBT, and that are at least 100 gross tonnage in size, and*
> - *effective from 1 January 2022, all motorised inboard fishing vessels of less than 100 gross tonnage down to a size limit of 12 metres in length overall (LOA) authorised to operate outside waters under the national jurisdiction of the flag State.*

There has been 100% compliance with the IMO number requirement for CCSBT authorised fishing vessels between 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025.

4.1.2. *Requirement Authorisations to Operate Outside National Jurisdiction*

Effective from 1 January 2024, Members have also been required to include whether vessels are authorised to operate outside waters of national jurisdiction in the information provided in their list of authorised fishing vessels. This information has been provided for all fishing vessels authorised between 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025.

4.1.3. *Information on Freezing Capacity*

Freezing capacity information has been provided for all fishing vessels for which vessel authorisation notifications have been received between 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025.

4.2. Combined Regional Authorised Vessels Tool (CRAVT)

As noted in previous Operation of Measures papers submitted to CC18 and CC19[11], maintenance of the Consolidated List of Authorised Vessels (CLAV) had not occurred since funding for this ceased in October 2019. The IMCS Network, in its support of the TCN has developed a Combined Regional Authorised Vessels Tool (CRAVT). This tool was launched in late 2024 and contains vessel authorisation data from CCSBT, along with Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC), South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO), and the Pacific Island's Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The CRAVT is publicly available and automatically combines vessel and vessel authorisation data and information from these RFMOs and RFB. The CCSBT vessel authorisation data is being made available through an API, so the ongoing requirements on the Secretariat to support this development are minimal.

[11] CCSBT-CC/2310/08 (Rev.1) and CCSBT-CC/2410/08 (Rev 1)

5. VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM (VMS)

Three Members reported some VMS technical failures during their most recently completed fishing season, but no Members reported any VMS non-compliance.

In its annual report, New Zealand reported that:

> *During the 2023/24 fishing season, the Ministry for Primary Industries issued a total of three direction notices for vessels which had reported a VMS unit failure and were targeting SBT. All failures occurred within New Zealand's exclusive economic zone.*
>
> *In the event of device failure at sea, the permit holder is required to notify Fisheries New Zealand as soon as practicable. Upon notification the vessel will either be ordered to port or will be issued a direction notice allowing the permit holder to continue fishing. A direction is issued for a specific time period and once back at port, the permit holder must have their geospatial positional reporting (GPR) unit fixed prior to any future trips. In some cases, Fisheries Compliance can corroborate vessel GPR separately through Automatic Identification System (AIS) data.*

Japan reported one VMS technical failure in its annual report, which commenced in late October 2024. The latitude and longitude provided places the vessel in the Japanese EEZ at the time of the failure, not in areas where SBT would be caught.

Korea also reported one VMS technical failure in its annual report. This technical failure related to "a satellite issue" in late August 2024 and lasted less than four hours. Korea further reported that the "vessel operator submitted data generated from its secondary units, which were later put into Korea's system manually".

Australia and Indonesia both reported no VMS technical failures in their annual reports.

South Africa and Taiwan both provided a response to question 2.2.4 (vi) that outlined their processes to respond to VMS technical failures, but these responses did not include whether or not any technical failures occurred during 2024.

Members are reminded that the CCSBT annual report requires that, in the event of a technical failure of a vessel's VMS, Members report the vessel's geographical position (latitude and longitude) at the time of failure and the length of time the VMS was inactive. Reporting these incidents can demonstrate effective monitoring and oversight of vessel reporting on VMS.

In the pre-meeting discussion before CC19, Indonesia noted changes to its regulations where vessels fishing beyond 12 nautical miles would now be required to have a central permit. This would mean that vessels measuring less than 30 GT but operating more than 12 nautical miles from shore must migrate to a central permit.

