



CCSBT-CC/1310/14 **(Rev1)**

Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures CCSBT MCS 措置の運用

Introduction

はじめに

This document provides a **brief** summary of the operation of the main four CCSBT Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) measures from the Secretariat's perspective: この文書は、CCSBTにおける以下の主要な4つの監視、管理及び取締り（MCS）措置の運用について、事務局の観点から**簡潔に**総括するものである。

- 1) The Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS),
漁獲証明制度（CDS）
- 2) The Transshipment at Sea Monitoring Program,
洋上転載モニタリング計画
- 3) The Vessel Monitoring System (VMS), and
船舶監視システム（VMS）
- 4) Records of Authorised Vessels and Farms.
許可船舶・畜養場記録

For each measure, the Secretariat's roles/responsibilities with respect to that measure are outlined. In addition, any issues that the Secretariat is aware of in the operation of the measure and any recommendations for changes to that measure are also discussed.

各措置に関して、当該措置に対する事務局の役割/責任を概説している。さらに、措置の運用に関して事務局が気付いた課題、及びこれらの措置の変更にかかる勧告についても議論した。

1. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) 漁獲証明制度（CDS）

Secretariat Role

事務局の役割

The Secretariat's roles/responsibilities are:

事務局の役割/責任は以下のとおりである。

- receiving and processing¹ all CDS documents,
全てのCDS文書の受理及び処理¹
- checking the completeness and accuracy of these documents,
これらの文書の完全性及び正確性の確認

¹ Loading all electronic documents received (all Catch Tagging Forms from all Members and all Catch Monitoring Forms & Re-Export/Export after landing of Domestic Product forms from Australia) to the database, and data entry of all paper documents received (all other forms). 受領した全ての電子的な文書（全てのメンバーからの全ての漁獲標識様式、豪州からの全ての漁獲モニタリング様式及び再輸出/国産品水揚げ後の輸出様式）をデータベースに保存すること、及び受領した全ての紙媒体の文書をデータ入力すること。

- conducting reconciliations between the different types of CDS forms and between copies of forms provided by exporters and importers,
異なるタイプの CDS 様式間、並びに輸出業者及び輸入業者から提出された様式の写し間の照合
- following-up with Members/Cooperating Non-members (CNMs) regarding discrepancies and missing information,
差違がある及び欠損している情報に関するメンバー/協力的非加盟国 (CNM) とのフォローアップ
- managing validation details submitted by Members/CNMs,
メンバー/CNM から提出された確認者の詳細の管理
- producing 6 monthly CDS reports,
CDS に関する 6 ヶ月報告の作成
- maintaining and enhancing the CDS database, and
CDS データベースの維持強化
- coordinating the purchase of centralised tags for use with the CDS.
CDS と一緒に利用される一元管理化標識

Electronic CDS (e-CDS) Proposal Update

電子 CDS (e-CDS) 提案のアップデート

A significant proportion of CDS information is already provided electronically and consequently the Secretariat's data entry costs for the CDS are small (approximately \$8,600 in 2012). As noted in previous years, the most time-consuming components of the CDS for the Secretariat are reconciliations and following-up and resolving any discrepancies and missing information with Members/CNMs. As a result of this observation, at CC7 there was discussion that these components of the CDS could be made more efficient for all parties if a web based e-CDS was developed and introduced.

CDS 情報の大部分は、既に電子的な形で提供されており、その結果、CDS に関する事務局におけるデータ入力経費は僅かなものである (2012 年は約 8,600 ドル)。昨年も記載したとおり、事務局が CDS に関して最も多くの時間を費やすのは、照合並びに、あらゆる不一致及びメンバー/CNM からの情報の欠如に関するフォローアップ及びその問題解決である。この所見の結果として、CC7 において、こうした CDS の構成要素について、ウェブベースの e-CDS が開発及び導入されれば、全てのメンバーにとってより効率的にできる可能性があるとの議論があった。

The Nineteenth meeting of the Extended Commission supported the request by the Seventh Compliance Committee meeting to explore the costs and benefits of an eCDS system. It was agreed that a progress report would be provided to the Compliance Committee Technical Working Group held in May 2013 and a final report provided to CC8. This final report is provided to CC8 as paper 16: "Costs and benefits of a web-based eCDS for the CCSBT", and includes details of the proposal to date.

第 19 回拡大委員会会合は、eCDS システムの費用対効果を調査するための第 7 回遵守委員会会合による要請を支持した。2013 年 5 月に開催された遵守委員会技術作業部会に進捗状況報告書を提出すること、及び CC8 に最終報告書を提出することが合意された。この最終報告書は、CC8 の会合文書「CCSBT のウェブベース eCDS の費用対効果」として提出されており、これにはこれまでの提案の詳細も含まれている。

Indonesian CDS Training Workshop

インドネシアにおける CDS 訓練ワークショップ

In mid-August 2013, the CCSBT Compliance Manager travelled to Indonesia to facilitate a training workshop on various aspects of the CDS, CDS Resolution, and associated Minimum

Performance Requirements. This workshop was well attended by both Indonesian government officials including managers, administrators, validators and data submitters, as well as by members of Indonesia's commercial tuna associations. The workshop included productive discussions with regard to common Indonesian CDS document issues encountered by both the CCSBT and Indonesian officials.

CCSBT のコンプライアンス・マネージャーは、CDS、CDS 決議及び関連する最低履行要件の様々な側面に関する訓練ワークショップを支援するため、2013年8月中旬にインドネシアに出張した。このワークショップには、部長、行政官、確認者及びデータ提出者といったインドネシア政府関係者と、インドネシアの商業的なマグロ団体のメンバーの両方が多数参加した。このワークショップでは、CCSBT とインドネシア政府関係者がともに直面している、インドネシアでよく起こる CDS 文書問題に関する生産的な議論も行われた。

CDS Operational Issues

CDS の運用上の課題

The following are the main CDS operational issues that the Secretariat has observed since the Seventh meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC7). The first 6 of these issues are the same ones that were reported to CC7 in 2012. The Secretariat has continued to work with relevant Members/ CNMs to resolve these issues where possible/ practicable.

