Activities with Other Organisations
他の機関との活動

Purpose
目的

To brief the Extended Commission on interactions with other organisations during 2008 and proposals for 2009. To also draw attention to work done by the tuna RFMOs towards the development of a Unique Vessel Identifier for tuna fishing vessels.
2008 年における他の国際機関との関わり及び 2009 年の提案を拡大委員会に説明する。また、まぐろ漁船に対する固有の船舶識別子の開発に向けた、まぐろ類 RFMO の取組にも注目する。

Activities in 2008
2008 年における活動

Secretariat staff participated in the following meetings since CCSBT14:
CCSBT14 以降、事務局職員は以下の会合に出席した。

- Tuna RFMO Chair's meeting, February 2008
  まぐろ類 RFMO 議長会合、2008 年 2 月
- Tuna Secretariat's meeting, February 2008
  まぐろ類事務局会合、2008 年 2 月
- 5th Steering Committee meeting of the Fisheries Resources Monitoring System (FIRMS) and Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics (CWP) Inter-sessional meeting, July 2008
  第 5 回 FIRMS ステアリング・コミッティー及び CWP 中間会合、2008 年 7 月

In addition, the Executive Secretary is in regular contact with the Executive Secretaries of other regional fisheries bodies on matters of mutual interest.
さらに、事務局長は、他の地域漁業機関の事務局長と、相互に関心のある事項について、定期的に連絡をとっている。

The report of the Tuna RFMO Chair's meeting is at Attachment A. The meeting provided suggestions for future activities in the following areas:
まぐろ類 RFMO 議長会合の報告書を別紙 A に添付した。会合では、次の分野における、将来の活動に対する提案が提起された。

- Consistency of conservation and management measures with scientific advice;
  科学的助言と保存管理措置の一貫性
- Trade/catch tracking systems;
  貿易/漁獲の追跡システム
- Harmonised vessel list;
  共通漁船リスト
- Compliance and MCS; and
  遵守及び MCS
- Capacity building and assistance
  能力の強化及び支援

Within the area of a harmonised vessel list, WCPFC Secretariat agreed to initiate and lead a study of unique vessel identifier (UVI) systems. This study has proceeded with the involvement of all the tuna RFMO (t-RFMO) Secretariats. Attachment 2 provides a paper prepared through this study on a UVI for tuna fishing vessels. In brief:
共通漁船リストについて、WCPFC 事務局は、固有船舶識別子(UVI)システムの調査に着手し、リードすることに合意した。この調査は、すべてのまぐろ類 RFMO(t-RFMO)事務局を巻き込み進められている。別紙 2 に、まぐろ漁船のための UVI に関する調査を通じて、作成された文書を示す。

- The issue of a UVI has received wide-spread consideration in a range of international discussions and the introduction of a UVI is widely regarded as a practical, positive step towards combating IUU fishing world-wide.
  UVI の問題は、さまざまな国際的な議論における幅広い検討をふまえると、UVI の導入は、世界中の IUU 漁業に対抗するための現実的かつ明確な手段とされている。
- The development of a UVI by the t-RFMOs, for their collective use, would facilitate the exchange of vessel information among the t-RFMOs in the short term, support the further development of a global vessel list among t-RFMOs and make a positive contribution to related efforts within FAO towards this goal.
  t-RFMO の共同利用のため、UVI の開発は、船舶情報の t-RFMO 間での交換の短縮を促進し、t-RFMO 間でのグローバル・ベッセル・リストの開発を支援し、この目標に向けた FAO における関係のある取組に対し積極的な貢献をするものである。
- A set of minimal information requirements have been identified to enable the vessel records of t-RFMOs to be integrated with those maintained by Lloyds Registry-Fairplay (LR-F) and to be allocated an LR-F number which would become the UVI.
  t-RFMO の船舶記録をロイズ(LR-F)が管理している船舶記録に統合し、UVI となる LR-F 番号を割当てるため、最低限の情報要件が特定されている。
- Paragraph 11 of Attachment B identifies the additional information that would be required to obtain a UVI for vessels over 100GRT that are on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel list.
  別紙 B パラグラフ 11 は、CCSBT 許可船リストに掲載されている 100GRT 以上の船舶の UVI を得るのに必要とされる追加情報を特定している。
- On the basis of advice from LR-F, there are no costs associated with acquiring a UVI once the additional vessel information is obtained.
  LR-F の助言に基づき、追加の船舶情報が得られれば、UVI の獲得に関連する費用は発生しない。
- The proposed method for obtaining a UVI is limited to vessels of 100GRT or more, which accounts for approximately 90% of the CCSBT fleet if New Zealand vessels are excluded. It is recommended that for vessels under 100GRT, the CCSBT await the outcome of further discussions in FAO before deciding on a course of action.
  UVI 獲得方法として、ニュージーランドの漁船を除いた場合 CCSBT 船団の約 90%に相当する 100GRT 又はそれ以上に限定することを提案する。100GRT 未満の漁船について、CCSBT が方針を決定する前に FAO における議論の結論を待つことを勧告する。

The allocation of a UVI to vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel list will be of most value if UVI's are also allocated by the other t-RFMOs. The Extended Commission may therefore wish to:
CCSBT 許可船リストに掲載されている船舶への UVI の割当は、他の t-RFMO によって UVI が割当てられていたとしても、最も価値がある。従って、拡大委員会は、次を望む。

- Consider its position on allocating UVIs to vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel list; and
  CCSBT 許可船リストに掲載されている船舶に対する UVI の割当に関する見解を検討すること。
- Consider a recommendation on the issue of allocating UVIs by all t-RFMOs for presentation at the second tuna RFMO Chair's meeting scheduled for early 2009.
  2009 年頭に予定されている第 2 回 RFMO 議長会合において、すべての t-RFMO が UVI を割当てるという問題を提起する勧告について検討すること。

Activities in 2009
2009 年における活動

Known meetings of interest to the Extended Commission are:
拡大委員会に関係のある既知の会議は、次のとおり。

- Tuna RFMO Chair's meeting ⊕
  まぐろ類 RFMO 議長会合
- FAO Committee of Fisheries (COFI) *
  FAO 漁業委員会(COFI)
- Tuna Secretariat's and Regional Secretariat's Network Meetings *
  まぐろ類事務局及び地域事務局ネットワーク会合
- Annual meetings of other tuna regional bodies
  他のまぐろ類地域機関の年次会合
- CCAMLR annual meeting
  CCAMLR 年次会合

⊕ May be held prior to COFI
COFI 前に開催される予定

* Held concurrently at COFI
COFI とともに開催される

It is proposed to continue the practice of deciding whether to attend the annual meetings of other regional fisheries bodies and other meetings of interest on the basis of the specific interests of the CCSBT in the agendas.
議題における CCSBT の具体的な関心に基づき、他の地域漁業機関及び他の関心のある会合に参加するか否かを決定する慣行を継続することを提案する。

The budget prepared for 2009 provides for participation in the identified meetings except for the annual meetings of other regional fisheries bodies.
2009 年予算案は、他の地域漁業機関の年次会合を除いた、既知の会合への参加を前提としている。

For consideration
検討のために

Prepared by the Secretariat
事務局作成文書

Attachment A

REPORT OF TUNA RFMO CHAIRS' MEETING
(San Francisco, USA – February 5 and 6, 2008)

1. Opening

In accordance with the Course of Actions adopted at the Kobe Meeting of Joint Tuna RFMOs on January 26, 2007, a Tuna RFMO Chairs' Meeting was held on February 5 and 6 in San Francisco, California, USA. The meeting was attended by Officers and Secretariats of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), the Chair of the Kobe meeting and a representative from FAO. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Masanori Miyahara. The List of Participants is attached as **Annex I**.

The meeting was held to "discuss follow-up actions by each tuna RFMO" in response to the Course of Actions. All participants considered this meeting a significant step to continue the important process of communication and coordination across all the tuna RFMOs, which began with the Joint Tuna RFMOs Meetingin Kobe. The participants represented their organization, not their States.

The adopted agenda is attached as **Annex II**.

2. Reports of follow-up actions of Kobe meeting

− Reports from RFMOs

The Chair and/or Secretariat from the five tuna RFMOs presented the follow-up actions taken by their respective organization during the past year in response to the Course of Actions. Details of those presentations are attached as **Annexes III to VII**.

The participants welcomed the progress made regarding the 14 Key Areas and Challenges identified in the Course of Actions. In particular, it was noted that all RFMOs took actions, to varying degrees, to improve data sharing and strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) measures mainly efforts to deter illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing activities. Further, ICCAT, IOTC and CCSBT reported that they will conduct their performance reviews in 2008. It was reaffirmed that performance reviews should be conducted as soon as possible, according to the particular RFMO situation, recognizing that as a newly formed RFMO, the timing may be different for the WCPFC.

While progress was generally viewed as positive, significant concerns were shared among the participants on the slow progress, in some RFMOs, on other issues such as establishment of equitable and transparent allocation procedures, capacity control, and management based on scientific advice. Substantial concerns were expressed regarding the consequences of RFMOs not adopting management measures consistent with the best available scientific advice. Recognizing the potential impact on the stocks, loss of credibility of tuna RFMOs, adverse impacts on markets of the relevant tuna products by private certification and campaign activities, and possible future actions by other international organizations including CITES were other main concerns.

− Technical work

The progress of technical work identified by the Kobe meeting, namely, harmonization and improvement of trade/catch tracking systems, creation of harmonized list of vessels, harmonization of transshipment controls and standardization of stock assessment presentations were reviewed and discussed.

The participants took note of the results of the Technical Working Group on Trade and Catch Documentation Schemes held in Raleigh, North Carolina, USA in July 2007, and they welcomed the adoption of a recommendation by ICCAT in 2007 to implement a catch documentation scheme (CDS) for Atlantic bluefin tuna. It was also recognized that the lists of registered vessels of all RFMOs are now easily accessible from the tuna-org website (www.tuna-org.org) and participants thanked the ICCAT Secretariat for its assistance in this

regard. Further, the participants acknowledged that all RFMOs are now using the "Kobe Chart" format for presenting the stock status of resources.

