



CCSBT-ERS/1203/04

## **Current ERS reporting requirements for CCSBT Members and Cooperating Non-Members to the Compliance Committee (CC) and Extended Commission (EC)**

### **Purpose**

The Compliance Committee (CC) has requested that the ERSWG review current Ecologically Related Species (ERS) reporting requirements to the CC and the Extended Commission (EC) in order to improve ERS reporting.

This document provides the current ERS reporting requirements in order to assist the ERSWG in its review.

### **Current Reporting Requirements**

There are two basic sets of requirements for reporting ERS information to the CC/EC.

The first set of requirements is in the template for annual review of SBT fisheries to the Extended Commission. This template requires Members and Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs) to provide information on:

- Mitigation<sup>1</sup> and
- ERS interactions, in particular to provide a table of observed interactions & mortalities, and methods of scaling to produce estimates of total ERS mortality in the same format as presented in Attachment 4 of the ERSWG8 Report

The second set of requirements comes from CCSBT's Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on Ecologically Related Species of Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna. Paragraph 4 of this recommendation specifies that Members and CNMs will report annually to the CC on the action they have taken pursuant to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the recommendation. This therefore requires Members and CNMs to:

- Report on their implementation of the International Plans of Action (IPOAs) for Reducing Incidental Catches of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries (IPOA-Seabirds), the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks), and the FAO Guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing operations (FAO-Sea turtles);
- Report on their compliance with all current binding and recommendatory measures<sup>2</sup> aimed at the protection of ecologically related species sharks, from fishing, which are adopted from time to time by IOTC, WCPFC and ICCAT when fishing in those Convention Areas; and
- Report on their collection and reporting of data on ecologically related species to the EC and/or its subsidiary bodies as appropriate, including the ERSWG.

---

<sup>1</sup> The type of mitigation information that should be provided is not specified in the template. To achieve consistency of reports between Members/CNMs and to ensure adequate reporting of important information, it may be worthwhile to clearly specify what should be provided in relation to mitigation.

<sup>2</sup> This includes measures on the collection and reporting of data in relation to ecologically related species.

Each year, the CCSBT Secretariat prepares a report to the CC on compliance with CCSBT management measures. The main table of the report to the 2011 Compliance Committee meeting is at Attachment A. The third page of this attachment summarised high level compliance with current ERS measures<sup>3</sup>. There is currently no requirement for Members/CNMs to report on more detailed ERS compliance matters such as the actual level of compliance with ERS measures or the method and robustness of processes established to monitor ERS compliance.

**Prepared by the Secretariat**

---

<sup>3</sup> A new item “Comply with ICCAT Measures” will be added to this report in 2012 because the 2011 meeting of the Extended Commission modified the ERS Recommendation to include compliance with ICCAT measures.

**Compliance with CCSBT measures for the period 01-Jul-2010 to 30-Jun-2011.**

**For CDS data, the table covers the 2010 Calendar year, and the first quarter of 2011 as data for Jan - Mar 2011 is provided on 30 June 2011.**

**With the exception of National reports and Quota, all compliance indicators are as at 11 October 2011. The notation used within the table is described on the next page.**

		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
<b>Data</b>	Monthly Catch Reports	✓	P	✓	✓	✓	F	✓	F	P
	Quota Allocation & Final Catch per entity									
	• <i>Initial Allocation</i>	✓	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	• <i>Final Catch by Vessel</i>	✓	X	X <sup>1</sup>	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
	Scientific Data Exchange									
	• <i>Total Catch by Fleet</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	F
	• <i>Catch and Effort</i>	✓	X	F	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Size Data</i>	✓	X	F	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Direct Ageing</i>	✓	NRDE	F	X	✓	✓	NRDE	NRDE	NRDE
• <i>Other<sup>2</sup></i>	✓	X	F	X	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	
<b>CDS (during 2010 Calendar year)<sup>3</sup></b>	Validation Details Updated	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
	Documents Received	F	F	✓	F	✓	F	F	F	P
	% of CMFs with all corresponding CTFs	93%	78%	89%	87%	95%	91%	100%	100%	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish numbers exactly match CMF</i>	93%	88%	96%	92%	88%	89%	100%	0% <sup>4</sup>	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish weights within 2.5% of CMF</i>	88%	95%	92%	97%	90%	92%	100%	0% <sup>4</sup>	X
	% of Domestic Landing CMFs contain complete and accurate information <sup>5</sup>	89%	75%	86%	n/a	80%	94%	n/a	87%	X
	% of Export CMFs contain complete and accurate information <sup>5</sup>	84%	64%	n/a	86%	93%	88%	100%	82%	X
	% of Domestic Landing CMFs with valid authorised vessels/farms	100%	91%	100%	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	100%	X
	% of Export CMFs with valid authorised vessels/farms	100%	77%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	X