以下は、第7回遵守委員会会合（CC7）以降に事務局が気付いた主な CDS 運用上の課題である。これらの課題のうち最初の6つは、2012年のCC7で報告されたものと同じである。事務局は、可能な/実施できる範囲で、これらの課題を解決するため、関係するメンバー/CNM との作業を継続してきている。

1. Late Submission of CDS Documentation

CDS 文書提出の遅延

Some of the required CDS documentation due since CC7 continued to be received later than the agreed timeframes, with some Catch Monitoring Forms (CMFs) and catch tagging information not being received until well after the quarterly deadlines. CC7以降も、いくつかの CDS 文書において合意された期限以降の提出が継続しており、いくつかの漁獲モニタリング様式（CMF）及び漁獲標識情報については、四半期の締切を過ぎても受領がなかった。

Time delays in receiving data submissions can make some CDS tasks difficult or impossible to carry out in a timely manner. For example, late submissions may delay the commencement of reconciliation work and/or negatively impact on reconciliation results. Late submissions may also affect the completeness of information that can be provided to meetings and presented in the Secretariat's six-monthly CDS reports.

提出データの恒常的な遅延は、CDS の迅速な実施を困難又は不可能なものとしている。例えば、提出の遅延は、照合作業の開始を遅らせ及び/又は照合結果に悪影響を与える可能性がある。さらに、提出の遅延は、事務局からの6か月 CDS 報告によって提供され得る情報の完全性にも影響を与える可能性がある。

2. Tagging Data Mismatches

標識データのミスマッチ

Many tagging data mismatches and/or missing sets of tagging data continued to be found during the reconciliation process for both 2012 and 2013 CDS data.

Mismatches generally occurred due to one of the following three situations:

2012年及び2013年両方の CDS データの照合プロセスにおいて、多くの標識

データのミスマッチ及び/又は標識データセットの欠如が継続的に見られた。ミスマッチは、総じて、以下のような 3 つの状況のいずれかに起因していた。

- i) some tagging data which should have been submitted as part of the Excel spreadsheet quarterly submission of tagging data were missing, or
標識データの四半期提出のエクセルシートの一部として提出されるべき一部の標識データが欠如していた、又は
- ii) an incorrect or incomplete list of Catch Tagging Form (CTF) numbers was recorded on the CMF, or
不正確又は不完全な漁獲標識様式 (CTF) の番号のリストが、CMF に記録されていた、又は
- iii) the electronically submitted spreadsheets of catch tagging data contained errors such as referencing incorrect CMF numbers, or containing duplicate CMF numbers.
電子的な形で提出された漁獲標識データのシートが、不正確な CMF 番号を参照していた等誤った情報を含んでいた、又は CMF 番号の重複を含んでいた。

3. Fish Weight/Number Differing Between Exporter and Importer Copies of a CMF

輸出業者と輸入業者から提出された CMF の写しにおける魚の重量/尾数の差違

This item continued to be an issue during 2012 and the first quarter of 2013. In 2012 there were 22 CMFs where the number of fish differed on the exporter and importer copies of the CMF, and 24 CMFs where the weight differed between the exporter and importer copies of CMFs, and a combined total of 30 CMFs where either the number of fish and/or weight was different between exporter and importer CMFs.

この課題は、2012 年及び 2013 年第一四半期にも継続的に発生した。2012 年においては、魚の尾数が輸出者及び輸入者から提出された CMF の写しと異なっていた CMF が 22 件、魚の重量が輸出者及び輸入者から提出された CMF の写しと異なっていた CMF が 24 件、及び輸出者及び輸入者から提出された CMF との間で魚の尾数及び/又は重量の両方が異なっていた CMF が 30 件あった。

In the first quarter of 2013, there were 3 CMFs where the number of fish differed on the exporter and importer copies of the CMF, and 1 CMF where the weight differed between the exporter and importer copies of the CMF, and a combined total of 4 CMFs where either the number of fish and/or weight was different between exporter and importer CMFs.

2013年第一四半期においては、魚の尾数が輸出者及び輸入者から提出されたCMFの写しと異なっていたCMFが3件、魚の重量が輸出者及び輸入者から提出されたCMFの写しと異なっていたCMFが1件、及び輸出者及び輸入者から提出されたCMFとの間で魚の尾数及び/又は重量の両方が異なっていたCMFが4件あった。

4. **Importer Data Missing**

輸出業者データの欠如

There continued to be numerous cases where the Secretariat did not receive copies of the CMF from the final import destination state/entity, even though the export destination (on the exporter copy of the CMF) was recorded as a Member or CNM.

(輸出業者から提出されたCMFの写しに記載された)輸出先がメンバー又はCNMとなっていたにも関わらず、事務局が最終輸入国/主体からCMFの写しを受領しなかったケースが多く見られた。

In addition, the following issues commonly occurred on importer copies of CMFs:

さらに、輸出業者から提出されたCMFの写しにおいて、以下の問題が頻繁に見られた。

- i) the import city and/ or import name and/or date were not provided, and
輸入市及び/又は輸入者名及び又は輸入日が記載されていない、及び
- ii) importers had not signed the final destination section of the CMF.
CMFの最終仕向地の部に輸入業者のサインがない。

The Secretariat will produce detailed reports on these items for presentation to CC9 so that importers can be better informed about where these issues are occurring.

事務局は、こうした問題が発生していることについて輸入業者により良く情報提供できるよう、これらの事項に関する詳細な報告書を作成し、CC9において提示する予定である。

5. **Mismatching Page Numbers and Duplicate Form Numbers**

ページ番号のミスマッチ及び様式番号の重複

CMFs from Indonesia are currently received as two page documents. As in 2012, there continued to be a number of CMF documents received from Indonesia where the first and second pages had different CMF numbers, but the pages did belong to the same CMF. Indonesia has advised that it will change the length of CMF forms to being a single page so as to prevent this issue occurring in future. This change is already in progress.

インドネシアから受領するCMFは、現在のところ2ページから構成されている。2012年においても、同国から、最初と2番目のページのCMF番号が異なっているがそのページは同一のCMFであるCMF文書の受領が多数続いた。インドネシアは、将来的にもこの問題が発生するのを防止するため、CMF様式が1ページに収まるようにその長さを変更する予定であると報告した。この変更は既に進行中である。

In addition, there were a number of Indonesian CMFs that had duplicate (19) or triplicate (1) form numbers, *i.e.* CMFs were received that had the same CMF number but contained different information. Indonesia is also working to put processes in

place to address this issue.

さらに、インドネシアから、様式番号の二重重複（19件）、及び三重重複（1件）、すなわち CMF 番号は同じであるがその情報が異なっているものを多数受領した。インドネシアは、この問題に適切に対処するためのプロセスにも取りかかっている。

6. South Africa Forms not Authorised by an Authorised Validator

権限を付与された確認者により許可されていない南アフリカの様式

Last year, reconciliation of the 2011 South African data revealed three CMFs which were considered by South Africa to be fraudulent.