3. Advice for future activities

The participants agreed to present the results of this meeting to all members at their next annual meeting for their consideration, particularly the following suggestions:

a) Consistency of conservation and management measures with scientific advice

Among other things, the participants shared the view that the critical task many of the RFMOs are currently facing is to establish and implement conservation and management measures that are consistent with advice from their scientific bodies, although it was recognized that other factors such as socio-economic impacts should be taken into account in the discussion of the Commission. In addition, it was recognized that challenges exist in converting scientific advice into management action. Based on these discussions, the participants made the following suggestions:

− RFMOs should reaffirm the need to take conservation and management measures based upon the best available scientific advice.
− RFMOs should clearly explain the rationale of their future conservation and management measures in their report to the public, including the reasons for not following scientific advice, if the situation occurs.
− To enhance the consistency between management and science advice, RFMOs should consider possible involvement of political level and/or stakeholders in future meetings.

b) Trade/catch tracking systems

The participants noted that public pressure to supply products from sustainable sources is increasing and shared the view that CDSs are more comprehensive than the current statistical document programs, and therefore can improve the quality and quantity of data available which in turn can strengthen management. It was also recognized that tracking systems for the same species should be established and, where existing, be harmonized around the world, emphasizing the desirability to move toward use of CDSs. Further, given that CDSs cover both domestically and internationally traded products, which was viewed by the participants as a more appropriate balance, products with accurate and completed CDS forms should be assured effective access to markets, particularly since the system is costly to implement. Participants acknowledged, however, that CDSs have some practical problems as well as financial implications that will need to be overcome before implementation for all species or fisheries, and that cost/benefit analyses may be necessary on a case-by-case basis. Particular concerns were expressed regarding implementation of CDSs for fresh products and purse seine products. Nevertheless, the participants encouraged the RFMOs to consider further how to overcome those issues related to CDSs and how to implement them. The participants also encouraged RFMOs to further develop electronic tracking programs and tagging programs. As a specific recommendation for the 2nd Joint Tuna RFMOs Meeting, the participants considered it useful to have a 2nd Technical Working Group meeting in 2009 on those technical problems associated with implementation of CDSs.

c) Harmonized vessel list

The participants also discussed issues concerning the current list of registered vessels of each tuna RFMO. Among the suggested ways to improve the lists of registered vessels was distinguishing between active and non-active vessels within a certain time period (e.g., within the previous year). In addition, participants saw utility in having clear and compatible procedures, including due process, to list and de-list IUU vessels among RFMOs. The participants welcomed an offer from the WCPFC Secretariat to initiate a study of unique identifier systems for tuna RFMOs taking into account the outcomes of the FAO expert consultation on the subject scheduled in February 2008 and encouraged all the Secretariats to work jointly on this matter.

d) Compliance and MCS

Compliance of members to adopted conservation and management measures was identified as a common problem among RFMOs. A concern was shared among the participants that activities of non-compliant

members could undermine compliance efforts by all other members. The participants considered possible options to improve compliance among members including sanctions for non-compliant members and shifting to centralized and integrated MCS measures. The important role of market states and port state measures were also highlighted because any sanctions could be ineffective if the products caught by non-compliant members can easily enter markets. It was also noted that, when considering sanctions, the different capacity levels of members should be taken into consideration. Participants also indicated ample time should be allowed by RFMOs before annual meetings to conduct compliance assessments of members and non-members particularly given the limited amount of time available during annual meetings.

e) Capacity building and assistance

The participants felt strongly that the effective participation of all members, particularly developing country members, is essential for an RFMO to function properly. It was therefore emphasized that capacity building and financial assistance to developing countries for participation in meetings, data collection, implementation of conservation and management measures, human resource training and scientific research are very important and the participants encouraged RFMOs to consider the issue further. The participants considered it important to take a long-term approach, including by institutionalizing capacity building and assistance in the organization, if it is not. Coordination with other organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Bank were also considered to be useful.

It was reaffirmed that all the progress made regarding "Key Areas and Challenges" and "Technical Work" shall be reported to the 2nd Joint Tuna RFMOs Meeting to be held in Europe in 2009, preferably before the next FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting, in accordance with the Course of Actions. The participants called upon each RFMO to continue to take steps to address the issues identified in the Kobe Course of Actions in the coming year.

The Secretariats were requested to circulate the report of the Meeting to their members and cooperating non-members. It was also confirmed that the report will be posted on the tuna-org website.

4. Closing

The participants thanked the Government of the United States for the arrangement of the meeting.

The participants agreed to adopt the report of the Tuna RFMO Chairs' Meeting by correspondence. The meeting was closed on February 6, 2008.

Annex 1

List of Participants

Name	*Affiliation*
Mario Aguilar	Comision Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca, Mexico
Guillermo Compean	Director, Inter-American Tropical Tunas Commission (IATTC)
Kelly Denit	NOAA Fisheries Service, United States
Fabio Hazin	Secretaria Especial de Aquicultura e Pesca, Brazil
Neil Hermes	Executive Secretary, Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)
Arthur Hore	Ministry of Fisheries, New Zealand
Jim Jones	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Sylvie LaPointe	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Driss Meski	Executive Secretary, International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)
Masanori Miyahara	isheries Agency of Japan
Shuya Nakatsuka	Fisheries Agency of Japan
Rondolph Payet	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)
Christopher Rogers	NOAA Fisheries Service, United States
Sachiko Tsuji	Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Andrew Wright	Executive Secretary, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)

Annex 2

Agenda

Tuesday, February 5

9:00 am	1. Registration/Sign-in
9:30 am	2. Opening Adoption of Agenda Meeting arrangements
	3. Reports of follow-up actions of Kobe meeting - IATTC
10:30-11:00 am	Coffee break
	- ICCAT - IOTC
Lunch break	
	- WCPFC - CCSBT
3:00-3:30 pm	Coffee break
	- Technical Work (stocktaking) - Harmonization and improvement of trade/catch tracking systems (Mr. M. Miyahara)

Wednesday, February 6

9:00 am	Creation of harmonized list of vessels (RFMO Secretariats)
10:30-11:00 am	Coffee break
	- Harmonization of transshipment control (RFMO Secretariats) - Standardization of stock presentation (RFMO scientific chairs)
Lunch Break	
	3. Advice for Future Activities
3:00-3:30 pm	Coffee break
	4. Other matters 5. Closing

Annex 3

CCSBT Chair´s Report

A. CCSBT annual meeting support for Kobe Course of Actions

The Extended Commission of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Commission on 16-19 October 2007 in Canberra endorsed the Course of Actions for Tuna RFMOs from the Kobe meeting.

The CCSBT noted that the Commission and its subsidiary bodies will be guided by the recommendations of the first and subsequent meetings of the Joint Tuna RFMOs and its subsidiary meetings.

B. Report in relation to Kobe action points

1. Data sharing

CCSBT has well developed protocols for data exchange in support of its scientific process albeit that data is aggregated in space for reasons of confidentiality. No data exchange provisions have been agreed for bycatch species.

2. Allocation

CCSBT has allocation criteria and historical agreements in relation to future allocations. CCSBT has been active in encouraging other flag states that fish for SBT to cooperate most notably Indonesia which has recently indicated its intention to accede to the convention. Allocation for new members is by negotiation.

3. Capacity

Capacity has not been a focus for CCSBT as a global catch limit is the primary conservation measure for SBT. There is a positive list of vessels authorised to take SBT (although not limited) and a proviso of the resolution establishing that list is that members should not authorise vessels flagged to non-cooperating non-members to fish for SBT.

4. Management based on best available scientific advice

CCSBT has a well established scientific process which includes the use of independent experts. In 2006 CCSBT reduced catch limits on the basis of a scientific risk based assessment and the catch limit adopted (for a three year period) was premised on there being a significant improvement in MCS arrangements for SBT.

5. Integrated MCS arrangements

This has been a key work area for CCSBT.. Proposals being considered as part of integrated MCS measures include implementation of a CDS, VMS system, transhipment monitoring and port state measures. CCSBT requires all vessels fishing for, retaining on board, transhipping or landing SBT to be registered with the CCSBT. This list is made available electronically through the CCSBT website with links from the Tuna.org Website.

6. Penalties and sanctions

Trade constraints are in place to ensure that only SBT taken by authorised vessels and verified by flag states is able to be exported into cooperating markets.

7. IUU measures

CCSBT has a positive vessel list (as outlined in 5 above) plus consideration is being given to implementation of a black list of vessels.

8. CDS

CCSBT has agreed to implement a CDS but has yet to agree details of the system. Different proposals have been developed and a further proposal to integrate these will be progressed in the course of the year. The role of tagging and the role of any centralised CDS has yet to be agreed.

9. Performance review

The general concept of modernising and improving the functioning of the Commission was discussed at the thirteenth meeting of the Commission (CCSBT 13) with the meeting report recording that:

"Members also agreed that there is an immediate need to modernise the CCSBT, with a view to improve its efficiency and effectiveness.

By CCSBT 14, the Kobe meeting had occurred and the suggested criteria for reviewing the performance of tuna RFMO's had been developed. The Commission was able to draw from this work and agree the process and terms of reference for a performance review

The Commission's performance review has two stages:

- Stage one: a self assessment of CCSBT by a group consisting of a nominee from each Member,
- Stage two: a review by the independent expert(s) of the self assessment report

The decision not to include the independent experts in the self assessment was a result of concern by Members at the costs involved.

Members also agreed both the self assessment report and the expert(s)' comments on it would be made available on the CCSBT website.

Current Position

The terms of reference provide that the performance review shall be completed in time for CCSBT 15 (October 2008). To date, Members have identified a list of potential independent reviewers, some of whom have formally indicated their willingness and availability to participate. The selection of the independent reviewers will be made by Members before 15 April 2008. In the meantime work is commencing on the self assessment by the group of Member nominees.

10. Environmental/ precautionary approach

This remains a work in progress for CCSBT. Issues of competency and potential for overlapping measures with geographically based RFMOs remain to be worked through. While there is an existing measure requiring tori line use this measure has yet to be updated to reflect modern best practise.

11. Specific shark fishery management

CCSBT shark management is as in 10 above.

12. Reduction in juvenile by-catch

A substantial part of the fishery is based on juvenile fish as a target for farming. SBT mature at a late age and immature fish are taken as target in other fisheries.

13. Capacity building

While not a CCSBT initiative members have assisted the development of a catch monitoring program in Indonesia.

14. Enhanced scientific cooperation

Standardization of stock presentations Is a matter to be referred to the CCSBT Scientific Committee and Stock Assessment Group.

Annex 4

Presentation by ICCAT

Fabio Hazin, the ICCAT Chairman, made an opening statement to thank Japan and the US for the arrangement of the meeting. He introduced the power point presentation prepared by ICCAT outlining the main actions taken by the Commission in response to the course of actions resulted from Kobe meeting in 2007.