> *"The VMS provisions stipulate that vessels with a central permit are required to install a VMS. However, the ID government provides a grace period for vessels <= 30 GT that have a central permit to be allowed not to install a VMS until December 31, 2024."*

Indonesia notes in its annual report that it is mandatory for Indonesian fishing vessels licensed by the central government or operating in the high seas to install VMS on-board. However, it is unclear whether all vessels that migrated from regional to central government permits have installed VMS units following the grace period that was initially provided to vessels less than 30 GT.

6. CCSBT IUU VESSEL LIST

In October 2019, CCSBT's IUU Vessel List was revised to include a provision to cross-list vessels from the IUU Lists of eight other organisations onto the CCSBT's IUU Vessel List, but only in cases where the RFMO concerned was the original IUU listing organisation.

The eight organisations the CCSBT agreed to cross-list vessels from are the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO), the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) and the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO).

In late 2019 and early 2020, the Secretariat collated an initial CCSBT IUU List consisting of all appropriate cross-listed vessels from the eight nominated organisations above. This initial CCSBT IUU List included 116 cross-listed vessels and was first posted on the CCSBT's website in February 2020. In August 2025, CCSBT's IUU List included 158 cross-listed vessels, and no vessels independently IUU-listed by the CCSBT.

7. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR INSPECTIONS IN PORT

The Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port was adopted in 2015 and came into effect from 1 January 2017 and includes a number of obligations for Port State Members.

Designated Points of Contact and Ports

The Resolution requires that each Member wishing to grant port access to 'foreign fishing vessels' (including carrier vessels other than container vessels) carrying SBT or fish products originating from SBT submits to the CCSBT Secretariat:

- A designated point of contact for receiving inspection reports, and
- A list of designated ports to which 'foreign fishing vessels' may request entry.

This information has been provided by all Members and the Secretariat encourages Members to check this information which is reported on the CCSBT website to ensure that it remains up to date.

Port Inspection Reports

Paragraph 15 of the Resolution requires that:

15. Each year Members shall inspect at least 5 % of landing and transshipment operations in their designated ports as are made by foreign fishing vessels.

Further, paragraph 20 specifies that:

20. The port Member shall transmit a copy of the inspection report to the CCSBT Secretariat no later than 14 days following the date of completion of the inspection. If the inspection report cannot be transmitted within 14 days, the port Member should

notify the CCSBT Secretariat within the 14 day time period the reasons for the delay and when the report will be submitted.

Table 1 outlines the Secretariat's interpretation of the number of inspections that need to be conducted to meet the 'at least 5%' port inspection requirement.

Table 1: Number of Required Inspections (to meet the 'at least 5%' inspection requirement)

Number of landing/ transhipment operations occurring in designated ports	Number of inspections required by Members to meet the requirements of paragraph 15, "*at least 5% of landing and transhipment operations in their designated ports as are made by foreign fishing vessels*"
1 – 20	1[12]
21 – 40	2
41 – 60	3
61 – 80	4
81 – 100	5

During the 2024 calendar year, Taiwan, South Africa, Korea, Australia and Indonesia provided inspection reports to the Secretariat for inspections carried out on foreign fishing vessels or carrier vessels.

In their respective annual reports, Japan, Korea, South Africa and Taiwan have all reported carrying out inspections on vessels with SBT/SBT products on board that were conducting landing/transhipment operations in their designated ports during 2024.

In relation to the other inspection reports received:

- Indonesia's annual report recorded port inspections of foreign FVs and CVs as not applicable, and the one inspection report received from Indonesia in 2024 related to a vessel that had SBT onboard, but that did not unload or tranship SBT while in port in Indonesia.
- South Africa submitted three (3) inspection reports in 2024, and all of these reports did not record any SBT being on board the vessels inspected.
- The inspection report provided by Australia related to a vessel that was reprovisioning only and did not involve the unload or transhipment of SBT.

The reports listed above have been excluded from this analysis/Table 2 below.