昨年、2011年の南アフリカデータの照合を行ったところ、南アフリカによって偽造されたものであると認識された CMF が 3 件あったことが判明した。

This year, a similar problem occurred during reconciliation of the 2012 data. The Secretariat received two copies of the same form (but with different form numbers) from South Africa. The first copy was not stamped by an authorised validator, but was instead stamped by the same company that submitted the 3 fraudulent forms during 2011. The second copy of the form was stamped by an authorised South African validator, and was noted as being a replacement for the incorrectly validated first copy of the CMF. Japan also provided the Secretariat with copies of two additional South African CMFs where this same situation had occurred.

今年も、2012年データの照合によって同様の問題が発生した。事務局は、南アフリカから、2つの同じ様式の写し（しかし様式番号は異なっている）を受領した。最初の写しには、権限を付与された確認者の押印がなく、その代わりに、2011年に3つの偽造様式を提出したのと同じ企業の押印がされていた。二番目の様式の写しには、権限を付与された南アフリカの確認者により押印されており、誤って確認された最初の CMF の写しの差し替えであるとする注記が付されていた。また、日本は事務局に対し、同様の状況が発生していた南アフリカの CMF の写しをさらに 2 件提供した。

South Africa has advised the Secretariat that these CMF duplications were a result of the company not providing documents validated by the Department with the original export consignment. An investigation ~~was into the issue has been launched and into the matter taken to court. The court case is still pending. Further, South Africa advised that they have embarked upon an administrative process whereby it is seeking to further sanction the company, and that outcomes of the criminal and administrative proceedings will be communicated to CCSBT. Details of the investigation were provided in Circular #2013/052. The investigation concluded that no further action should be taken against the company concerned because there had been no deliberate intent to export illegally-caught SBT product. The situation had arisen as a result of the challenges the exporter faced in exporting fresh SBT after hours.~~

南アフリカは、事務局に対し、これらの CMF の重複は、企業が最初の輸出委託の際に当局により確認された文書を提出しなかった結果であると報告した。この問題にかかる捜査が開始された~~ており、事件は裁判に持ち込まれている。訴訟はまだ審理中である。さらに南アフリカは、当該企業にさらなる制裁を科す方向の行政プロセスに乗り出しており、刑事及び行政訴訟の結果は CCSBT に連絡されることになっている~~ 捜査の詳細は回章#2013/052 のとおりである。捜査の結果、違法漁獲された SBT 製品を意図的に輸出しようとしたものではないため、当該企業に対してさらなるアクションを取る必要はないと結論した。こうした状況は、新鮮な SBT を数時間の内に輸出する輸出業者の業務の結果として起こったものであった。

7. Importer Copies of CMFs (4) not Provided by South Africa for 2012

2012年に南アフリカから提出されなかった輸入業者からのCMFの写し(4件)

During 2012, Taiwan sold SBT from four CMFs into the local market in South Africa. South Africa has not yet been able to provide importer copies of the four CMFs concerned, but are currently investigating the matter.

2012年中に、台湾は、南アフリカの地方市場に4つのCMFにかかるSBTを販売した。南アフリカは、関連する4つのCMFにかかる輸入業者からの写しを未だに提出することができていないが、現在調査中である。

8. Discarded Tags

標識投棄

a) Tagged SBT Discarded Over-board

標識装着魚の船上投棄

As part of its reconciliation process, the Secretariat identified an instance where tagged SBT had been discarded over-board. In this case, Taiwan advised that 137 tagged SBT were discarded by the master of a Taiwanese fishing vessel due to an accidental vessel collision that had caused the SBT to become contaminated. Taiwan further advised that according to its domestic regulations, the Taiwanese fishing agency had imposed penalties on the vessel owner and master, and that the fishing vessel is not permitted to fish for SBT until December 2013 for the next 3 years.

However, at the time that this paper was finalised Taiwan requested that the vessel concerned be removed from was still on CCSBT's list of authorised fishing vessels in September 2013.

照合プロセスの中で、事務局は、標識が装着されたSBTが船上から投棄された事例を確認した。このケースに関して、台湾は、予想外の船舶の衝突によってSBTの品質が落ちてしまったため、台湾漁船の船長により137尾の標識が装着されたSBTが船上から投棄されたことを報告した。さらに台湾は、国内法に基づき、台湾漁業署は当該船舶の船主及び船長にペナルティを科したこと、及び当該船舶は今後3年間、2013年12月までSBTの漁獲が許可されないことを報告した。しかしながら、本文書の最終化時点において、台湾は、当該船舶をはまだCCSBTの許可漁船リストに掲載されたままであるから削除するよう要請した。

b) Unused Tags Discarded

未使用タグの投棄

The Secretariat investigated the recovery of a Japanese CDS tag found at a beach location in New South Wales, Australia. Japan advised that the tag had not been used and may have been blown off the vessel concerned by the wind. Japan further advised that it often disposes of surplus tags on land when the vessels are in port.

事務局は、オーストラリアのニューサウスウェールズの砂浜で発見された日本のCDSタグの回収について調査した。日本は、当該タグは未使用であり、風のために船舶から吹き飛ばされたものと考えられることを報告した。さらに日本は、船舶の入港時に、余ったタグの処分が陸上でしばしば行われることも報告した。

The Secretariat considers that it would strengthen the CDS if records were kept of any: 事務局は、以下のような記録を残しておくことでCDSを強化できるものと考ええる。

- tagged SBT that are discarded, and
標識が装着された SBT であって投棄されたもの、及び
- un-used tags that are discarded.
投棄された未使用標識

9. Non-submission of CDS Documents by the EU

EUからのCDS文書の未提出

The European Union (EU)

欧州連合 (EU)

The EU has not yet submitted any CDS documents including for 2012 or any previous years despite having caught some SBT². The EU's catch of SBT during 2012 is recorded as being 4.04t. However, in terms of SBT catches, the EU provided information in their National Report noting that:

EUは、いくらかの SBT を漁獲しているにも関わらず、2012 年又はそれ以前のいずれの年についても、CDS 文書を未だに全く提出していない²。2012 年の EU の SBT 漁獲量は、4.04 トンと記録されている。しかしながら、SBT の漁獲に関して、EU は、その国別報告書の中で以下を指摘した。

“The small amount of EU SBT by-catches is either consumed by the vessel crew or given to local workers in the port of landing that assist with off-loading the vessel. By-catches of SBT taken in the WCPFC Convention Area are off-loaded in Papeete (Tahiti), and by-catches taken in the IOTC Convention Area are off-loaded in Durban (South Africa). EU SBT bycatches therefore never enter any commercial channels, for which reason the catch documentation is not filled in or the specimen of SBT are not tagged.”