Driss Meski, the ICCAT Executive Secretary, presented the detailed progress made by ICCAT with respect to the Kobe course of actions. He went through the key areas as identified in Kobe. He also mentioned the participation of ICCAT to other international meeting and the cooperation developed with other RFMOs

Among several initiatives, encompassing all 14 key areas and challenges identified in Kobe, ICCAT participated in the Joint Tuna RFMO Technical Working Group on Trade and Catch Documentation Schemes,

held in July 2007, in Raleigh- USA, and applied the results of that meeting to prepare and to adopt, at its annual meeting in 2007, the *Recommendation by ICCAT on an ICCAT Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation program* [Rec. 07-10] which is expected to enter into force in June of this year. This measure will help to strengthen controls in the bluefin tuna fishery by linking catch data to trade data. At the 2007 Commission Meeting, new measures were also adopted in relation to the criteria for inclusion of vessels on the IUU list, allowing vessels identified by other RFMOs to be included on the ICCAT IUU list where appropriate. One of the major objectives of ICCAT in the 2008 inter-sessional period will be the carrying out of a performance review, to be conducted by three external experts in the fields of fisheries management, fisheries biology and international law, which have been already selected through an open and transparent process. The evaluation will be made on the basis of the common criteria accepted by RFMOs, although this does not rule out the use of additional criteria to take into account the specific characteristics of ICCAT. The results of this performance review will be studied in detail by the Working Group to Strengthen ICCAT, which will in turn recommend actions to be taken by the Commission to improve performance and to ensure the objective of maintaining the stocks of tuna and tuna-like species at levels above MSY, at the same time respecting as far as possible the delicate eco-systems of its broad Convention area.

At the end Fabio Hazin provided the example of standardized presentation of the status of tuna species stocks as adopted by the ICCAT SCRS.

Annex 5

Presentation by IATTC

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), following the guidelines recommended for the regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) that were identified at the meeting of these organizations held in Kobe (Japan) in January 2007, has put into action, with various degrees of progress, several of the commitments established, as described below.

The policy of improving, sharing and disseminating the data and stock evaluations has been maintained. With the system of observer coverage of 100% of trips by large tuna purse-seine vessels, catches of both target and bycatch species are well monitored. This system of observers is complemented by the sampling of the unloadings of purse-seine vessels of lesser capacity that do not have observers aboard. Information on catches of target species by longline vessels is gathered monthly, and this system needs only to be complemented with information on other species caught incidentally. Monthly catches, the list of active vessels, stock assessments, and evaluations of the proposals for management measures made by Parties are published on the Commission's web site (www.iattc.org).

The Regional Vessel Register, established by the IATTC for registering vessels authorized to fish for tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), and the related system for controlling the fishing capacity of the tuna fleet, which allows free movement of capacity among the countries that participate in the fishery, has proved to be a tool that allows the distribution of fishing opportunities among the countries of the region. In 2007, all the movements of capacity among the participating countries have been published on the IATTC web site.

The Commission staff has continued to ensure that the management measures recommended to the meetings of the IATTC are based on the best scientific information available, and that they be presented to the Parties in a transparent and clear fashion. Its assessments of the stocks are reviewed at the meeting of the Working Group on Stock Assessments, in meetings open to the participation of researchers interested in the study of the tuna species of the EPO.

In order to promote the review of the IATTC's performance, the report of the Kobe meeting was presented to the IATTC Parties during the Commission's 75th Meeting, held in June 2007. Also, a proposal for performance review was submitted, in the form of a draft Resolution presented by one of the Parties and supported by three other Parties, but, due to the importance of other matters, such as the appointment of a new Director, that took up all the time at the meeting, it was not possible to address the matter. It will be addressed at the next Meeting of the IATTC, in June 2008.

Annex 6

Presentation by WCPFC

Improvement, sharing and dissemination of data and stock assessments and all other relevant information in an accurate and timely manner including development of research methodologies.

- Public website:
  - Statistics and Data section.
  - Meeting documents, including assessments and related information.
  - Monitoring of compliance with data submission obligations
- Scientific Committee's Statistics Specialist Working Group monitors data availability
- Initiation of a gaps analysis, data deficiencies (including with respect to provision of data by WCPFC members)
- Particular attention to the Indonesian/Philippines region which accounts for 25% of the WCPO fishery.

Development, where appropriate, and application of equitable and transparent criteria and procedures for allocation of fishing opportunities or level of fishing effort, including provisions to allow for new entrants.

- Allocation has been on the WCPFC agenda since 2006. No substantive progress.
- WCPFC has adopted several conservation and management measures (CMMs) limiting fishing opportunities among CCMs (Members, Participating Territories and Cooperating Non-Members) by controlling catch and effort by fisheries and by areas for CCMs and adopting constraints on capacity expansion.
- New entrants. Most stocks over subscribed and developing State CCMs have fishery development aspirations. Belize the only one of 4 applicants for CNM status admitted at last Session of the Commission.
- Controls, including capacity reduction as appropriate, to ensure that actual total catch, fishing effort level and capacity are commensurate with available fishing opportunities in order to ensure resource sustainability of tuna stocks while allowing legitimate fishery development of developing coastal states, particularly small island developing states and territories
  - Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) use catch, effort and capacity as fishery control tools although the extent these provide for sustainability for some stocks, at levels of effort provided for, is a concern to some CCMs. A Vessel Day Scheme is being implemented for in-zone effort allocation in the purse seine fishery in 8 CCMs with contiguous zones. VDS, which is in early stages of implementation, and will be tested by increased interest by fleets keen to re-locate from other oceans – and no mechanism, other than flag State control and commitment not to increase effort, for the high seas for any gear.
  - Most SIDS CCMs proactive in pursuing their tuna fishery development aspirations.
- Ensuring that management measures are based on the best scientific advice available and consistent with the precautionary approach, particularly, with respect to establishment of effective stock rebuilding measures and other measures to maintain stocks at sustainable levels
  - Concern that some CMMs have not adequately reflected the advice received from the Scientific Committee. Economic and political considerations take precedence over the science. No specific management objectives have yet been adopted by the Commission for each species or fishery (currently use F_{MSY} or B_{MSY} as *de facto* limit reference points), precautionary approaches have not yet been clearly defined. Management strategy evaluation under consideration.
- Ensuring compliance through establishment of integrated MCS (monitoring, control and surveillance) measures that could include VMS, observers, boarding and inspection schemes, port state controls, market state measures, stronger controls on transhipment, and monitoring of bluefin tuna farming, and the harmonization of those measures across the five tuna RFMOs where appropriate to avoid duplication and increase cost efficiency.

Comprehensive suite of integrated tools developed or under development:

- *Developed and being implemented:*

  WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (Active)
  IUU List
  Register of carriers and bunkers
  Scientific data to be provided to the Commission
  Information Security Policy
  VMS
  Regional Observer Programme
  HSB&I

- *Under development:*
  Transhipment verification
  CDS
  Port State measures

- Application of penalties and sanctions of adequate severity to deter IUU fishing by both non-members and members.

  IUU List now operational. No schedule for penalties and sanctions, particularly in relation to non-compliance with obligations of CCMs in areas such as data submission and reporting obligations yet developed but under consideration.

- Development and implementation of stronger measures to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing including, mechanisms to identify and quantify IUU activities based on trade and other relevant information, a system to exchange information on IUU fishing among RFMOs and among flag states, port states and market states and coastal states, consolidation of the positive and negative lists as described in section II below, effective control over nationals in accordance with their duties under international law, identification of beneficial ownership and demonstration of "genuine link" and dissemination of relevant information to the public.

  To be considered during 2008:

  Genuine link
  Beneficial owners

- Establishment and implementation of a system to monitor catches from catching vessels to markets.
- Views on whether to develop a statistical document programme or full catch document scheme remain polarized in the Commission.
- Reviewing the performance of tuna RFMOs in accordance with ANNEX I
  - The Fifth Session of the Commission (WCPFC5), in December 2008, will consider this issue.
- Implementation of the precautionary approach and an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management including improved data collection on incidental by-catch and non-target species and establishment of measures to minimize the adverse effect of fishing for highly migratory fish species on ecologically related species, particularly sea turtles, seabirds and sharks, taking into account the characteristics of each ecosystem and technologies used to minimize adverse effect.
  - One the Scientific Committee's six Specialist Working Groups, established in 2005, is focused on ecosystem and by-catch.
  - Data collection on incidental by-catch is not yet fully implemented, partly because of the delay of implementing Regional Observer Programme. However, the Commission has adopted CCMs that require CCMs to release non-target fish species, release by-catch unharmed where possible and implement research programmes and collect data with a focus on sharks, seabirds and sea turtles.
  - Through the Scientific Committee, WCPFC is supporting Ecosystem Risk Assessment (ERA) to assist an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management. The project is anticipated to be implemented over four years – it commenced in 2007.

- Development of data collection, stock assessment and appropriate management of shark fisheries under the competence of tuna RFMOs.
  - Conservation and Management Measure for Sharks CMM-2006-05] is being implemented from 1 January 2008 for vessels greater than 24m in overall length.
  - WCPFC regional observer programme will require collecting information on the catch of all shark species and shark data should be included in the annual report provided to the Commission by CCMs.
  - The Commission received a report on recent developments at the United Nations regarding shark conservation and management at its December 2007 session.
- Research and development of techniques to reduce incidental take of juvenile tunas during tuna fisheries, in particular FAD operations.
  - At its December 2007 Session the Commission endorsed industry-associated research to mitigate the juvenile mortality of bigeye and yellowfin, especially associated with fish aggregating devices.
- Provision of adequate capacity building assistance, including human resource development, for developing coastal states, particularly small island developing states and territories, towards responsible fishery development, including participation in RFMO and scientific meetings, fisheries data collection and stock assessment and implementation of MCS measures
  - WCPFC has two funds to assist capacity building for developing coastal states such as WCPFC Special Requirements Fund and a Trust Fund provided by Japan. In addition, participation for all SIDS in all meetings of the Commission is provided for in the Commission's core budget. In addition, a voluntary fund to support capacity building in Indonesia and Philippines has been operational in the Commission for three years.
- Enhancement of cooperation among scientists, relevant experts and with other relevant fisheries organizations possibly through organization of symposia or working groups on appropriate topics of common interest. Coordination of timing of annual meetings and scientific meetings with a view to avoiding their overlap as well as allowing an adequate interval between scientific and annual meetings and between proposal submission and annual meetings
- WCPFC has six Specialist Working Group associated with the Scientific Committee which supports cooperation among scientists. Inter-sessional work on the development of a comprehensive tagging proposal for the western and central Pacific, CPUE standardization, and ERA has also promoted scientific interaction.

