Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna

みなみまぐろ保存委員会

CCSBT–CC/2610/17

Update on CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with Other Bodies and Organisations

1. Introduction

This paper updates Members on CCSBT's compliance relationships with other RFMOs[1] and RFMO like organisations, including the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), 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 paper also details engagement with international organisations, including CCSBT's compliance relationships with the IMCS Network (IMCSN) and the networks that it supports, including the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN) and Pan-Pacific Tuna Compliance Network (PPFCN). An update is also included on the relationship with other organisations, including TMT (formerly Trygg Mat Tracking).

2. ICCAT and IOTC

The CCSBT Secretariat has had regular interactions with ICCAT and IOTC Secretariat compliance personnel since CC20, primarily concerning at-sea transhipment observer programmes and IUU Vessel Lists cross-listing matters. The Compliance Manager also continues to collaborate with IOTC and ICCAT personnel through the TCN.

2.1. ICCAT

The Compliance Manager has continued to collaborate with ICCAT's Head of Compliance to support CCSBT's continued access to ICCAT carrier vessel supply declaration information under the updated the Transhipment Memorandum of Understanding[2]. The Secretariat also continues to collaborate with ICCAT and its Regional Observer Programme (ROP) provider[3] to support ongoing access to transhipment data and information for SBT transhipments in the Atlantic region.

2.2. IOTC

The Secretariat has continued to collaborate with the IOTC Secretariat following CC 20, specifically sharing data and information on transhipments and IUU vessel listing updates. The Compliance Manager also attending a meeting with IOTC and Indonesian Officials in November 2025 on the use of IOTC's eMARIS system to collect transhipment information and coordinated with IOTC to support CCSBT's access to IOTC transhipment information recorded in the eMARIS system.

The Compliance Manager has also engaged with IOTC and its ROP provider[3] regarding CCSBTs work to develop a proof of concept for considering the costs and benefits of

[1] Regional Fisheries Management Organisations

[2] See paper CCSBT–CC/2510/13 for more details on the updated MOU with ICCAT.

[3] MRAG UK in Consortium with CapFish, South Africa

transhipment observers taking genetic samples to support species identification. This has included both virtual discussion and e-mail correspondence.
The Secretariat has also been in regular contact with the IOTC Secretariat to support progress of the MOU with UN FAO, which is required to replace CCSBT's existing Transhipment LoU with the IOTC[4].

3. WCPFC

A Transhipment Memorandum of Cooperation[5] (MoC) with WCPFC was signed by the CCSBT and WCPFC Chairs during 2017, but has not yet been operationalised as WCPFC transhipment observers cannot be cross-endorsed by CCSBT until CCSBT's transhipment observer standards are met[6]. In the interim, SBT remains unable to be transhipped at-sea within the WCPFC Convention Area and no transhipment of SBT in the WCPO has been reported to WCPFC during the past decade.

Since CCSBT 32, the Compliance Manager has continued discussions with the WCPFC Secretariat to identify opportunities to progress with the operationalisation of the MoC. For WCPFC, these discussions have been supported by the request from the 20th Regular Session of the WCPFC Commission (WCPFC20) that the WCPFC Secretariat establish arrangements with specific RFMOs, including CCSBT, for the exchange of information on transhipment activities, observer reports and carrier vessels.

The discussions with WCPFC have focussed on establishing the relevant data sharing mechanisms to support the exchange of information described in the MoC and relevant Resolutions. This is also consistent with Paragraph 45 of the CCSBT Transhipment Resolution, which states that:

> *The CCSBT Secretariat shall liaise with the ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC with respect to any information submitted to those organisations regarding SBT. The CCSBT Secretariat shall also exchange information on transhipment and observer standards with other RFMO Secretariats.*

The CCSBT Secretariat has provided information to the WCPFC Secretariat on the CCSBT transhipment reporting requirements. Both Commissions require reporting and observer monitoring of relevant at-sea transhipments, but some differences exist between the two reporting frameworks. These differences are especially evident in regard to reporting timeframes and CCSBT's requirement for an observer deployment request[7] and five-day reports[8].