「少量のEUのSBT混獲量は、船舶の積載量削減のために船舶のクルーによって消費されるか、水揚げ港の現地労働者に配布される。WCPFCの条約海域で混獲されたSBTはパペーテ（タヒチ）で、IOTCの条約海域で混獲されたものはダーバン（南アフリカ）で降ろされる。このように、EUの混獲SBTは、決して商業経路に入ることが無く、このために漁獲文書に記載されることがないし、SBTの個体に標識を付けることもないのである。」

However, the Secretariat notes that the EU has reported importing SBT between 2010 – 2012, but no import copies of CMFs have been provided to the Secretariat. The EU stated in its National Report that:

“The EU is currently collecting data from Member States about imports of SBT in order to be able to undertake an audit of the system used for controlling and monitoring imports of SBT, and to clarify any shortcomings in the system.”

しかしながら、EUは、2010年から2012年の間のSBTの輸入を事務局に報告している一方、事務局に対して輸入にかかるCMFの写しを提出していない。これについて、EUは国別報告書において以下のとおりとしている。

「EUは、SBT輸入の管理及びモニタリングに使用するシステムの外部監査に着手できるよう、またシステムの欠陥を明確にできるよう、加盟国のSBT輸入にかかるデータを現在収集している。」

Indonesia

インドネシア

² In addition, the EU is yet to authorise any CDS validators. その上、EU は、CDS の確認者を未だにまったく許可していない。

In its National Report to the Extended Commission/ CC8, Indonesia noted that there were 360 vessels in its artisanal longline fleet (< 30GT) during 2012 that caught SBT but were not included in the CCSBT authorised vessel list – refer also to paper CCSBT-CC/1310/04. Since the Secretariat has not received CDS documents from these vessels, it appears that CMF documents were not issued and/or completed for the SBT landings or any potential transshipments from these vessels.

インドネシアは、拡大委員会/CC8に対する国別報告書の中で、CCSBT-CC/1310/04でも言及したように、2012年中にSBTを漁獲したがCCSBTの許可船舶リストには掲載されていない沿岸零細はえ縄漁船（総トン数30トン未満）が360隻存在することを指摘した。事務局は、これらの船舶からのCDS文書を受領しておらず、これらの船舶によるSBT水揚げ又は潜在的な転載に関するCMF文書の発行及び/又は完了に至っていない。

9.10. Transshipment Information Filled out when no Transshipment Occurred 転載が行われなかった場合の転載情報の記入

The Secretariat received approximately 30 CMFs from Taiwan where the transshipment tick-box was selected and partial transshipment information was filled out on export CMFs. These forms therefore all appeared to include incomplete transshipment information. However, queries during the reconciliation process revealed that these forms did not involve transshipments and therefore it had not been necessary to fill out any transshipment information onto these CMFs. Taiwan is working with its operators to ensure that in future they do not fill out the transshipment section of CMFs in cases where no transshipments have occurred.

事務局は、台湾から、転載の項目がチェックされているが、CMFの輸出部分における転載情報に記入が不十分なCMF約30件を受領した。しかしながら、照合プロセスにおける一連の質問により、これらの様式は、実際は転載を含んでおらず、そのためこれらのCMFの転載情報の部分に何ら記入する必要がなかったことが判明した。台湾は、将来、転載が行われなかった場合にはCMFの転載セクションには記入しないよう確保するため、操業者とともに作業中である。

10.11. REEFs³ Submitted when not Required

不必要なREEF³の提出

During 2012, both Indonesia and Taiwan submitted REEFs in some cases where it was un-necessary to do so. The Secretariat advised that REEFs are not required to be submitted in situations where the fish were landed in the port with the sole intention of immediately exporting them for the first time from that port (and they were not sold to domestic buyers). In these cases only an export CMF needs to be filled out. Both Indonesia and Taiwan cancelled the un-necessary REEFs and will amend their processes in order not to submit any un-necessary REEFs in future.

2012年中、いくつかのケースにおいて、インドネシアと台湾は、提出する必要がない場合にもREEFを提出した。事務局は、速やかな輸出のみを目的として水揚げされた魚の当該港からの最初の輸出の場合（及び魚が国内のバイヤーに売却されない場合）はREEFを提出する必要がないことを助言した。こうしたケースでは、CMFの輸出セクションのみが記入される必要がある。インドネシアと台湾は、不必要なREEFをキャンセルし、将来、不必要なREEFを提出することがないように、それぞれのプロセスを修正することとしている。

³ REEFs refers to 'Re-export/ Export after Landing of Domestic Product Forms'. REEFとは、「再輸出/国産品水揚げ後の輸出様式」である。

11.12. Establishment of OSECs⁴ to CCSBT's CDS

CCSBT CDS に対する OSEC⁴ の設立

CDS data indicate that a relatively large tonnage of SBT product is imported by the USA – 204.6t in 2011 and 189.3t in 2012. Lower levels of SBT product also appear to be imported by Hong Kong, Singapore and more recently China. To date, none of these Non-Cooperating Non-Member States/entities (NCNMs) have become formal OSECs to the CCSBT. As a result, the Secretariat has not yet received importer copies of CMFs from any NCNMs in order to facilitate independent verification of CDS exports to these States/entities.

CDS データは、相対的に大きいトン数の SBT 製品 – 2011 年は 204.6 トン、2012 年は 189.3 トン – が米国により輸入されていることを示唆している。より低いレベルで、SBT 製品が香港、シンガポール、直近では中国に輸入されていることも明らかになっている。これまで、正式に CCSBT の OSEC となった非協力的非加盟国 (NCNM) はない。結果として、事務局は、これらの国/主体に対する CDS 輸出の独立的な確認を促進するための NCNM の輸入業者から提出された CMF の写しを、未だ受領していない。

However, the USA has incorporated instructions about CCSBT CDS documentation into their Highly Migratory Species International Trade Permit Regulations. In addition, during 2013 Singapore also indicated its willingness to cooperate with the CDS in future. Both Singapore and the USA have also indicated they will attend CC8. The Secretariat will continue to promote cooperation of NCNMs to further assist the reconciliation and verification processes in the CCSBT CDS.