Technical work to cooperate across RFMOs will commence by addressing the following challenges

- Harmonization and improvement of the trade tracking programs and, as appropriate, development of catch documentation including tagging systems as required
- Creation of a harmonized list of tuna fishing vessels that is as comprehensive as possible (positive list) including use of a permanent unique identifier for each vessel such as an IMO number. The positive list should include support vessels. Creation of a global list of IUU vessels.
- Harmonization of transshipment control measures
- Standardization of presentation form of stock assessment results

Attachment B

A UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UVI) FOR TUNA FISHING VESSELS: AN ESSENTIAL STEP IN COMBATING IUU

Introduction

1. The suggestion to keep records of fishing vessels was raised during the development of the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (FAO Compliance Agreement), and adopted by the FAO Conference in 1993. As issues related to illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing began to attract increasing international attention, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and FAO convened the first meeting of a "Joint FAO/IMO *ad hoc* Working Group" in October 2000. The Working Group endorsed the need to ensure flag State links to the registration of a fishing vessel with its authorization to fish, and urged closer collaboration between relevant agencies in national administrations. The Working Group also agreed that consideration should be given to how the IMO numbering scheme might be applied to fishing vessels not currently subject to this requirement in order to enable vessels to be traced regardless of changes in registration or name over time.

2. The twentieth meeting of the Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics (CWP20) in 2003 agreed that, for the purpose of inter-agency exchanges of vessel records, a unique vessel identifier (UVI) should be assigned to each vessel, since current vessel identifiers (e.g. vessel name, flag State and registration number in the flag State, international radio call sign, etc.) are unstable. CWP20 recommended that the FAO draft a list of essential and desirable vessel identifiers for vessel registries (keeping them to a minimum) for the consideration of CWP agencies, and that FAO consult with those agencies regarding the use of UVIs in the FAO's High Seas Vessel Authorization Record (HSVAR) database and CWP agency vessel registries. An essential part of the proposal was the inclusion of a unique HSVAR_ID (and its non-HSVAR_ID complement) identifier.

3. The 2005 Rome Declaration on IUU Fishing, adopted by Ministers includes a call *"to develop a comprehensive record of fishing vessels within FAO, including refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels, that incorporates available information on beneficial ownership, subject to confidentiality requirements in accordance with national law"*. Thereafter, the FAO Fisheries Department undertook a study to determine the feasibility and viability of developing such a comprehensive record which was referred to as the "Global Record".

4. The twenty-seventh meeting of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI27), in 2005, received the FAO Study report which concluded a need to introduce a system through which any vessel could be clearly identified over time, irrespective of change of name, ownership or flag.

5. In relation to the concept of a unique method to identify vessels over time, the FAO Study recognized the advantages that would accrue from the use of the Lloyds Registry-Fairplay (LR-F) Number (that forms the basis for the IMO number and is obligatory for certain classes of fishing vessels), which would include, *inter-alia*, that, "…the identification number remains with the vessel irrespective of change of name or ownership and/or flag thus it provides a possibility to follow the history of a vessel". Further, the Study noted that the use of the LR-F/IMO number would allow ready comparison with other databases, such as LR-F, European Quality Shipping

Information System (*EQUASIS*), RFMOs and such port State control measures where the LR-F/IMO number is included in the criteria[1].

6. The first substantive meeting of the Ministerial-led Task Force on IUU Fishing on the High Seas that took place at Paris, France on 9 March 2005 agreed, *inter-alia*, to establish a global information system on high seas fishing vessels in the form of a publicly available international database of information relating to the global high seas fishing fleet.

7. From 25-28 February 2008, the FAO convened an "Expert Consultation on the Development of a Comprehensive Global Record of Fishing Vessels" at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. During that consultation, LR-F described the management of both the IMO Ship Numbering Scheme and the IMO Registered Owner and Company Numbering Scheme on behalf of the International Maritime Organization which, in LR-F practice, have been extended to include fishing activities related records. Both schemes provide a mechanism for sourcing comprehensive fishing vessel data from flag administrations. Currently, approximately 26,000 fishing vessels over 100GT and corresponding registered owners have LR-F numbers (within the unique number range of the IMO Ship Numbering Schemes)[2].

8. The Expert Consultation agreed that a system to provide a unique identifier which would not change even if the vessel changed flag, owner or name, was essential. While this can be aaccomplished for vessels >100GT through the LR-F there is no formal proposal, within FAO or elsewhere, for vessels smaller than 100GT. The report of the Expert Consultation will be presented to the 2009 session o COFI seeking further advice and direction in relation to FAO's future wrk on this matter.

A UVI and t-RFMO Vessel Records/Registries

9. The issue of a UVI has received wide-spread consideration in a range of international discussions and is considered an essential element in global efforts to combat IUU fishing. It has also been discussed on numerous occasions in meetings of the t-RFMO secretariats, where it has broad support as an issue on which the RFMOs can collaborate.

10. While keen to integrate to any process established through the FAO, the t-RFMO Secretariats, in close consultation with the IMO and LR-F, have collaborated to identify minimal information requirements to enable the vessel records of t-RFMOs to be integrated with that maintained by LR-F and, except for Chinese Taipei-flag vessels, the IMO. It is noted that, on the basis of advice from both LR-F and the IMO, there are no costs associated with acquiring a UVI once this information is obtained.

11. The information requirements to acquire a UVI are summarised at **Annex 1**. This matrix was designed to assist each t-RFMO identify that information which the RFMO currently doesn't collect and which would support coordination with LR-F and the IMO to produce a UVI for vessels of 100GT or greater. In the case of the CCSBT, the following additional information would be required for each vessel on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List:

---

[1] The IMO and LR-F have different policies relating to the treatment of Chinese Taipei-flag vessels. The IMO must refer to Chinese Taipei as "Taiwan, China" and only refers to these vessels in matters relating to casualties involving "Taiwan, China" vessels, and port State control deficiencies found on board "Taiwan, China" vessels. LR-F, on the other hand, holds Chinese Taipei-flag vessels (>=100GT) on its database and thus each has a LR Number and it also allocates IMO Numbers to vessels to Chinese Taipei-flag vessels in accordance with IMO Resolution A.600 (15), SOLAS XI 1/3 and 1/5.

[2] Also includes vessels reported to have been scrapped or sunk.

- Parent company of registered owner (if known)
- Ship manager (if applicable)
- MMSI Number
- Flag State Identification Number (Official No.)
- Port of registry
- Where and when built
- Moulded depth
- Beam
- GT (if applicable)
- Power of main engine or engines
- Net tonnage
- Dead weight
- Ship builder
- Nationality of shipbuilder
- Date entered onto flag State Register
- Date ship de-registered (if applicable)

12. The introduction of a UVI is widely regarded as a practical, positive step towards combating IUU fishing world-wide. The development of a UVI by the t-RFMOs, for their collective use, would facilitate the exchange of vessel information among the t-RFMOs in the short term, support the further development of a global vessel list among t-RFMOs and make a positive contribution to related efforts within the FAO towards this goal. It is anticipated that each t-RFMO will invite its members to consider this initiative.

13. In relation to the CCSBT it may take a year or more to acquire the additional information for the 385 vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel list of 100GT and over. It is proposed that, for vessels less than 100GRT, the CCSBT await the outcome of further discussions in FAO before deciding on a course of action.

Annex 1

List of fields collected by IMO and LR-F and those currently collected by t-RFMOs

Information required	Required to provide an LR-F No.	LR-F[3]	IMO[4] For vessels >100GRT	WCPFC	IATTC	IOTC	CCSBT	ICCAT
IMO Unique Company (DOC) Number			X					
IMO Registered Owner Identification Number			X					
IMO Ship Identification Number			X			X[5]		
LR-F Number		X	IMO<Company/registered owner><7 digit LR-F number>					
Document of Compliance (DOC) Company		X	X					
Current Company name			X					
Date of company registration			X					
Country of registration			X					
Full address details for Company			X					
Previous company name (if known)			X					
Registered Owner	X	X	X	X	X	X	X[6]	X
Parent company of registered owner (if known)	X		X					
Date of incorporation of company			X					
Ship Manager (if applicable)	X	X	X					
Technical Manager		X						
Operator		X			X	X	X[7]	X
Bareboat/Demise Charterer		X	X					
Group Beneficial Owner		X						

[3] See Annex 2
[4] Associated with the a). IMO Unique Company Number Scheme, b). the IMO Registered Owner Identification Number Scheme and, c). IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme
[5] If available
[6] It is not known if Owner details submitted by all flags are in accordance with the LR-F definition of the Registered Owner.
[7] It is not known if Operator details submitted by all flags are in accordance with the LR-F definition of the Operator.

Group Operated Fleet		X						
Flag State	X		X	X		X[8]	X[8]	
MMSI Number	X		X					
Flag State Identification Number (Official No.)	X		X	X				
Name of fishing vessel	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Registration number (Fishing No.)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Previous names (if known)	X	X		X	X	X	X[9]	X
Port of registry	X		X	X	X			
Address of owner or owners	X	Company	X	X	X	X	X	X
Name and nationality of master				X				
Previous flag (if any)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
International Radio Call Sign	X		X	X	X	X	X[10]	X
Vessel communication types and numbers (INMARSAT A, B and C numbers and satellite telephone number)		X		X				
Colour photograph of vessel		X		X	X			
Where and when built	X		X	X	X			
Type of vessel	X	X		X		X	X	X
Normal crew complement		X		X				
Type of fishing method or methods		LR-F ship type	X	X	X	X	X[11]	X
Length	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Moulded depth	X	X		X	X			
Beam	X	X		X	X			
Gross register tonnage (if applicable)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
GT (if applicable)	X							
Power of main engine or engines	X	X		X	X			
The nature of the authorization to fish granted				X	X	X		

[8] This information is not requested but becomes available by virtue of a flag State submitting vessel information to add to the authorized list
[9] This information is often recorded as “Unknown”.
[10] This is absent for 11% of vessels over 100 tonnes and 35% of vessels under 100 tonnes.
[11] This is recorded as “Unclassified” for 11% of vessels over 100 tonnes and 22% of vessels under 100 tonnes.

by the flag State								
Carrying capacity, including freezer type, capacity and number and fish hold capacity.		X		X	X	X[12]		Carriers only
Net tonnage	X		X					
Dead weight	X		X					
Shipbuilder	X		X					
Nationality of shipbuilder	X		X					
Parallel-in ships true ownership registration details			X					
Parallel-out ships true owner details			X					
Ship status code			X					
Date ship entered register	X		X					
Date ship de-registered (if applicable)	X		X					
Fishing authorization period							X	X

[12] Information on carrying capacity is sought only in relation to carrier (transport) vessels

Annex 2

Lloyd's Register – Fairplay: Owner / Manager Definitions

LRF identify the following roles in respect to a vessels Ownership/Management. It should be noted that the same company may perform more than one role on a ship.

1. **Document of Compliance (DOC) Company -** the owner of the ship or any other organisation or person such as the manager or bareboat charterer who has assumed the responsibility for the technical operation of the ship from the owner of the ship and who on assuming such responsibility has agreed to take over all the duties and responsibilities imposed by the ISM Code.

   A documented company on both DOC and SMC Certificates issued by flag Administrations; but the information for which is also available from the Responsible Organisations, such as Classification Societies, who may undertake the audits.