Table 2 provides a summary of the port inspection reports that were provided (or not), how many reports were submitted within the required 14-day period, whether appropriate notifications were received for any reports that were submitted late and/or have not yet been submitted, and whether the inspection requirement of 'at least 5%' was met.

[12] Inspecting no (0) landing and transhipment operations out of 1-20 operations, would mean that 0% were inspected and the minimum threshold of 'at least 5%' would not be met

Table 2: Summary of 2024 Port Inspection Reports Required/Submitted (NA is 'Not Applicable' and TBC is 'To be Confirmed')

Member	Total No. of Landing/ Transhipment Operations by 'Foreign Fishing Vessels'[13] (carrying SBT/SBT products)	Number of Inspection Reports Received for 'Foreign Fishing Vessels' (carrying SBT/SBT products)	Percentage of Inspection Reports Received within the Required 14-Day Timeframe	Number of Notifications Received that Inspection Reports would be Submitted Late	Was the 'at least 5%' inspection requirement met?[14]
Japan	4	1	0%	0	Yes
Korea	1	1	0%	0	Yes
South Africa	3	0	0%	0	TBC
Taiwan	2	2	100%	NA	Yes

In summary:

- Japan, Korea, South Africa and Taiwan all reported meeting and exceeding the 'at least 5%' port inspection requirement in 2024. Inspection reports have been received from Japan, Korea and Taiwan that also confirm these members meeting this level of inspections.
- Taiwan complied with the 14-day timeframe for submitting port inspection reports to the Secretariat.
- The inspection report from Korea was received 21 days after the inspection was completed, so this was received outside of the 14-day period required in the Resolution.
- Japan did not initially provide any inspection reports to the Secretariat during 2024. However, following notification from the Secretariat, Japan has now provided all port inspection information required by the Resolution for 2024. But this information has also not been provided within 14 days of completion of the inspection, as required by the Resolution. Japan explained that this inspection report was received during a period of staffing changes, which meant that the requirement to provide this report to the Secretariat was missed at this time.
- South Africa has reported three vessels landing or transhipping SBT during 2024 in its annual report to CC20/CCSBT32. Three inspection reports were received from South Africa during 2024, but none of these related to vessels that reported having SBT onboard[15]. So, South Africa have not yet complied with the requirements in the Resolution related to the submission of inspection reports[16].
- South Africa's annual report to CC20 listed inspections on vessels from Spain, Uruguay and Vanuatu in 2023 or 2024 that were reported as carrying SBT. In response to outreach from the Secretariat South Africa rechecked its inspection records and confirmed:

  "Regarding the Spanish vessels, the EU catches in 2023, and vessels from Vanuatu and Uruguay (carriers) in 2023 or 2024, we did not find any records, so that was an error on our side".

[13] As provided in Members' annual reports to the CC/EC

[14] Based on the port inspection data received by the Secretariat.

[15] Two inspection reports were for vessels reported as landing rock lobster, so were almost certain to not be carrying SBT. The third inspection report is for a longline vessel, but this inspection report notes only tropical tuna species (and bycatch) onboard.

[16] South Africa provided additional 12 inspection reports to the Secretariat on 11 September 2025. These all related to 2022 and 2023 and included seven inspection reports that has been provided to the Secretariat previously and five that had not previously been received. No further inspection reports for 2024 have been provided.

- New Zealand also noted in their national report that during the 2023/24 fishing year, 9 foreign fishing vessels (FFVs) authorised for CCSBT entered New Zealand ports and were inspected. In its annual report, New Zealand again notes that:

  "Several FFVs inspected at port were found to have potential compliance issues relating to relating to seabird mitigation measure required by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). All issues detected at port were referred to the relevant flat state for further investigation and action."

  None of these FFVs were reported as having unloaded or transhipped any SBT while in NZ ports, so the reports from these inspections were not required to be submitted to the Secretariat.