しかしながら、米国は、その「Highly Migratory Species International Trade Permit Regulations」に CCSBT CDS 文書に関する指示を組み込んでいる。さらに、2013 年において、シンガポールも将来的に CDS に協力する意志を表明した。また、シンガポール及び米国は、CC8 へ参加する意志を表明している。事務局は、CCSBT CDS に関する照会及び確認プロセスをさらに支援するため、NCNM との協力の促進を継続していくこととしている。

The following issues were reported to CC7 and have shown improvement since that meeting: 以下は、CC7 において報告され、会合後に改善が見られた課題である。

1. CMFs for Exports which Included Valid Authorised Fishing Vessels 有効な許可漁船を含んでいる輸出に関する CMF

In the past, a significant number of Indonesian CMFs for exports included fishing vessels which were not authorised by CCSBT. The percentage of Indonesian CMFs for exports that included valid authorised vessels was recorded as only 58.4% during 2011 – refer to paper CCSBT-CC/1209/04 (Rev 3). For 2012 and the first quarter of 2013, this percentage has increased to 95.9% and 100% respectively.

過去、インドネシアの相当数の輸出に関する CMF が、CCSBT によって許可されていない漁船を含んでいた。2011 年において、有効な許可船舶を含む輸出に関するインドネシアの CMF のパーセンテージはわずか 58.4% であった (文書 CCSBT-CC/1209/04 (Rev 3) において言及)。2012 年及び 2013 年第一四半期においては、そのパーセンテージはそれぞれ 95.9% 及び 100% に上昇し

⁴ The term OSEC refers to Other State/Fishing Entity Cooperating in the CDS. OSEC とは、「CDS に協力するその他の国/漁業主体」である。

た。

2. CMFs were Received where Both Export and Landing of Domestic Product Sections had been Filled Out

輸出及び国産品の水揚げの両方の部が記入された CMF を受領

There were no longer any issues determining whether Taiwanese CMFs represented landing of domestic products or exports due to both sections having been filled out on one form.

台湾の CMF に関して、国産品の水揚げを示すものなのか、又は輸出を示すものなのか、一つの様式上で両方の部が記入されていたために判断が困難だったが、その問題は最早なくなった。

3. Data Provided in Languages other than English or Japanese

英語又は日本語以外の言語によるデータ提供

In the past, on some Taiwanese CMFs, often fishing vessel master information was initially either not filled out in the transshipment section of CMFs, or was provided in a language other than English or Japanese. In addition, in the domestic landing section, buyer information was sometimes either not provided or was provided in a language other than English or Japanese. These issues no longer occurred on 2012 CMFs.

過去、いくつかの台湾の CMF において、当初、漁船の船長情報が CMF の転載の部に記載されていないか、又は英語又は日本語以外の言語で記載されていることが度々あった。加えて、時として、買主の情報が記入されていないか、又は日本語若しくは英語以外の言語で記載されていた。こうした問題は、2012 年には発生しなかった。

4. Destination Field Not Completed in the Export Section of CMFs

CMF の輸出の部において仕向先の欄が不完全

This is no longer a CDS issue of concern to the Secretariat.

これは、事務局にとって最早 CDS の課題ではない。

POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE CDS RESOLUTION

CDS 決議の修正案

A.Changes to the CDS Resolution Recommended by the Secretariat

事務局が勧告する CDS 決議の修正

The following changes to the CDS resolution are suggested or recommended by the Secretariat (**Attachment A** contains the specific recommended changes to the Resolution):
事務局は、CDS 決議について、以下に掲げる修正を提案又は勧告する（別紙 A は、当該決議に対する具体的な修正勧告を含む）。

1. The CDS Resolution provides no guidance regarding that minimum period of time that CDS documents need to be retained for. It is proposed that a minimum storage time of five (5) years is added to section 6.1 of the Resolution.
CDS 決議には、CDS 文書が保存されるべき最低限の期間に関する指針がない。5年間の最低保存期間を、決議のセクション 6.1 に追加することを提案する。
2. Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the CDS Resolution state the following:
CDS 決議のセクション 3.3 及び 3.4 は以下を明記している。

3.3 Once approved forms are adopted, only minimal modifications, such as the addition of translations, may be made. No information field may be omitted from the standard form, except where the field is not applicable.

承認された様式の採択後は、翻訳の追加といった最小限の変更のみ認められる。情報欄が該当しないという場合を除き、標準様式から情報欄を削除することは認められない。

3.4 Any documentation modified, as described in 3.3, shall be provided to the Executive Secretary for distribution to other Members, Cooperating Non-Members, as well as Non-Members known to be involved in the landing, transshipment, import, export, or re-export of SBT.

3.3 に従い変更が加えられた文書は、メンバー、協力的非加盟国及び SBT の水揚げ、転載、輸入、輸出又は再輸出に関与していることが知られている非加盟国に配布するため、事務局長に提供されなければならない。

For transparency purposes, it is recommended that section 6.4 of the Resolution is amended to require that copies of all modified forms are placed on the public area of the CCSBT website.

透明性を目的として、決議のセクション 6.4 について、全ての変更が加えられた様式の写しを CCSBT ウェブサイトのパブリックエリアに掲載することを求めるよう修正することを勧告する。

3. The CDS Catch Monitoring Form (CMF) and its instructions specify the following:
CDS 漁獲モニタリング様式 (CMF) 及びその記入要領は以下を明示している。

“Validation by Authority (not required for transshipments at sea): *If this is not a transshipment at sea, enter the name and full title of the official signing the document, together with the signature of the official, date (dd/mm/yyyy) and official seal.”*

「当局による確認（洋上転載については不要）：洋上転載でない場合、政府職員の署名、日付及び公印とともに、文書に署名する当該政府職員の指名及

び肩書きを記入する。」

These instructions could be interpreted to imply that validation of the catch/harvest section of a CMF is not required in cases where landings of domestic product are transhipped at sea.

これらの記入要領は、水揚げされた国産品が洋上転載されたものである場合にはCMFの漁獲/収穫セクションの確認が不要であるというニュアンスに解釈し得る。

However, at CC5 the CDS Technical Working Group on Implementation Issues with the CDS (refer to Attachment 6 of the Report of CC5) recognised that validation is required and made the following comments:

しかしながら、CC5において、CDSの実施上の課題に関するCDS技術作業部会（CC5報告書の別紙6において言及）は、確認は以下のコメントのとおり要請及び実施されるよう認識した。

“(i) For transhipments at sea or in port that are landed as domestic product: validation of the catch/harvest section occurs upon landing;

洋上又は港で転載され国産品として水揚げされる場合：漁獲/収穫の部の確認は、水揚げの際に実施する。

(ii) For transhipments at sea that are subsequently exported: the catch/harvest section is not validated, but the export section must be validated before import into the market state (and transhipment observers sign the form);

洋上で転載され、その後輸出される場合：漁獲/収穫の部は確認されないが、市場国で輸入される前に、輸出の部が確認されなければならない（また、転載オブザーバーは、様式に署名する）。

(iii) For transhipments in port that are subsequently exported: both the catch/harvest and export sections must be validated before import into the market state.”