   In most cases the DOC Company will be responsible for the Technical Management of the ship

2. **Registered Owner -** The legal title of ownership of the vessel that appears on the ship's registration documents. It may be an Owner/Manager or a wholly-owned subsidiary in a larger shipping group; or a bank or one-ship company vehicle set up by the bank; or of course, it may be a "brass-plate" company created on paper to legally own a ship and possibly to limit liability for the "real" owners and/or benefit from off-shore tax laws. It may anyway be a legal-requirement of the flag-state with whom the ship is registered for the legal owner to be a company registered in that country.

3. **Shipmanager -** The company designated by the ship owner or charterer to be responsible for the day to day running of the ship and the best contact for the ship regarding commercial matters. This company may be an owner related company, or a third-party manager, whose purpose is primarily the management of ships for their ship-owning clients. This company may also be responsible for major purchases for the fleet, such as classification, insurance, surveys etc.

   N.B. Many ships today are owned by banks or finance/leasing companies who have no operational involvement whatever. In practice the lessee companies, referred to as 'Disponent Owners' or one of their subsidiary companies, may appear as the Manager of the ship.

4. **Technical Manager -** The company designated by the ship owner or operator or ship manager to be specifically responsible for the technical operation and technical superintendancy of a ship. This company may also be responsible for purchases regarding the fleet, such as repairs, spares, re-engining, surveys, dry-docking, etc.

   In the majority of cases the DOC Company will also be responsible for the Technical Management of the ship.

5. **Operator -** The company responsible for the commercial decisions concerning the employment of a ship and therefore who decides how and where that asset is employed. The direct beneficiary of the profits from the operations of the ship, this company may also be responsible for purchasing decisions on bunkers and port services. A medium to long-term time or bareboat charterer is considered to be the operator of the ship. Companies heading operator pools (e.g. Cool Carriers or Gearbulk) are Operators of the ships in the pool.

N.B. Many ships today are owned by banks or finance/leasing companies who have no operational involvement whatever. In practice the lessee companies, referred to as 'Disponent Owners' may appear as the Operator of the ship.

6. **Bareboat/Demise Charterer –** The company identified on the charter-party who charters the ship on a bareboat or demise charter. In this the charterer assumes control over all operations, costs and responsibilities associated with the vessel for an agreed period of time. The charterer becomes or appoints the shipmanager and may also have the right to sub-charter the vessel.
It is increasingly common for ships to be in parallel registry during the period of a bareboat charter. In this case, the ship is transferred by the bareboat charterer to a new operational flag, while the ownership of the ship (Registered Owner) continues under the original Registry. None of the legal or financial responsibilities of the Registered Owner are transferred to the bareboat charterer during the period of charter.

N.B. In Demise Charter agreements, if negotiated at the beginning of charter agreement, the charterer may have the option to purchase the vessel at the end of the charter period.
In **Time Charter Party** agreements, the charterer may only assume responsibility for operations, routing and cargo, while technical, crewing etc. remain with the owner.

7. **Group Beneficial Owner –** This is the parent company of the Registered Owner, or the Disponent Owner if the ship is owned by a bank. It is the controlling interest behind its fleet and the ultimate beneficiary from the ownership. A Group Beneficial Owner may or may not directly own ships itself as a Registered Owner. It may be the Manager of its fleet, which is in turn owned by subsidiary companies. Its ships may also be managed by a 3rd party under contract.

8. **Group Operated Fleet –** For companies identified as Group Beneficial Owners, LRF can identify the total operational fleet. This Group Operated Fleet includes all the ships in the fleet operated by the group, including both their owned vessels and chartered in ships.

J. Minkey 24th. July 2007

Attachment A

REPORT OF TUNA RFMO CHAIRS' MEETING
(San Francisco, USA – February 5 and 6, 2008)

1. Opening

In accordance with the Course of Actions adopted at the Kobe Meeting of Joint Tuna RFMOs on January 26, 2007, a Tuna RFMO Chairs' Meeting was held on February 5 and 6 in San Francisco, California, USA. The meeting was attended by Officers and Secretariats of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), the Chair of the Kobe meeting and a representative from FAO. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Masanori Miyahara. The List of Participants is attached as **Annex I**.

The meeting was held to "discuss follow-up actions by each tuna RFMO" in response to the Course of Actions. All participants considered this meeting a significant step to continue the important process of communication and coordination across all the tuna RFMOs, which began with the Joint Tuna RFMOs Meetingin Kobe. The participants represented their organization, not their States.

The adopted agenda is attached as **Annex II**.

2. Reports of follow-up actions of Kobe meeting

− Reports from RFMOs

The Chair and/or Secretariat from the five tuna RFMOs presented the follow-up actions taken by their respective organization during the past year in response to the Course of Actions. Details of those presentations are attached as **Annexes III to VII**.

The participants welcomed the progress made regarding the 14 Key Areas and Challenges identified in the Course of Actions. In particular, it was noted that all RFMOs took actions, to varying degrees, to improve data sharing and strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) measures mainly efforts to deter illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing activities. Further, ICCAT, IOTC and CCSBT reported that they will conduct their performance reviews in 2008. It was reaffirmed that performance reviews should be conducted as soon as possible, according to the particular RFMO situation, recognizing that as a newly formed RFMO, the timing may be different for the WCPFC.

While progress was generally viewed as positive, significant concerns were shared among the participants on the slow progress, in some RFMOs, on other issues such as establishment of equitable and transparent allocation procedures, capacity control, and management based on scientific advice. Substantial concerns were expressed regarding the consequences of RFMOs not adopting management measures consistent with the best available scientific advice. Recognizing the potential impact on the stocks, loss of credibility of tuna RFMOs, adverse impacts on markets of the relevant tuna products by private certification and campaign activities, and possible future actions by other international organizations including CITES were other main concerns.

− Technical work

The progress of technical work identified by the Kobe meeting, namely, harmonization and improvement of trade/catch tracking systems, creation of harmonized list of vessels, harmonization of transshipment controls and standardization of stock assessment presentations were reviewed and discussed.

The participants took note of the results of the Technical Working Group on Trade and Catch Documentation Schemes held in Raleigh, North Carolina, USA in July 2007, and they welcomed the adoption of a recommendation by ICCAT in 2007 to implement a catch documentation scheme (CDS) for Atlantic bluefin tuna. It was also recognized that the lists of registered vessels of all RFMOs are now easily accessible from the tuna-org website (www.tuna-org.org) and participants thanked the ICCAT Secretariat for its assistance in this

regard. Further, the participants acknowledged that all RFMOs are now using the "Kobe Chart" format for presenting the stock status of resources.

3. Advice for future activities

The participants agreed to present the results of this meeting to all members at their next annual meeting for their consideration, particularly the following suggestions:

a) Consistency of conservation and management measures with scientific advice

Among other things, the participants shared the view that the critical task many of the RFMOs are currently facing is to establish and implement conservation and management measures that are consistent with advice from their scientific bodies, although it was recognized that other factors such as socio-economic impacts should be taken into account in the discussion of the Commission. In addition, it was recognized that challenges exist in converting scientific advice into management action. Based on these discussions, the participants made the following suggestions:

− RFMOs should reaffirm the need to take conservation and management measures based upon the best available scientific advice.
− RFMOs should clearly explain the rationale of their future conservation and management measures in their report to the public, including the reasons for not following scientific advice, if the situation occurs.
− To enhance the consistency between management and science advice, RFMOs should consider possible involvement of political level and/or stakeholders in future meetings.

b) Trade/catch tracking systems

The participants noted that public pressure to supply products from sustainable sources is increasing and shared the view that CDSs are more comprehensive than the current statistical document programs, and therefore can improve the quality and quantity of data available which in turn can strengthen management. It was also recognized that tracking systems for the same species should be established and, where existing, be harmonized around the world, emphasizing the desirability to move toward use of CDSs. Further, given that CDSs cover both domestically and internationally traded products, which was viewed by the participants as a more appropriate balance, products with accurate and completed CDS forms should be assured effective access to markets, particularly since the system is costly to implement. Participants acknowledged, however, that CDSs have some practical problems as well as financial implications that will need to be overcome before implementation for all species or fisheries, and that cost/benefit analyses may be necessary on a case-by-case basis. Particular concerns were expressed regarding implementation of CDSs for fresh products and purse seine products. Nevertheless, the participants encouraged the RFMOs to consider further how to overcome those issues related to CDSs and how to implement them. The participants also encouraged RFMOs to further develop electronic tracking programs and tagging programs. As a specific recommendation for the 2nd Joint Tuna RFMOs Meeting, the participants considered it useful to have a 2nd Technical Working Group meeting in 2009 on those technical problems associated with implementation of CDSs.

c) Harmonized vessel list

The participants also discussed issues concerning the current list of registered vessels of each tuna RFMO. Among the suggested ways to improve the lists of registered vessels was distinguishing between active and non-active vessels within a certain time period (e.g., within the previous year). In addition, participants saw utility in having clear and compatible procedures, including due process, to list and de-list IUU vessels among RFMOs. The participants welcomed an offer from the WCPFC Secretariat to initiate a study of unique identifier systems for tuna RFMOs taking into account the outcomes of the FAO expert consultation on the subject scheduled in February 2008 and encouraged all the Secretariats to work jointly on this matter.

d) Compliance and MCS

Compliance of members to adopted conservation and management measures was identified as a common problem among RFMOs. A concern was shared among the participants that activities of non-compliant

members could undermine compliance efforts by all other members. The participants considered possible options to improve compliance among members including sanctions for non-compliant members and shifting to centralized and integrated MCS measures. The important role of market states and port state measures were also highlighted because any sanctions could be ineffective if the products caught by non-compliant members can easily enter markets. It was also noted that, when considering sanctions, the different capacity levels of members should be taken into consideration. Participants also indicated ample time should be allowed by RFMOs before annual meetings to conduct compliance assessments of members and non-members particularly given the limited amount of time available during annual meetings.

e) Capacity building and assistance

The participants felt strongly that the effective participation of all members, particularly developing country members, is essential for an RFMO to function properly. It was therefore emphasized that capacity building and financial assistance to developing countries for participation in meetings, data collection, implementation of conservation and management measures, human resource training and scientific research are very important and the participants encouraged RFMOs to consider the issue further. The participants considered it important to take a long-term approach, including by institutionalizing capacity building and assistance in the organization, if it is not. Coordination with other organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Bank were also considered to be useful.

It was reaffirmed that all the progress made regarding "Key Areas and Challenges" and "Technical Work" shall be reported to the 2nd Joint Tuna RFMOs Meeting to be held in Europe in 2009, preferably before the next FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting, in accordance with the Course of Actions. The participants called upon each RFMO to continue to take steps to address the issues identified in the Kobe Course of Actions in the coming year.