		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
<b>ERS Recommendations</b>	<b>ERS Compliance <u>as advised by Member/CNM</u></b>									
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Seabirds</i>	✓	✓	✓	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Sharks</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Implement FAO-Sea Turtles</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Comply with IOTC Measures</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Comply with WCPFC Measures</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	✓
	Report to the CC on action taken pursuant to paragraphs 1-3 of ERS recommendation									
• <i>2010</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	
• <i>2011</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	✓	
<b>Members Reports in 2011 providing all information as required by templates</b>	CC/CCSBT	P <sup>9</sup>	P	✓	P <sup>9</sup>	P <sup>9</sup>	P <sup>9</sup>	P	P	P <sup>9</sup>
	ESC	✓	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
	ERSWG	n/a								
	Compliance Action Plan	P <sup>10</sup>	P	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	✓
<b>VMS</b>	Members Reports	P <sup>10</sup>	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	P

- ✓ - For Data and CDS - Indicates Full compliance where the total number of days outside the due date was less than 28 (when added together for the entire period).  
- For Members Reports – Indicates that reports contained all information as required by the template.  
- For Authorised Vessels/Farms – indicates that data has been received and there is no evidence of periods of non-authorisation
- F - For Data and CDS - Indicates Full compliance but the total number of days outside the due date was greater than 28 (when added together for the entire period).  
- For Members Reports – Indicates that reports contained partial information on all aspects of the template.  
- For ERS – indicates that a plan is ‘Under Development’  
- For Authorised Vessels/Farms – indicates that full information has been received; however there has been some period of non-authorisation
- P - Indicates Partial compliance (not all data received or no advice provided for a part of the period)  
- For Members Reports – Indicates that report did not contain all of the information specified in the template.
- X - Indicates non compliance (no data received, or no advice provided)  
- For ERS – indicates non-implementation of measure, or no advice provided.
- n/a - Not Applicable
- NRDE - Not specified as required for the ESC Data Exchange because this Member/Cooperating Non-Member is not currently able to provide this type of information. However they are encouraged to start collecting/providing this core information as soon as possible.

---

<sup>1</sup> The data is not provided to the Secretariat as required by the decision. However, Japan has advised that this data was provided to Diplomatic Posts.

<sup>2</sup> Evaluation is limited to other agreed primary data items for specific Members, including: Catch at age, CPUE indices, Aerial survey and Troll indices.

<sup>3</sup> The process for the Secretariat contacting Members/CNM's regarding missing data and discrepancies and obtaining responses is taking some time to complete and some figures in this table are subject to improvement through this process

<sup>4</sup> South Africa has provided Catch Tagging data for 2010, however this data did not directly match to a single CMF form.

<sup>5</sup> Documents where a range of months has been provided for one product type are considered to be incomplete even though the resolution does not specifically disallow this. Incomplete/Inaccurate information includes things such as missing information for one or more fields and incorrect information such as invalid codes/conversion factors etc.

<sup>6</sup> Australia allows its farms to provide a single Catch tagging form at the end of their harvest period. Subsequently the data for the period 1-Jan-2011 to 31-Mar-2011 has not yet been received. It is expected that this data will be provided at the next submission of data due on 30-Sep-2011.

<sup>7</sup> Correct information is interpreted to mean that the deployment requests contained information relating to SBT and were not revised.

<sup>8</sup> Correct information is interpreted to mean that the Transshipment Declaration contains the same information on SBT (presence and/or weight) as the Observer reports, or has not been revised.

<sup>9</sup> A common factor with all of these Reports is that they have not specified details on the level of coverage and type of audit undertaken, in accordance with paragraph 5.8 of the CDS resolution, and the level of compliance, as required by the template.

<sup>10</sup> Australia has provided a comprehensive Compliance Action Plan detailing its verification and implementation measures, however it does not use the standard template, and as a result does not contain specific information as required by the template (such as vessels expected to fish for/target SBT, percent of catches Exported).