港で転載され、その後輸出される場合：市場国に輸出される前に、漁獲/収穫の部及び輸出の部の両方が確認されなければならない。」

In addition, the way the instructions are currently written, could make them appear to conflict with paragraph 5.1.1 of the CDS resolution, which specifies that the CDS document must be validated as applicable by:

さらに、記入要領の現在の書きぶりは、CDS文書は規定通りに確認されなければならないと明記した、以下のCDS決議の Paragraph 5.1.1と矛盾している。

“5.1.1 for landings of domestic product, an official of the flag Member or

Cooperating Non-Member of the catching vessel or, when the fishing vessel is operating under a charter arrangement, by a competent authority or institution of the chartering Member or Cooperating Non-Member; and”

「国産品の水揚げについては、漁獲した船舶の旗国であるメンバー若しくは協力的非加盟国の政府職員、又は当該船舶が用船契約に基づき操業している場合にあっては、当該用船先のメンバー若しくは協力的非加盟国の権限を有する当局若しくは機関。及び・・・」

These potential ambiguities can be addressed by modifying the CMF form and its instructions to explicitly allow the validation of landings of domestic product transhipped at sea to occur at the time of landing rather than before transshipment.

これらの曖昧な表現は、洋上転載された国産品の水揚げの確認を、転載の前ではなく水揚げの時点で行うよう明確にするようCMF様式及びその記入要領を修正することで対処できる。

4. Instructions for the transshipment section of a CMF form currently read:

CMF 様式の転載セクションの記載要領は、現在は以下のとおりである。

“**Certification by Master of Fishing Vessel (only required for transshipments at sea):** In the case of transshipments at sea, the master of the fishing vessel shall complete this section, with his/her full name, signature and date (dd/mm/yyyy) to certify that the form correctly records the catch/harvest information.”

「漁獲した船舶の船長による証明（洋上転載についてのみ）：洋上転載の場合、漁獲した船舶の船長は、漁獲/収穫に関する情報が正しく記載されていることを証明するために、指名、署名及び日付をもって、この部を記入しなければならない。」

It appears to be an error that this instruction does not require the transshipment section to be filled out when transshipments take place in port. Therefore, the Secretariat recommends that this oversight be corrected by removing the current wording “only required for transshipments at sea”.

この記入要領は、転載が港で行われる場合は転載セクションを記載する必要がないとする誤解を招くと思われる。このため、事務局は、この誤解を、現在の「洋上転載についてのみ」という文言を削除することで是正するよう勧告する。

5. The CDS Resolution does not currently provide a means of recording information about tagged SBT which have been discarded or tags which have never been used and are discarded. The Secretariat recommends that in order to strengthen the CDS, and to account for all tags issued to Members, it would be appropriate for Members to submit details about discarded and/or unused tags to the Secretariat.

現行の CDS 決議には、投棄された標識を装着された SBT、又は使用されなかった及び投棄された標識に関する情報を記録する手段がない。事務局は、CDS を強化し、及びメンバーに対して発行された全ての標識を把握するため、

投棄された及び/又は未使用の標識に関する詳細を事務局に提出することはメンバーにとって適切であると勧告する。

Section 2 of Appendix 2 of the Resolution (Minimum Procedural and Information Standards for CCSBT Member and Cooperating Non-Member Tagging Programmes) could be expanded to specify that information about discarded tags which should be submitted to the Secretariat annually on a fishing season basis.

漁期ベースで毎年事務局に提出されるべき投棄された標識に関する情報を明記するよう、決議の別添 2 のセクション 2 (CCSBT のメンバー及び協力的非加盟国による標識装着計画にかかる手続き及び情報に関する最低基準) を拡大することが考えられる。

The Secretariat would then record these tag numbers on the CDS database and report on any instances of these tags being used at a later date.

事務局は、これらの標識番号を CDS データベースに記録し、後日、これらの標識の使用にかかるあらゆる事例を報告したい。

6. The CDS Resolution does not clearly specify the necessary attachments that need to be provided to the Secretariat when REEF forms are submitted. This can cause uncertainties to Members regarding documentation requirements. Further guidance in this area could be provided by modifying the instructions on the back of the REEF form itself.

CDS 決議は、REEF 様式を提出する際に事務局に提出されなければならない必要な別紙について明確に規定していない。これは、文書化要件に関するメンバーの疑念を惹起し得る。この分野の追加的な指針は、REEF 様式自体の裏面にある記入要領を修正することにより提供し得る。

B.CDS Resolution Items Referred by CCWG2 for Clarification and/or Amendment

CCWG2 から持ち込まれた CDS 決議事項の明確化及び/又は修正

The following items in the CDS Resolution were referred to CC8 for further discussion by the Second Meeting of the Compliance Committee Working Group (CCWG2). **Attachment B** contains the corresponding recommended changes to the resolution.

CDS 決議に関する以下の事項は、第 2 回遵守委員会作業部会 (CCWG2) 会合により、CC8 でのさらなる議論が必要とされたものである。別紙 B は、同様に勧告された決議の修正を含んでいる。

The Report of CCWG2 held in Canberra during May 2013 referred one item of the CDS Resolution to CC8 as a topic for discussion – refer to item 1 below.

2013 年 5 月にキャンベラで開催された CCWG2 報告書は、CDS 決議の 1 項目を CC8 における議論のトピックとするよう言及した一下に引用した項目 1 である。

CCWG2 also noted some cases where discussion and clarification of the proposed CDS Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) could lead to proposed amendments to the CDS Resolution – possible amendments discussed by CCWG2 are detailed in items 2 and 3 below:

また、CCWG2 は、提案されている CDS 最低履行要件 (MPRs) に関する議論及び明確化の結果として、場合によっては、CDS 決議の修正提案につながる可能性があることに留意した。CCWG2 で議論された修正の可能性の詳細は、以下の項目 2 及び 3 である。

1. Clarify which items actually constitute the CDS Resolution

CDS 決議の実質的な構成要素の明確化

CCWG2 discussed potential ambiguities between the text of the CDS Resolution itself and the CDS form instructions which are found on the back of CDS forms. In particular, there was discussion about whether the CDS Resolution includes all of the Resolution text, the attached forms and the form instructions, or only some of those items? For example, does the Resolution include only the Resolution text and the CDS forms, but not the CDS form instructions? The CCWG2 made no recommendation regarding this matter, however the Secretariat has proposed a recommendation at Attachment B.