8. SUMMARY

It is recommended that CC20 notes:

- The USA's continued important voluntary cooperation with respect to providing quarterly CDS submissions to the Secretariat;
- The increase in CDS exports to non-cooperating non-members, and particularly the significant increase in reported exports to China;
- Transhipment summary information provided at **Attachment A**;
- The current status of the CCSBT's IUU Vessel List and the IUU cross-listing process; and
- Port inspection information submitted to the Secretariat for inspections completed during 2024.

CC20 is invited to discuss the current challenges in reconciling REEFs and to note:

- The additional information that will be available in the eCDS to support Member's to accurately record preceding documents numbers on REEFs, including by making limited catch tagging data available to importing Members;

CC20 is also invited to consider recommending that:

- Members continue improving the accuracy of preceding documents reported on REEFs and limiting the number of preceding documents listed to only those that actually contributed to the SBT reported on the REEF;
- intersessional work through the Technical Compliance Working Group is undertaken to further discuss the current challenges related to the use of conversion factors by CCSBT and develop a workplan to address these challenges; and
- support is sought from ESC to review and recommend conversion factors for specific priority processed codes identified by CC20.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Attachment A

Table 1: Summary of Transhipments <u>at sea</u> during the 2024 Calendar Year (transhipment observer on board)

	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
Fishing Vessel Flag	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	7	594,897	GG	7	346,619[17]
Taiwan	43	596,165	GG	43	255,734[17]
TOTAL	**50**	**1,191,062**		**50**	**602,353**

Table 2: Summary of Transhipments <u>at sea</u> during the first half of the 2025 Calendar Year (transhipment observer on board and transhipment declarations already received)

	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
Fishing Vessel Flag	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	7	665,132	GG	0	0
Korea	1	151,191	GG	0	0
Taiwan	17	187,473	GG	2	0[177]
TOTAL	**25**	**1,003,796**		**2**	**0**

Table 3: Summary of Transhipments <u>at sea</u> versus CDS Forms versus Observer Reports for the 2024 Calendar Year[18]

Fishing Vessel Flag	Comment	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) from Transhipment Declaration	Total Net Weight (kg) from CDS	Total Net Weight (kg) from Observer Report
Japan	Observer provided SBT weights	4	334,674	334,793	346,619
Japan	Observer provided no SBT weights	3	260,223	260,223	0
Taiwan	Observer provided SBT weights	14	248,853	256,060	255,734
Taiwan	Observer provided no SBT weights	29	347,312	354,655	0
TOTAL		**50**	**1,191,062**	**1,205,731**	**602,353**

[17] The Secretariat has received the observer reports but the observer did not provide an estimate of weight transhipped for some of the Japanese and Taiwanese transhipments.

[18] This report is limited to transhipments where observer reports have been provided, and where the Secretariat has been able to match CDS information

Table 4: Summary of Transhipments that occurred <u>in port</u> during the 2024 Calendar Year[19]

	From Transhipment Declarations			From CDS		
Fishing Vessel Flag	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type
Taiwan	1	21,780	GG	1	22,820	GGT
TOTAL	**1**	21,780		**1**	22,820	

Table 5: Summary of Transhipments that occurred <u>in port</u> during the first half of the 2025 Calendar Year[19]

	From Transhipment Declarations			From CDS		
Fishing Vessel Flag	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type
Korea	2	274,689	GG	-	-	-
TOTAL	**2**	274,689				

[19] Transhipments conducted in port are not part of the CCSBT Transhipment Regional Observer Program, and therefore no observer deployment requests, nor observer reports are required to be submitted for these transhipments. Only Transhipment Declarations are required to be submitted.

Attachment B

Processed Codes Used on REEFs and CMFs (Number of CDS Documents and Total Weight)

*This table reports all REEF and CMFs back to 2011 but does not include catch reported for processed codes that are no longer used (e.g. GG).