However, the MoC states that each Secretariat will identify the transhipment data and information requirements for its Commission and will ensure that ROP observers will be able to meet all such requirements. Therefore, these differences do not prevent transhipments from occurring, provided the required standards and reporting requirements are met. Similarly, these differences do not prevent the establishment of mechanisms to support the exchange of

[4] This is discussed further in paper **CCSBT–CC/2610/13**.

[5] Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) on the Endorsement of WCPFC Regional Observer Programme Observers for Observing Transshipments of Southern Bluefin Tuna on the High Seas of the WCPFC Convention Area.

[6] The MOC states that CCSBT endorsement of a WCPFC ROP observer to monitor transhipments of South Bluefin Tuna in the High Seas of the WCPFC Convention Area will occur only when the CCSBT Secretariat agrees that the WCPFC ROP observer has met the necessary requirements for observing transshipments of Southern Bluefin Tuna as specified in the CCSBT's Transshipment Resolution.

[7] The WCPFC Transhipment CMM (2009-06) does not require a deployment request but requires that CCMs responsible for reporting against both the offloading and receiving vessels notify the WCPFC Executive Director specified information regarding the planned transhipment at least 36 hours prior to each transhipment taking place.

[8] The CCSBT Transhipment Resolution requires that the observer produce a daily report of the Carrier Vessel's transhipping activities and transmit a summary of these daily reports to the Secretariat every 5 days.

core information on the transhipment activity (specific to transhipments of SBT). The two Secretariat's have worked together to develop the scope of any potential data sharing, and this is described in **Attachment A** to this paper.

To clarify, the transhipment data-sharing proposed by the WCPFC is already covered by the CCSBT-WCPFC Transhipment MoC signed in 2017, and therefore there is no need to conclude a new MoC or similar arrangement with the WCPFC. To move toward operationalising the Transhipment MoC and work through the details between the CCSBT and the WCPFC Secretariats, the Secretariat would like the CC's support for further development of transhipment data-sharing arrangements with WCPFC in accordance with the proposed scope set out in **Attachment A**.

In addition to this ongoing direct collaboration, the Compliance Manager also virtually attended the 22nd Regular Session of the WCPFC Commission in December 2025, and the 9th E-reporting and E-monitoring Intersessional Working Group in June 2026.

4. CCAMLR

The Compliance Manager continues to regularly liaise with the CCAMLR compliance and monitoring team on issues of mutual interest. Since CC 20, this engagement has included sharing information on IUU vessel listings and eCDS development and implementation, including discussing CCAMLRs development of resources to support the use of eCDS use. Whilst there are distinct differences between the systems, there discussions continue to be very beneficial to inform the work of the CCSBT Secretariat to support CCSBT eCDS implementation, noting that CCAMLR e-CDS has been mandatory since 2010.

5. IMCSN

The IMCSN is a non-profit and informal organisation, established to facilitate bilateral and multilateral co-operation on MCS, compliance and enforcement and to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and associated activities. The CCSBT became a member of the IMCSN in November 2013. The IMCSN RFMO membership continues to include six RFMOs/organisations with a conservation agreement with some of the attributes of an RFMO[9], in addition to its 72 member States. The IMCSN membership also includes the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources, the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Indian Ocean Commission and the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) that all also have a regional fisheries focus or interest.

Since CCSBT32, the Compliance Manager has continued to be part of the IMCSN Executive Committee. The Secretariat has not received any direct support from IMCSN since CCSBT 32, outside of the support provided to the TCN and PPFCN.

In late 2024, the IMCS Network, in its role supporting the TCN, commenced development of an IUU Vessel Hub to assist RFMO Secretariats to update and share final IUU vessel lists. The intent of the IUU Vessel Hub tool is to support RFMO secretariats to manage and exchange IUU vessel list data and information. The Hub is hosted on a secure section of the IMCSN website and can only be accessed by RFMO secretariat staff. The Hub includes the data and information from the final IUU vessel lists adopted by the RFMOs and provides an automated mechanism for RFMO secretariats to share this information (including changes). The Secretariat has found these notifications, along with the tools in the Hub that support Secretariat staff to easily identify updates and changes to other RFMO IUU lists along with anomalies in listings, have added efficiencies to Secretariat processes.