CCWG2 は、CDS 決議本体の条文と CDS 様式の記入要領（CDS 様式の裏面）との間に曖昧な点がある可能性について議論した。特に、CDS 決議は決議条文、添付された様式及び様式の記入要領を含むものなのか、さもなければ、同決議はこれらの一部分のみを含むものなのか？例えば、同決議は、決議条文及び CDS 様式のみを含むものであり、CDS 様式の記入要領は含まないのか？CCWG2 は、この課題に対する勧告を行わなかったが、事務局は別紙 B として勧告を提案した。

2. Possible amendment to paragraph 1.2 of the CDS Resolution

CDS 決議パラグラフ 1.2 の改正案

There was discussion as to whether the following sentence in paragraph 1.2 of the CDS Resolution means that exports of SBT “cheek meat” are exempt from CDS documentation requirements:

CDS 決議のパラグラフ 1.2 における下記の分は、SBT 「ほほ肉」の輸出を CDS 文書作成要件から除外していることを意味するものであるかどうかについて議論があった。

“1.2 However, the exportation/import of fish parts other than the meat (i.e. head, eyes, roe, guts, tails) may be allowed without the document.”

「しかしながら、肉以外の魚体の部位（即ち、頭、目、卵、内臓、尾）については、文書なく輸出/輸入することができる。」

CCWG2 recommended that cheek meat not be exempt from CDS documentation requirements and further recommended that if clarification is required a footnote could be added alongside the word “meat”.

CCWG2 は、ほほ肉を CDS 文書作成要件から除外されるべきではないと勧告し、この決定を受けて明確化が必要な場合には、この分の「肉」という用語に脚注を加え得ると勧告した。

3. Possible amendment to the Catch Tagging Form instructions of the CDS Resolution

CDS 決議の漁獲標識様式の記入要領の改正案

CCWG2 identified that there is ambiguity in the Catch Tagging Form (CTF) instructions with respect to how to measure SBT fork length and their relationship with the text in the body of the CDS Resolution.

CCWG2 は、漁獲標識様式（CTF）の記入要領における CBT の尾叉長の測定方法、及び CDS 決議本文とこの記入要領の記述との関連性に関して、曖昧な点があることを確認した。

- a) The instructions on the back of the Catch Tagging Form (CTF) currently state:
漁獲標識様式（CTF）の裏面にあるこの記入要領は、現在のところ、次のような規定となっている。

“Enter the fork length of the fish, rounded to the nearest whole centimetre. Measure the straight line horizontal (not curved over body) length of the fish from the closed mouth to the fork of the tail before freezing and tailing as shown in the diagram below.”

「魚の尾叉長を四捨五入してcm単位(整数)で記入。冷凍及び尾を除去する前に、閉じた口先から尾叉までの水平な直線(魚体に沿わせない)を測定すること(下図参照)。」

- b) An accurate measure of fork length before freezing and tailing can be provided – either by:

冷凍及び尾を除去する前の尾叉長の正確な測定は、以下のどちらかの方法によって提供することが可能である。

- directly measuring fork length before the SBT is frozen and tailed, or SBTの冷凍及び尾の除去前に、尾叉長を直接測定する、又は
- by measuring the SBT after tailing (but before freezing), and then applying an appropriate conversion factor to convert the length measured after tailing to a length which would have represented fork length before the tailing occurred. 尾の除去後(ただし、冷凍前)のCBTを測定し、適切な変換係数を適用して、かかる尾の除去後の測定値を、尾の除去する前の尾叉長に相当していたであろう値に変換する。

CCWG2 recommended the Compliance Committee should consider how measurement of fork length can be better clarified in the CDS Resolution. One option considered by CCWG2 is provided at **Attachment B**.

CCWG2は、遵守委員会が、CDS決議上、尾叉長の測定方法を明確化する方法を検討すべきことを勧告した。CCWGにより検討された一つのオプションは別紙Bのとおりである。

2. Transshipment at Sea Monitoring Program

洋上転載モニタリング計画

Secretariat Role

事務局の役割

The Secretariat maintains a record of carrier vessels authorised to receive transshipments at-sea. On receipt of updates, the Secretariat updates its internal database of authorised carrier vessels and the CCSBT web site. For transshipments involving SBT, the Secretariat receives and maintains records for observer deployment requests, transshipment declarations and observer reports from both the IOTC and ICCAT Secretariats.

事務局は、洋上転載を受け取ることが許可された運搬船の記録を保持している。更新情報の受領後、事務局は、許可運搬船の事務局内データベースを更新するとともにCCSBTウェブサイトも更新する。SBTに関与する転載に関して、事務局は、IOTC及びICCAT事務局からオブザーバー配乗要求、転載申告及びオブザーバー報告書に関する記録を受領し、保持している。

A summary of transshipments according to transshipment declarations and observer reports, aggregated by flag and product type, during 2012 and the first half of 2013 (until 30 June 2013) is provided at **Attachment C** (Tables 1, 2 and 3). The Secretariat has not provided this summary on a vessel by vessel basis for confidentiality reasons, however this information is available if it is required by the Compliance Committee.

旗及び製品タイプによって集計した2012年及び2013年上半期(2013年6月30日ま

で)の転載申告書及びオブザーバー報告書に基づく転載の概要は、別紙 C (表 1、2 及び 3) のとおりである。事務局は、機密性の理由から、この概要には船舶ごとには記載していないが、遵守委員会からの要請があった場合には、当該情報も利用可能である。

The tables provide information for all transshipment declarations, but in some cases the observer reports have not yet been received. Missing observer reports account for the large discrepancies between transshipment declarations and observer reported weights reported in Tables 1 and 2.