The Secretariats were requested to circulate the report of the Meeting to their members and cooperating non-members. It was also confirmed that the report will be posted on the tuna-org website.

4. Closing

The participants thanked the Government of the United States for the arrangement of the meeting.

The participants agreed to adopt the report of the Tuna RFMO Chairs' Meeting by correspondence. The meeting was closed on February 6, 2008.

Annex 1

List of Participants

Name	*Affiliation*
Mario Aguilar	Comision Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca, Mexico
Guillermo Compean	Director, Inter-American Tropical Tunas Commission (IATTC)
Kelly Denit	NOAA Fisheries Service, United States
Fabio Hazin	Secretaria Especial de Aquicultura e Pesca, Brazil
Neil Hermes	Executive Secretary, Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)
Arthur Hore	Ministry of Fisheries, New Zealand
Jim Jones	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Sylvie LaPointe	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Driss Meski	Executive Secretary, International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)
Masanori Miyahara	isheries Agency of Japan
Shuya Nakatsuka	Fisheries Agency of Japan
Rondolph Payet	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)
Christopher Rogers	NOAA Fisheries Service, United States
Sachiko Tsuji	Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Andrew Wright	Executive Secretary, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)

Annex 2

Agenda

Tuesday, February 5

9:00 am	1. Registration/Sign-in
9:30 am	2. Opening Adoption of Agenda Meeting arrangements
	3. Reports of follow-up actions of Kobe meeting - IATTC
10:30-11:00 am	Coffee break
	- ICCAT - IOTC
Lunch break	
	- WCPFC - CCSBT
3:00-3:30 pm	Coffee break
	- Technical Work (stocktaking) - Harmonization and improvement of trade/catch tracking systems (Mr. M. Miyahara)

Wednesday, February 6

9:00 am	Creation of harmonized list of vessels (RFMO Secretariats)
10:30-11:00 am	Coffee break
	- Harmonization of transshipment control (RFMO Secretariats) - Standardization of stock presentation (RFMO scientific chairs)
Lunch Break	
	3. Advice for Future Activities
3:00-3:30 pm	Coffee break
	4. Other matters 5. Closing

Annex 3

CCSBT Chair´s Report

A. CCSBT annual meeting support for Kobe Course of Actions

The Extended Commission of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Commission on 16-19 October 2007 in Canberra endorsed the Course of Actions for Tuna RFMOs from the Kobe meeting.

The CCSBT noted that the Commission and its subsidiary bodies will be guided by the recommendations of the first and subsequent meetings of the Joint Tuna RFMOs and its subsidiary meetings.

B. Report in relation to Kobe action points

1. Data sharing

CCSBT has well developed protocols for data exchange in support of its scientific process albeit that data is aggregated in space for reasons of confidentiality. No data exchange provisions have been agreed for bycatch species.

2. Allocation

CCSBT has allocation criteria and historical agreements in relation to future allocations. CCSBT has been active in encouraging other flag states that fish for SBT to cooperate most notably Indonesia which has recently indicated its intention to accede to the convention. Allocation for new members is by negotiation.

3. Capacity

Capacity has not been a focus for CCSBT as a global catch limit is the primary conservation measure for SBT. There is a positive list of vessels authorised to take SBT (although not limited) and a proviso of the resolution establishing that list is that members should not authorise vessels flagged to non-cooperating non-members to fish for SBT.

4. Management based on best available scientific advice

CCSBT has a well established scientific process which includes the use of independent experts. In 2006 CCSBT reduced catch limits on the basis of a scientific risk based assessment and the catch limit adopted (for a three year period) was premised on there being a significant improvement in MCS arrangements for SBT.

5. Integrated MCS arrangements

This has been a key work area for CCSBT.. Proposals being considered as part of integrated MCS measures include implementation of a CDS, VMS system, transhipment monitoring and port state measures. CCSBT requires all vessels fishing for, retaining on board, transhipping or landing SBT to be registered with the CCSBT. This list is made available electronically through the CCSBT website with links from the Tuna.org Website.

6. Penalties and sanctions

Trade constraints are in place to ensure that only SBT taken by authorised vessels and verified by flag states is able to be exported into cooperating markets.

7. IUU measures

CCSBT has a positive vessel list (as outlined in 5 above) plus consideration is being given to implementation of a black list of vessels.

8. CDS

CCSBT has agreed to implement a CDS but has yet to agree details of the system. Different proposals have been developed and a further proposal to integrate these will be progressed in the course of the year. The role of tagging and the role of any centralised CDS has yet to be agreed.

9. Performance review

The general concept of modernising and improving the functioning of the Commission was discussed at the thirteenth meeting of the Commission (CCSBT 13) with the meeting report recording that:

"Members also agreed that there is an immediate need to modernise the CCSBT, with a view to improve its efficiency and effectiveness.

By CCSBT 14, the Kobe meeting had occurred and the suggested criteria for reviewing the performance of tuna RFMO's had been developed. The Commission was able to draw from this work and agree the process and terms of reference for a performance review

The Commission's performance review has two stages:

- Stage one: a self assessment of CCSBT by a group consisting of a nominee from each Member,
- Stage two: a review by the independent expert(s) of the self assessment report

The decision not to include the independent experts in the self assessment was a result of concern by Members at the costs involved.

Members also agreed both the self assessment report and the expert(s)' comments on it would be made available on the CCSBT website.

Current Position

The terms of reference provide that the performance review shall be completed in time for CCSBT 15 (October 2008). To date, Members have identified a list of potential independent reviewers, some of whom have formally indicated their willingness and availability to participate. The selection of the independent reviewers will be made by Members before 15 April 2008. In the meantime work is commencing on the self assessment by the group of Member nominees.

10. Environmental/ precautionary approach

This remains a work in progress for CCSBT. Issues of competency and potential for overlapping measures with geographically based RFMOs remain to be worked through. While there is an existing measure requiring tori line use this measure has yet to be updated to reflect modern best practise.

11. Specific shark fishery management

CCSBT shark management is as in 10 above.

12. Reduction in juvenile by-catch

A substantial part of the fishery is based on juvenile fish as a target for farming. SBT mature at a late age and immature fish are taken as target in other fisheries.

13. Capacity building

While not a CCSBT initiative members have assisted the development of a catch monitoring program in Indonesia.

14. Enhanced scientific cooperation

Standardization of stock presentations Is a matter to be referred to the CCSBT Scientific Committee and Stock Assessment Group.

Annex 4

Presentation by ICCAT

Fabio Hazin, the ICCAT Chairman, made an opening statement to thank Japan and the US for the arrangement of the meeting. He introduced the power point presentation prepared by ICCAT outlining the main actions taken by the Commission in response to the course of actions resulted from Kobe meeting in 2007.

Driss Meski, the ICCAT Executive Secretary, presented the detailed progress made by ICCAT with respect to the Kobe course of actions. He went through the key areas as identified in Kobe. He also mentioned the participation of ICCAT to other international meeting and the cooperation developed with other RFMOs

Among several initiatives, encompassing all 14 key areas and challenges identified in Kobe, ICCAT participated in the Joint Tuna RFMO Technical Working Group on Trade and Catch Documentation Schemes,

held in July 2007, in Raleigh- USA, and applied the results of that meeting to prepare and to adopt, at its annual meeting in 2007, the *Recommendation by ICCAT on an ICCAT Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation program* [Rec. 07-10] which is expected to enter into force in June of this year. This measure will help to strengthen controls in the bluefin tuna fishery by linking catch data to trade data. At the 2007 Commission Meeting, new measures were also adopted in relation to the criteria for inclusion of vessels on the IUU list, allowing vessels identified by other RFMOs to be included on the ICCAT IUU list where appropriate. One of the major objectives of ICCAT in the 2008 inter-sessional period will be the carrying out of a performance review, to be conducted by three external experts in the fields of fisheries management, fisheries biology and international law, which have been already selected through an open and transparent process. The evaluation will be made on the basis of the common criteria accepted by RFMOs, although this does not rule out the use of additional criteria to take into account the specific characteristics of ICCAT. The results of this performance review will be studied in detail by the Working Group to Strengthen ICCAT, which will in turn recommend actions to be taken by the Commission to improve performance and to ensure the objective of maintaining the stocks of tuna and tuna-like species at levels above MSY, at the same time respecting as far as possible the delicate eco-systems of its broad Convention area.

At the end Fabio Hazin provided the example of standardized presentation of the status of tuna species stocks as adopted by the ICCAT SCRS.

Annex 5

Presentation by IATTC

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), following the guidelines recommended for the regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) that were identified at the meeting of these organizations held in Kobe (Japan) in January 2007, has put into action, with various degrees of progress, several of the commitments established, as described below.

The policy of improving, sharing and disseminating the data and stock evaluations has been maintained. With the system of observer coverage of 100% of trips by large tuna purse-seine vessels, catches of both target and bycatch species are well monitored. This system of observers is complemented by the sampling of the unloadings of purse-seine vessels of lesser capacity that do not have observers aboard. Information on catches of target species by longline vessels is gathered monthly, and this system needs only to be complemented with information on other species caught incidentally. Monthly catches, the list of active vessels, stock assessments, and evaluations of the proposals for management measures made by Parties are published on the Commission's web site (www.iattc.org).

The Regional Vessel Register, established by the IATTC for registering vessels authorized to fish for tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), and the related system for controlling the fishing capacity of the tuna fleet, which allows free movement of capacity among the countries that participate in the fishery, has proved to be a tool that allows the distribution of fishing opportunities among the countries of the region. In 2007, all the movements of capacity among the participating countries have been published on the IATTC web site.

The Commission staff has continued to ensure that the management measures recommended to the meetings of the IATTC are based on the best scientific information available, and that they be presented to the Parties in a transparent and clear fashion. Its assessments of the stocks are reviewed at the meeting of the Working Group on Stock Assessments, in meetings open to the participation of researchers interested in the study of the tuna species of the EPO.

In order to promote the review of the IATTC's performance, the report of the Kobe meeting was presented to the IATTC Parties during the Commission's 75th Meeting, held in June 2007. Also, a proposal for performance review was submitted, in the form of a draft Resolution presented by one of the Parties and supported by three other Parties, but, due to the importance of other matters, such as the appointment of a new Director, that took up all the time at the meeting, it was not possible to address the matter. It will be addressed at the next Meeting of the IATTC, in June 2008.

Annex 6

Presentation by WCPFC

Improvement, sharing and dissemination of data and stock assessments and all other relevant information in an accurate and timely manner including development of research methodologies.

- Public website:
  - Statistics and Data section.
  - Meeting documents, including assessments and related information.
  - Monitoring of compliance with data submission obligations
- Scientific Committee's Statistics Specialist Working Group monitors data availability
- Initiation of a gaps analysis, data deficiencies (including with respect to provision of data by WCPFC members)
- Particular attention to the Indonesian/Philippines region which accounts for 25% of the WCPO fishery.

