



CCSBT-EC/0510/13

## 10. Indonesian Catch Monitoring

### Purpose

To discuss CCSBT involvement in future monitoring of the SBT catch by Indonesia.

### Background

Monitoring of the SBT catch in Indonesia has been supported by Japan through funding support for the IOTC and by Australia through the provision of research funding to the CSIRO.

This support has evolved into a collaborative project with Indonesia, which has established an integrated tuna and billfish monitoring program at three ports - Benoa, Jakarta and Cilacap. SBT are landed at the port at Benoa, which services the longline fleet fishing in the SBT spawning ground. The IOTC is now the lead collaborator.

The broad structure of the monitoring program is:

- a group of enumerators at the three ports with responsibility for collecting data on landings
- data entry activities at Indonesian official institutions
- data analysis by the IOTC
- collection of otoliths and direct ageing

The program has been supported through:

- financing the group of enumerators and supervisors (IOTC support is directed to Jakarta and Cilacap with Australian support directed to Benoa)
- purchase of computing equipment
- training of Indonesian officials in data entry
- on-going support of the monitoring system

The annual support for the program to date from Japanese and Australian sources is around \$180,000-200,000.

A workshop was held in April 2003 to consider Indonesian catch monitoring. The workshop observed:-

“that the information being generated by the IOTC monitoring program is critical for estimation of SBT catch, both on the spawning ground and globally, and that the information on age distribution of the spawning stock is used as one of the stock indicators within the CCSBT assessment process. Every effort should be made to continue this program, and to maintain the planned coverage level of 30% of landings. Efforts to improve the WASKI direct landings records to document all tuna landings by species were also strongly encouraged”

CCSBT10 acknowledged the high importance of the monitoring program to the Extended Commission's conservation and management objectives.

CCSBT11 also acknowledged the importance of continuing catch monitoring in Indonesia. It was agreed that a funding mechanism to continue support of the monitoring program should be discussed intersessionally. The Secretariat is unaware of any intersessional discussion of this matter and consideration of the issue is pending.

Indonesian catch monitoring was considered at the Scientific Committee meeting in September 2005. The Extended Scientific Committee reiterated its advice provided in 2004 that the Indonesian catch monitoring program is essential and also stated that the substantial increase in catch of SBT from the Indonesian fishery further emphasises the importance of this program.

Australia has underwritten the monitoring program in 2005 on the basis that:

- if CCSBT12 agrees to fund monitoring, Australia will be reimbursed the cost: or
- if members do not agree to fund monitoring at CCSBT12, Australia will be reimbursed for its expenditure from the proceeds from the sale of mortalities from the Australian east coast tagging program

## **Discussion**

Clearly, monitoring the Indonesian catch is of the highest priority for the CCSBT and the issue before the Extended Commission is not whether it should be continued but how it should be funded. In this context the following matters need to be considered:

### Cost

Current outlays by Australia are about \$155,000 per annum comprising:-

- |                                    |          |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| - Direct expenditure on monitoring | \$70,000 |
| - Ageing of otoliths               | \$15,000 |
| - Support expenses                 | \$70,000 |

These funds are paid to the CSIRO, which delivers and manages the program on behalf of the Australian Government.

Any continuation of the program will cost around this amount.

If management responsibility for the program was given to the CCSBT Secretariat along the lines of the IOTC, the Secretariat estimates it could operate the program at an annual cost of \$120,000.

### Funding Source

There are several options that might be considered:

1. Australia to continue to support the program.  
This option would be inconsistent with Australia's advice that it does not intend to continue funding Indonesian catch monitoring by itself.
2. Japan to finance the program.

At CCSBT11 Japan indicated it would examine the possibility of financing the monitoring program using existing bilateral aid sources. However, since CCSBT11 Japan has not advised other members of any developments in this regard.

3. The CCSBT finance the program. A number of financing options are possible.
  - an addition to the general budget, which would require individual member contributions according to the Extended Commission's funding formula
  - a special budget similar to that created for the surface fishery tagging program and funded by new member contributions; a diversion of funds from the tagging program if that was scientifically feasible; and/or application of funds from the sale of mortalities in the Australian tagging programs.

4. Ask the IOTC to pick up responsibility. The IOTC already operating a monitoring program in Indonesia and coordinates the analysis of the data for both the IOTC and the CCSBT. However, this could not be arranged for 2006 and the IOTC does not at present manage activities of this kind from general funds but rather relies on special funding from members. Negotiation with the IOTC could take some time and see the monitoring program at Benoa degrade rapidly while the issue was being resolved.

This option might also be seen as representing an abrogation of its responsibility by the CCSBT.

#### Responsible Agency

This is dependent on the source of funding for the monitoring program. For example, if Australia continued to support the program it would make sense to continue with that member having responsibility.

If the view of the Extended Commission was that the CCSBT should assume responsibility for the monitoring program, it would seem appropriate that the CCSBT Secretariat be responsible. This would be similar to the arrangement in place at the IOTC.

**Prepared by the Secretariat**