Reference	Code	Name	Description	Count of REEFs that used this code	Count of CMFs that used this code	Sum of Reported REEF Weight (kg)	Sum of Reported CMF Weight (kg)
Current	DRO	Dressed - Tail on	Processed with gills, gut, operculae (gill plates/covers) and head removed. Dorsal, pelvic and anal fins may or may not be removed.	61	2,774	48,714.94	742,354.05
Current	DRT	Dressed - Tail off	Processed with gills, gut, operculae (gill plates/covers), head and tail removed. Dorsal, pelvic and anal fins may or may not be removed.	22	1,673	360,156.65	1,223,200.53
Current	FL	Fillet	Processed further than DRT, with the trunk cut into fillets.	980	168	1,296,572.48	16,087.34
Current	GGO	Gilled and Gutted - Tail on	Processed with gills and gut removed. Operculae (gill plates/covers) and dorsal, pelvic and anal fins may or may not be removed.	462	24,419	587,606.19	90,671,615.87
Current	GGT	Gilled and Gutted - Tail off	Processed with gills, gut and tail removed. Operculae (gill plates/covers) and dorsal, pelvic and anal fins may or may not be removed.	743	15,093	3,063,425.64	109,941,357.80
Current	RD	Round	SBT Without any processing.		316		68,514.68
OT	BLO	Block	Block	1,073	1	365,700.33	7.00
OT	BM	Belly Meat	Belly Meat	499	6	468,770.32	156.90
OT	CHK	Cheek	Cheek meat	149		59,151.70	
OT	CHN	Chin meat	Chin meat - meat around the bottom part of the collar	18		7,414.90	
OT	CUB	Cube	Tuna meet diced into cubes	44		26,094.91	
OT	EYE	Eye meat	Eye meat	6		68.80	
OT	HAR	Haramo	Similar to Toro	23		15,449.69	
OT	HED	Head meat	Head meat - meat around the forehead/top of the head	22		4,313.00	
OT	HOH	Hoho(niku) - Cheek Meat	Cheek Meat	8		860.00	

Reference	Code	Name	Description	Count of REEFs that used this code	Count of CMFs that used this code	Sum of Reported REEF Weight (kg)	Sum of Reported CMF Weight (kg)
OT	HRT	Hearts	This is a by-product not included in weight calculations.				
OT	HT	Heads and Tails	This is a by-product not included in weight calculations.	3		113.10	
OT	KAM	Kama	Collar meat	1,328		1,220,964.03	
OT	KAW	Kawara	Horizontally cut block	6		1,259.60	
OT	KIR	Kiriotoshi	Leftover pieces; this includes rib meat, cheek meat, head meat, etc. It is a byproduct of fillets and not included in weight calculations.	44		21,669.70	
OT	LOI	Loins	Fillets cut in half	740	496	550,834.78	38,435.17
OT	NAK	Nakaochi	Ribs and backbone with the rib meat in place	77		44,622.56	
OT	NEG	Negitoro genryo	Minced tuna meat	229		153,617.67	
OT	NOD	Nodo	Meat at the bottom of the head, connecting both side gill covers	1		400.00	
OT	PEC	Pectoral fin	Pectoral fin	2		5.80	
OT	SAK	Saku	Saku, akami saku, steaks	1,708		2,095,396.03	
OT	SLC	Slice / Sashimi	Sliced "saku" (general)	12		4,525.03	
OT	SMK	Smoked pieces	Smoked pieces	1		30.15	
OT	SUS	Sushi-neta	Sliced "Saku" product (used for sushi)	53		20,850.03	
OT	TR	Toro	Fillets of fat (the most expensive part of the tuna)	366	2	220,201.72	33.00
Current	OT	Other	None of the above codes are appropriate	551	169	450,781.65	76,086.41

	OT Processed Codes from Fillets
	OT Processed Codes from Other Parts

*Note that the CDS Resolution states that exportation/import of fish parts other than the meat (i.e. head, eyes, roe, guts, tails and fins) may be allowed without a CDS document.