Development, where appropriate, and application of equitable and transparent criteria and procedures for allocation of fishing opportunities or level of fishing effort, including provisions to allow for new entrants.

- Allocation has been on the WCPFC agenda since 2006. No substantive progress.
- WCPFC has adopted several conservation and management measures (CMMs) limiting fishing opportunities among CCMs (Members, Participating Territories and Cooperating Non-Members) by controlling catch and effort by fisheries and by areas for CCMs and adopting constraints on capacity expansion.
- New entrants. Most stocks over subscribed and developing State CCMs have fishery development aspirations. Belize the only one of 4 applicants for CNM status admitted at last Session of the Commission.
- Controls, including capacity reduction as appropriate, to ensure that actual total catch, fishing effort level and capacity are commensurate with available fishing opportunities in order to ensure resource sustainability of tuna stocks while allowing legitimate fishery development of developing coastal states, particularly small island developing states and territories
  - Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) use catch, effort and capacity as fishery control tools although the extent these provide for sustainability for some stocks, at levels of effort provided for, is a concern to some CCMs. A Vessel Day Scheme is being implemented for in-zone effort allocation in the purse seine fishery in 8 CCMs with contiguous zones. VDS, which is in early stages of implementation, and will be tested by increased interest by fleets keen to re-locate from other oceans – and no mechanism, other than flag State control and commitment not to increase effort, for the high seas for any gear.
  - Most SIDS CCMs proactive in pursuing their tuna fishery development aspirations.
- Ensuring that management measures are based on the best scientific advice available and consistent with the precautionary approach, particularly, with respect to establishment of effective stock rebuilding measures and other measures to maintain stocks at sustainable levels
  - Concern that some CMMs have not adequately reflected the advice received from the Scientific Committee. Economic and political considerations take precedence over the science. No specific management objectives have yet been adopted by the Commission for each species or fishery (currently use F_{MSY} or B_{MSY} as *de facto* limit reference points), precautionary approaches have not yet been clearly defined. Management strategy evaluation under consideration.
- Ensuring compliance through establishment of integrated MCS (monitoring, control and surveillance) measures that could include VMS, observers, boarding and inspection schemes, port state controls, market state measures, stronger controls on transhipment, and monitoring of bluefin tuna farming, and the harmonization of those measures across the five tuna RFMOs where appropriate to avoid duplication and increase cost efficiency.

Comprehensive suite of integrated tools developed or under development:

- *Developed and being implemented:*

  WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (Active)
  IUU List
  Register of carriers and bunkers
  Scientific data to be provided to the Commission
  Information Security Policy
  VMS
  Regional Observer Programme
  HSB&I

- *Under development:*
  Transhipment verification
  CDS
  Port State measures

- Application of penalties and sanctions of adequate severity to deter IUU fishing by both non-members and members.

  IUU List now operational. No schedule for penalties and sanctions, particularly in relation to non-compliance with obligations of CCMs in areas such as data submission and reporting obligations yet developed but under consideration.

- Development and implementation of stronger measures to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing including, mechanisms to identify and quantify IUU activities based on trade and other relevant information, a system to exchange information on IUU fishing among RFMOs and among flag states, port states and market states and coastal states, consolidation of the positive and negative lists as described in section II below, effective control over nationals in accordance with their duties under international law, identification of beneficial ownership and demonstration of "genuine link" and dissemination of relevant information to the public.

  To be considered during 2008:

  Genuine link
  Beneficial owners

- Establishment and implementation of a system to monitor catches from catching vessels to markets.
- Views on whether to develop a statistical document programme or full catch document scheme remain polarized in the Commission.
- Reviewing the performance of tuna RFMOs in accordance with ANNEX I
  - The Fifth Session of the Commission (WCPFC5), in December 2008, will consider this issue.
- Implementation of the precautionary approach and an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management including improved data collection on incidental by-catch and non-target species and establishment of measures to minimize the adverse effect of fishing for highly migratory fish species on ecologically related species, particularly sea turtles, seabirds and sharks, taking into account the characteristics of each ecosystem and technologies used to minimize adverse effect.
  - One the Scientific Committee's six Specialist Working Groups, established in 2005, is focused on ecosystem and by-catch.
  - Data collection on incidental by-catch is not yet fully implemented, partly because of the delay of implementing Regional Observer Programme. However, the Commission has adopted CCMs that require CCMs to release non-target fish species, release by-catch unharmed where possible and implement research programmes and collect data with a focus on sharks, seabirds and sea turtles.
  - Through the Scientific Committee, WCPFC is supporting Ecosystem Risk Assessment (ERA) to assist an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management. The project is anticipated to be implemented over four years – it commenced in 2007.

- Development of data collection, stock assessment and appropriate management of shark fisheries under the competence of tuna RFMOs.
  - Conservation and Management Measure for Sharks CMM-2006-05] is being implemented from 1 January 2008 for vessels greater than 24m in overall length.
  - WCPFC regional observer programme will require collecting information on the catch of all shark species and shark data should be included in the annual report provided to the Commission by CCMs.
  - The Commission received a report on recent developments at the United Nations regarding shark conservation and management at its December 2007 session.
- Research and development of techniques to reduce incidental take of juvenile tunas during tuna fisheries, in particular FAD operations.
  - At its December 2007 Session the Commission endorsed industry-associated research to mitigate the juvenile mortality of bigeye and yellowfin, especially associated with fish aggregating devices.
- Provision of adequate capacity building assistance, including human resource development, for developing coastal states, particularly small island developing states and territories, towards responsible fishery development, including participation in RFMO and scientific meetings, fisheries data collection and stock assessment and implementation of MCS measures
  - WCPFC has two funds to assist capacity building for developing coastal states such as WCPFC Special Requirements Fund and a Trust Fund provided by Japan. In addition, participation for all SIDS in all meetings of the Commission is provided for in the Commission's core budget. In addition, a voluntary fund to support capacity building in Indonesia and Philippines has been operational in the Commission for three years.
- Enhancement of cooperation among scientists, relevant experts and with other relevant fisheries organizations possibly through organization of symposia or working groups on appropriate topics of common interest. Coordination of timing of annual meetings and scientific meetings with a view to avoiding their overlap as well as allowing an adequate interval between scientific and annual meetings and between proposal submission and annual meetings
- WCPFC has six Specialist Working Group associated with the Scientific Committee which supports cooperation among scientists. Inter-sessional work on the development of a comprehensive tagging proposal for the western and central Pacific, CPUE standardization, and ERA has also promoted scientific interaction.

Technical work to cooperate across RFMOs will commence by addressing the following challenges

- Harmonization and improvement of the trade tracking programs and, as appropriate, development of catch documentation including tagging systems as required
- Creation of a harmonized list of tuna fishing vessels that is as comprehensive as possible (positive list) including use of a permanent unique identifier for each vessel such as an IMO number. The positive list should include support vessels. Creation of a global list of IUU vessels.
- Harmonization of transshipment control measures
- Standardization of presentation form of stock assessment results

Attachment B

A UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UVI) FOR TUNA FISHING VESSELS: AN ESSENTIAL STEP IN COMBATING IUU

Introduction

1. The suggestion to keep records of fishing vessels was raised during the development of the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (FAO Compliance Agreement), and adopted by the FAO Conference in 1993. As issues related to illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing began to attract increasing international attention, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and FAO convened the first meeting of a "Joint FAO/IMO *ad hoc* Working Group" in October 2000. The Working Group endorsed the need to ensure flag State links to the registration of a fishing vessel with its authorization to fish, and urged closer collaboration between relevant agencies in national administrations. The Working Group also agreed that consideration should be given to how the IMO numbering scheme might be applied to fishing vessels not currently subject to this requirement in order to enable vessels to be traced regardless of changes in registration or name over time.

2. The twentieth meeting of the Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics (CWP20) in 2003 agreed that, for the purpose of inter-agency exchanges of vessel records, a unique vessel identifier (UVI) should be assigned to each vessel, since current vessel identifiers (e.g. vessel name, flag State and registration number in the flag State, international radio call sign, etc.) are unstable. CWP20 recommended that the FAO draft a list of essential and desirable vessel identifiers for vessel registries (keeping them to a minimum) for the consideration of CWP agencies, and that FAO consult with those agencies regarding the use of UVIs in the FAO's High Seas Vessel Authorization Record (HSVAR) database and CWP agency vessel registries. An essential part of the proposal was the inclusion of a unique HSVAR_ID (and its non-HSVAR_ID complement) identifier.

3. The 2005 Rome Declaration on IUU Fishing, adopted by Ministers includes a call *"to develop a comprehensive record of fishing vessels within FAO, including refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels, that incorporates available information on beneficial ownership, subject to confidentiality requirements in accordance with national law"*. Thereafter, the FAO Fisheries Department undertook a study to determine the feasibility and viability of developing such a comprehensive record which was referred to as the "Global Record".

4. The twenty-seventh meeting of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI27), in 2005, received the FAO Study report which concluded a need to introduce a system through which any vessel could be clearly identified over time, irrespective of change of name, ownership or flag.

5. In relation to the concept of a unique method to identify vessels over time, the FAO Study recognized the advantages that would accrue from the use of the Lloyds Registry-Fairplay (LR-F) Number (that forms the basis for the IMO number and is obligatory for certain classes of fishing vessels), which would include, *inter-alia*, that, "…the identification number remains with the vessel irrespective of change of name or ownership and/or flag thus it provides a possibility to follow the history of a vessel". Further, the Study noted that the use of the LR-F/IMO number would allow ready comparison with other databases, such as LR-F, European Quality Shipping

Information System (*EQUASIS*), RFMOs and such port State control measures where the LR-F/IMO number is included in the criteria[1].

6. The first substantive meeting of the Ministerial-led Task Force on IUU Fishing on the High Seas that took place at Paris, France on 9 March 2005 agreed, *inter-alia*, to establish a global information system on high seas fishing vessels in the form of a publicly available international database of information relating to the global high seas fishing fleet.

7. From 25-28 February 2008, the FAO convened an "Expert Consultation on the Development of a Comprehensive Global Record of Fishing Vessels" at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. During that consultation, LR-F described the management of both the IMO Ship Numbering Scheme and the IMO Registered Owner and Company Numbering Scheme on behalf of the International Maritime Organization which, in LR-F practice, have been extended to include fishing activities related records. Both schemes provide a mechanism for sourcing comprehensive fishing vessel data from flag administrations. Currently, approximately 26,000 fishing vessels over 100GT and corresponding registered owners have LR-F numbers (within the unique number range of the IMO Ship Numbering Schemes)[2].