[9] CCAMLR, CCSBT, NEAFC, NPFC, SIOFA and SPRFMO are currently members of the IMCSN

The IMCSN also continues to host the Combined Regional Authorised Vessels Tool (CRAVT) which combines vessel and vessel authorisation data and information from different RFMOs and RFBs[10]. CCSBT's list of authorised vessels is available within the CRAVT, and the sharing of this data is also discussed in paper **CCSBT–CC/2610/11.**

The IMCSN also coordinates the TCN and PPFCN and CCSBT has continued to engage extensively in these networks.

5.1. *Tuna Compliance Network (TCN)*

The TCN continues to function with the support of the IMCSN. The CCSBT Compliance Manager was elected Chair of the TCN in March 2026 and will serve in this role for twelve months until March 2027. The TCN has met three times since CCSBT 32, and the Compliance Manager has attended all of these meetings. The TCN meetings continue to provide an opportunity for RFMO compliance personnel to exchange information on relevant issues and developments, in particular transhipment measure implementation and strengthening, developments in the catch documentation schemes (CDS), port state measures, and opportunities for future collaboration and analysis support.

Building on the work directed by CCSBT in 2025[11], the IMCSN and TCN have developed a resource that is housed on the IMCSN website that outlines Seabird Data Reporting across tuna RFMOs. It is planned that further resources will be developed through the TCN to support practitioners to understand and engage in RFMO processes across the tuna RFMOs. If Members have any priority areas that could be supported by the TCN, then these would be welcomed.

An in-person TCN meeting is proposed in 2027 for Bali, Indonesia in the margins of the IMCSN Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop (GFETW). This meeting was initially scheduled for 2026 but was delayed due to the uncertainty around travel availability and the increasing travels costs due to the conflict in the Middle East. The Secretariat again proposes that there is significant benefit in the Compliance Manager continuing to attend this meeting in 2027.

5.2. *Pan-Pacific Fisheries Compliance Network (PPFCN)*

The informal PPFCN has met three times virtually since CCSBT 32, and the Compliance Manager was able to attend two of these virtual meetings (December 2025 and June 2026). In December of 2025, Mr. Eldene O'Shea of CCAMLR was elected Chair of the PPFCN for 2026. The PPFCN group continues to meet virtually every quarter (where possible) to promote communication and cooperation between the RFMOs that have overlapping waters in the Pacific Ocean region. There is also a proposal for PPFCN members to attend the planned TCN meeting in the margins of the GFETW in Bali.

6. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (UN FAO)

The Secretariat continued to engage with the UN FAO following CCSBT 32, with much engagement focussed with the FAO PSMA Secretariat. Prior to the Sixth meeting of the PSMA Technical Working Group on Information Exchange (PSMA TWG-IE6) in June 2026, the Compliance Manager engaged with the FAO PSMA, Fisheries Operations and Compliance Team and provided updates to a table reporting the Status of Connections

[10] Currently CCSBT, FFA, IATTC, IOTC, NPFC, SPRFMO and WCPFC

[11] This work was undertaken to respond to Action 4C in the CCSBT Seabird Strategy to "Review data collection forms and procedures across tuna RFMOs regarding compliance with seabird CMMs by longline fishing operators and develop harmonised format to communicate and advocate across tuna RFMOs". The report produced was included as Attachment D to paper CCSBT–CC/2510/09.

Between GIES and RFBs Electronic-Port State Measures on behalf of CCSBT. During this engagement, FAO highlighted the importance of RFMO presence at the TWG-IE meetings, especially as there are discussions about the use of the Global Information Exchange System (GIES), connections of RFMOs e-PSMs to the GIES and upgrades of GIES to better serve RFMO compliance processes including a new functionality on analytics.