8. The Expert Consultation agreed that a system to provide a unique identifier which would not change even if the vessel changed flag, owner or name, was essential. While this can be aaccomplished for vessels >100GT through the LR-F there is no formal proposal, within FAO or elsewhere, for vessels smaller than 100GT. The report of the Expert Consultation will be presented to the 2009 session o COFI seeking further advice and direction in relation to FAO's future wrk on this matter.

A UVI and t-RFMO Vessel Records/Registries

9. The issue of a UVI has received wide-spread consideration in a range of international discussions and is considered an essential element in global efforts to combat IUU fishing. It has also been discussed on numerous occasions in meetings of the t-RFMO secretariats, where it has broad support as an issue on which the RFMOs can collaborate.

10. While keen to integrate to any process established through the FAO, the t-RFMO Secretariats, in close consultation with the IMO and LR-F, have collaborated to identify minimal information requirements to enable the vessel records of t-RFMOs to be integrated with that maintained by LR-F and, except for Chinese Taipei-flag vessels, the IMO. It is noted that, on the basis of advice from both LR-F and the IMO, there are no costs associated with acquiring a UVI once this information is obtained.

11. The information requirements to acquire a UVI are summarised at **Annex 1**. This matrix was designed to assist each t-RFMO identify that information which the RFMO currently doesn't collect and which would support coordination with LR-F and the IMO to produce a UVI for vessels of 100GT or greater. In the case of the CCSBT, the following additional information would be required for each vessel on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List:

---

[1] The IMO and LR-F have different policies relating to the treatment of Chinese Taipei-flag vessels. The IMO must refer to Chinese Taipei as "Taiwan, China" and only refers to these vessels in matters relating to casualties involving "Taiwan, China" vessels, and port State control deficiencies found on board "Taiwan, China" vessels. LR-F, on the other hand, holds Chinese Taipei-flag vessels (>=100GT) on its database and thus each has a LR Number and it also allocates IMO Numbers to vessels to Chinese Taipei-flag vessels in accordance with IMO Resolution A.600 (15), SOLAS XI 1/3 and 1/5.

[2] Also includes vessels reported to have been scrapped or sunk.

- Parent company of registered owner (if known)
- Ship manager (if applicable)
- MMSI Number
- Flag State Identification Number (Official No.)
- Port of registry
- Where and when built
- Moulded depth
- Beam
- GT (if applicable)
- Power of main engine or engines
- Net tonnage
- Dead weight
- Ship builder
- Nationality of shipbuilder
- Date entered onto flag State Register
- Date ship de-registered (if applicable)

12. The introduction of a UVI is widely regarded as a practical, positive step towards combating IUU fishing world-wide. The development of a UVI by the t-RFMOs, for their collective use, would facilitate the exchange of vessel information among the t-RFMOs in the short term, support the further development of a global vessel list among t-RFMOs and make a positive contribution to related efforts within the FAO towards this goal. It is anticipated that each t-RFMO will invite its members to consider this initiative.

13. In relation to the CCSBT it may take a year or more to acquire the additional information for the 385 vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel list of 100GT and over. It is proposed that, for vessels less than 100GRT, the CCSBT await the outcome of further discussions in FAO before deciding on a course of action.

Annex 1

List of fields collected by IMO and LR-F and those currently collected by t-RFMOs

Information required	Required to provide an LR-F No.	LR-F[3]	IMO[4] For vessels >100GRT	WCPFC	IATTC	IOTC	CCSBT	ICCAT
IMO Unique Company (DOC) Number			X					
IMO Registered Owner Identification Number			X					
IMO Ship Identification Number			X			X[5]		
LR-F Number		X	IMO<Company/registered owner><7 digit LR-F number>					
Document of Compliance (DOC) Company		X	X					
Current Company name			X					
Date of company registration			X					
Country of registration			X					
Full address details for Company			X					
Previous company name (if known)			X					
Registered Owner	X	X	X	X	X	X	X[6]	X
Parent company of registered owner (if known)	X		X					
Date of incorporation of company			X					
Ship Manager (if applicable)	X	X	X					
Technical Manager		X						
Operator		X			X	X	X[7]	X
Bareboat/Demise Charterer		X	X					
Group Beneficial Owner		X						

[3] See Annex 2
[4] Associated with the a). IMO Unique Company Number Scheme, b). the IMO Registered Owner Identification Number Scheme and, c). IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme
[5] If available
[6] It is not known if Owner details submitted by all flags are in accordance with the LR-F definition of the Registered Owner.
[7] It is not known if Operator details submitted by all flags are in accordance with the LR-F definition of the Operator.

Group Operated Fleet		X						
Flag State	X		X	X		X[8]	X[8]	
MMSI Number	X		X					
Flag State Identification Number (Official No.)	X		X	X				
Name of fishing vessel	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Registration number (Fishing No.)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Previous names (if known)	X	X		X	X	X	X[9]	X
Port of registry	X		X	X	X			
Address of owner or owners	X	Company	X	X	X	X	X	X
Name and nationality of master				X				
Previous flag (if any)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
International Radio Call Sign	X		X	X	X	X	X[10]	X
Vessel communication types and numbers (INMARSAT A, B and C numbers and satellite telephone number)		X		X				
Colour photograph of vessel		X		X	X			
Where and when built	X		X	X	X			
Type of vessel	X	X		X		X	X	X
Normal crew complement		X		X				
Type of fishing method or methods		LR-F ship type	X	X	X	X	X[11]	X
Length	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Moulded depth	X	X		X	X			
Beam	X	X		X	X			
Gross register tonnage (if applicable)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
GT (if applicable)	X							
Power of main engine or engines	X	X		X	X			
The nature of the authorization to fish granted				X	X	X		

[8] This information is not requested but becomes available by virtue of a flag State submitting vessel information to add to the authorized list
[9] This information is often recorded as “Unknown”.
[10] This is absent for 11% of vessels over 100 tonnes and 35% of vessels under 100 tonnes.
[11] This is recorded as “Unclassified” for 11% of vessels over 100 tonnes and 22% of vessels under 100 tonnes.

by the flag State								
Carrying capacity, including freezer type, capacity and number and fish hold capacity.		X		X	X	X[12]		Carriers only
Net tonnage	X		X					
Dead weight	X		X					
Shipbuilder	X		X					
Nationality of shipbuilder	X		X					
Parallel-in ships true ownership registration details			X					
Parallel-out ships true owner details			X					
Ship status code			X					
Date ship entered register	X		X					
Date ship de-registered (if applicable)	X		X					
Fishing authorization period							X	X

[12] Information on carrying capacity is sought only in relation to carrier (transport) vessels

Lloyd's Register – Fairplay: Owner / Manager Definitions

LRF identify the following roles in respect to a vessels Ownership/Management. It should be noted that the same company may perform more than one role on a ship.

1. **Document of Compliance (DOC) Company -** the owner of the ship or any other organisation or person such as the manager or bareboat charterer who has assumed the responsibility for the technical operation of the ship from the owner of the ship and who on assuming such responsibility has agreed to take over all the duties and responsibilities imposed by the ISM Code.

   A documented company on both DOC and SMC Certificates issued by flag Administrations; but the information for which is also available from the Responsible Organisations, such as Classification Societies, who may undertake the audits.

   In most cases the DOC Company will be responsible for the Technical Management of the ship

2. **Registered Owner -** The legal title of ownership of the vessel that appears on the ship's registration documents. It may be an Owner/Manager or a wholly-owned subsidiary in a larger shipping group; or a bank or one-ship company vehicle set up by the bank; or of course, it may be a "brass-plate" company created on paper to legally own a ship and possibly to limit liability for the "real" owners and/or benefit from off-shore tax laws. It may anyway be a legal-requirement of the flag-state with whom the ship is registered for the legal owner to be a company registered in that country.

3. **Shipmanager -** The company designated by the ship owner or charterer to be responsible for the day to day running of the ship and the best contact for the ship regarding commercial matters. This company may be an owner related company, or a third-party manager, whose purpose is primarily the management of ships for their ship-owning clients. This company may also be responsible for major purchases for the fleet, such as classification, insurance, surveys etc.

   N.B. Many ships today are owned by banks or finance/leasing companies who have no operational involvement whatever. In practice the lessee companies, referred to as 'Disponent Owners' or one of their subsidiary companies, may appear as the Manager of the ship.

4. **Technical Manager -** The company designated by the ship owner or operator or ship manager to be specifically responsible for the technical operation and technical superintendancy of a ship. This company may also be responsible for purchases regarding the fleet, such as repairs, spares, re-engining, surveys, dry-docking, etc.

   In the majority of cases the DOC Company will also be responsible for the Technical Management of the ship.

5. **Operator -** The company responsible for the commercial decisions concerning the employment of a ship and therefore who decides how and where that asset is employed. The direct beneficiary of the profits from the operations of the ship, this company may also be responsible for purchasing decisions on bunkers and port services. A medium to long-term time or bareboat charterer is considered to be the operator of the ship. Companies heading operator pools (e.g. Cool Carriers or Gearbulk) are Operators of the ships in the pool.

N.B. Many ships today are owned by banks or finance/leasing companies who have no operational involvement whatever. In practice the lessee companies, referred to as 'Disponent Owners' may appear as the Operator of the ship.

6. **Bareboat/Demise Charterer –** The company identified on the charter-party who charters the ship on a bareboat or demise charter. In this the charterer assumes control over all operations, costs and responsibilities associated with the vessel for an agreed period of time. The charterer becomes or appoints the shipmanager and may also have the right to sub-charter the vessel.
It is increasingly common for ships to be in parallel registry during the period of a bareboat charter. In this case, the ship is transferred by the bareboat charterer to a new operational flag, while the ownership of the ship (Registered Owner) continues under the original Registry. None of the legal or financial responsibilities of the Registered Owner are transferred to the bareboat charterer during the period of charter.

N.B. In Demise Charter agreements, if negotiated at the beginning of charter agreement, the charterer may have the option to purchase the vessel at the end of the charter period.
In **Time Charter Party** agreements, the charterer may only assume responsibility for operations, routing and cargo, while technical, crewing etc. remain with the owner.

7. **Group Beneficial Owner –** This is the parent company of the Registered Owner, or the Disponent Owner if the ship is owned by a bank. It is the controlling interest behind its fleet and the ultimate beneficiary from the ownership. A Group Beneficial Owner may or may not directly own ships itself as a Registered Owner. It may be the Manager of its fleet, which is in turn owned by subsidiary companies. Its ships may also be managed by a 3rd party under contract.

8. **Group Operated Fleet –** For companies identified as Group Beneficial Owners, LRF can identify the total operational fleet. This Group Operated Fleet includes all the ships in the fleet operated by the group, including both their owned vessels and chartered in ships.

J. Minkey 24th. July 2007