Recent engagement with UN FAO has been focussed on the development of an MoU to facilitate an updated Cooperation Agreement with IOTC, however the majority of this has been directed through IOTC. This is discussed in paper **CCSBT–CC/2610/13** and broader Secretariat engagement with UN FAO and other United Nations agencies is discussed in paper **CCSBT-EC/2610/19.**

7. TMT (formerly Trygg Mat Tracking)

The Secretariat entered into an agreement for TMT to provide CCSBT with ad-hoc fishing vessel and company analysis on request in 2019. The funds provided to TMT under this agreement have yet to be exhausted and TMT remains available to provide analysis to CCSBT as required.

TMT have informed the Secretariat that, as the contract has been ongoing more than seven years, continuing to carry over the funds for these extended periods presents challenges from an audit perspective. They have therefore requested that CCSBT attempt to get all work completed under this agreement by 31 December 2026.

As discussed in paper **CCSBT–CC/2610/16**, the Secretariat would welcome any input from Members on priority areas to engage with TMT on, and to utilise these remaining funds.

8. Recommendations

CC 21 is invited to:

- Note the CCSBT's Compliance Relationships with other bodies and organisations.
- Review and discuss the progress made in collaboration with WCPFC on transhipment data sharing and the defined scope of that data sharing included in **Attachment A**; and
- Consider including in the CC workplan an item for the Secretariat to continue the work with the WCPFC Secretariat to progress transhipment data sharing, consistent with the defined scope and the existing Transhipment MoC with WCPFC.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Attachment A
Proposed Scope of Transhipment Data Sharing Between WCPFC and CCSBT

1. A reciprocal WCPFC–CCSBT arrangement would require each Commission to agree that relevant reports transmitted through the other Commission may be accepted for its purposes and incorporated into its datasets. This is already recognised in the CCSBT Transhipment Resolution, however further CCSBT consideration is required in relation to the differences in reporting requirements. This would be subject to any necessary Member approval and agreement on processes to ensure that the reports contain all information required by the receiving Commission.
2. Information transmitted from WCPFC to CCSBT would include the vessel identifiers, date, time and location recorded in the relevant transhipment notification and declaration, together with the product and weight rows relating to Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT). Data rows relating to other species would not be transmitted to CCSBT. Any declaration submitted following a transhipment arising from force majeure would also be included where SBT was reported.
3. The agreed dataset could also be made available to the CCSBT Secretariat through the WCPFC Transhipment E-reporting System using a specific view established for this purpose.
4. Information transmitted from CCSBT to WCPFC would include the observer deployment request (or equivalent pre-transhipment information), including the vessel identifiers and the anticipated date, time and location of the transhipment. The corresponding declaration information would include the vessel identifiers, actual date, time and location, and the relevant SBT product and weight data.
5. As the CCSBT Secretariat only records the transhipment details as they relate to transfers of SBT from reports received in other RFMOs, the product information available for reciprocal electronic exchange with WCPFC would be limited to SBT.
6. Relevant information from CCSBT could be shared electronically either through an API or through providing limited access to eSBT. To avoid duplication of reporting, any information on other species received by CCSBT through transhipment reporting, that is not entered into eSBT, could be shared by email with WCPFC (if required) depending on the decision of CCSBT Members on this arrangement.
7. Once the respective Commissions have agreed to the scope of the exchange, the data to be shared, the purposes for which the exchanged reports may be used and the applicable data-management arrangements, the two Secretariats could commence technical implementation of the reciprocal exchange. This would include finalising the data-field mapping, establishing source identifiers, agreeing the technical specifications for the API exchange, applying relevant access and confidentiality controls, and testing the exchange before it becomes operational. The requirements for CCSBT would need to consider associated costs associated with the approach taken to the exchange of information.
8. Any subsequent expansion of the exchange beyond the information and purposes agreed by the two Commissions, and outlined in the MoC, would be subject to further consideration and agreement, as appropriate.