表は全ての転載申告書にかかる情報を盛り込んでいるが、一部のケースでは、未だオブザーバー報告書を受領していない。オブザーバー報告書の欠損が、表 1 及び 2 で報告された転載申告書とオブザーバーからの報告重量の間に大きな差違があることの主たる原因である。

The following summarises the information received by the Secretariat:

以下に事務局が受領した情報について概説する。

- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT was to be transhipped were received for 75% of the SBT transshipments in 2012. This is despite an initial perceived improvement reported last year (paper CCSBT-CC/1209/10 Rev 2) for the first half of 2012, where it was noted that 100% of deployment requests had been received to date.
2012 年において、SBT が転載されることを特定したオブザーバー配乗要求の受領があったものは、SBT の転載のうちの 75% であった。これは、2012 年上半期については改善が見られる (当該時点までに 100% の配乗要求を受領) としていた去年の当初の報告 (文書 CCSBT-CC/1209/10 Rev 2) に反している。
- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT was to be transhipped have so far been received for 51.4% of the SBT transshipments in 2013. Deployment requests are a key part of the effective operation of this program, and it is important to improve and maintain the percentage of deployment requests that are being received.
2013 年においては、今までのところ、SBT が転載されることを特定したオブザーバー配乗要求を受領したのは、SBT 転載のうち 51.4% である。配乗要求は、本計画の効果的な運用にかかる重要な部分であり、受領される配乗要求のパーセンテージを改善し、それを維持することが重要である。
- The Secretariat received 48 transshipment declarations for transshipments totalling 746t during 2012, and has so far received 3 transshipment declarations totalling 32t for the first half of 2013.
事務局は、2012 年において、総量 746 トンの転載に関して 48 件の転載申告を受領し、2013 年においては、これまでのところ、総計 32 トンの転載に関して 3 件の転載申告を受領している。
- Observer reports were received for 72.9% of all 2012 transshipments. Of the observer reports received, approximately 82.9% contained estimates of the weights of SBT transhipped, while the remaining 17.1% did not provide specific information on SBT⁵.
2012 年の転載のうち、72.9% についてオブザーバー報告書を受領した。受領した報告書のうち、約 82.9% が転載された SBT の推定重量を含んだものであったが、残りの 17.1% については、SBT にかかる具体的な情報は示されていない⁵。

⁵ This was generally due to the observer being unable to separately identify SBT during transfer to the carrier vessel. これは、主として、運搬船への転載の際に、オブザーバーが SBT を区別することが困難であったことによるものである。

- The Secretariat is working with IOTC and ICCAT to obtain outstanding observer reports in relation to the received transshipment declarations.

事務局は、IOTC 及び ICCAT とともに作業を継続し、受領した転載報告書に関連する残りのオブザーバー報告書を入手する。

- Table 3 of **Attachment C** provides a summary of transshipment weights according to transshipment declarations, observer reports, and CDS information. To enable valid comparisons to be made, this table presents data for only those transshipments for which the Secretariat has received both transshipment declarations and observer reports, and has also been able to match these transshipments with CDS documents. The weights of transhipped SBT reported from these three sources differed from each other by 8.7% at the most.

別紙 C の表 3 は、転載申告書、オブザーバー報告書及び CDS 情報に基づく転載重量の概要を示すものである。適切な比較ができるよう、この表は事務局が転載申告書とオブザーバー報告書の両方を受領した転載だけに限定し、これらの転載を CDS 決議文書と照らし合わせるができるようになっている。これら 3 つの情報源から報告された転載重量の差違は、最大で 8.7% であった。

Operational Issues

運用上の課題

This year, the Secretariat has again observed the same main issue with operation of the Transshipment Resolution as noted at the Seventh meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC7):

今年、事務局は、第7回遵守委員会会合（CC7）において留意された転載決議の運用にかかる大きな課題を、過去と同様に注視してきた。

1. Observers are often unable to separate species during transshipments. This is usually due to the fish being transhipped in frozen ‘strings’ containing a mix of species and also due to the speed of these transfers. These two factors often result in the observer report recording ‘Mixed Tuna Species’. Where observers can separate SBT, they most commonly use one of two methods to identify SBT and estimate weights. Both of these methods rely on information provided by the fishing vessel:

オブザーバーは、しばしば、転載中に種を見分けることが困難な場合がある。これは、通常、魚が冷凍状態で、種が混在したまま「ストロープ」に繋がれて転載されることと、加えて、その転載速度が速いことが原因である。この2つの要因によって、結果的にオブザーバー報告書において、「まぐろ種の混合」という形で記録されることとなる。オブザーバーが SBT を見分けることが可能な場合、彼らは、通常、2つの手法のうちの1つを利用し、重量を推定する。これらの手法は、漁船から提供される情報に依存している。

- Identify SBT by the presence of CCSBT tags that have been inserted by the fishing vessel;
漁船が装着する標識の存否を利用して SBT を見分ける
- Where SBT can be visibly identified in a transfer (often using the above method), observers commonly use an average weight, multiplied by the estimated number, to calculate a total weight. The average weight is generally calculated using weights and numbers of fish provided by the fishing vessel. 移送の際に SBT が視覚的に認識可能な場合においては（大抵は上記の方法を用いる）、オブザーバーは、一般に、総重量を算出するために、平均体重を利用しこれに推定尾数を乗じている。かかる平均体重は、通常、漁船から提供される重量及び尾数を用いて計算される

This situation has improved during 2012, potentially in response to the continued request by the CCSBT Compliance Committee that SBT should be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species where possible, in order to assist observers with identification. One area of improvement that the Secretariat noted is that IOTC Observer reports received during 2012 generally contained a specific section regarding transshipments of SBT. They also appeared to more accurately identify SBT and to include more detailed information about the transshipments.

オブザーバーによる種判定を助けるべく可能な場合には SBT を他のマグロ類似種と分けて転載すべきという遵守委員会からの継続的な要請に対応してか、2012年において、この状況は改善した。事務局が注目した改善海域の一つは、2012年に受領した IOTC オブザーバー報告書の対象海域であり、これには SBT の転載に関する特定のセクションを含んでいる。

Recommendations

勧告

The Secretariat has no recommendations for change, but would like to continue to emphasise the request made by the CCSBT Compliance Committee in 2010 that where possible, SBT should be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species, in order to assist observers with identification.

事務局からは修正に関する勧告はないが、2010年の遵守委員会からの要請、すなわち、オブザーバーによる種判定を助けるべく可能な場合には SBT を他のマグロ類似種と分けて転載すべきという要請を協調したい。

3. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)

船舶監視システム (VMS)

Secretariat Role

事務局の役割

The Secretariat has no interaction with Members' Vessel Monitoring Systems.

事務局は、メンバーの船舶管理システムに関与していない。

4. Records of Authorised Vessels and Farms

許可船舶・畜養場記録

Secretariat Role

事務局の役割

The Secretariat receives updates to authorised farms and vessels approximately twice a week, with vessel updates containing from one to hundreds of vessels. On receipt of this information, the Secretariat updates its internal database of authorised vessels/farms as well as the CCSBT web site. Updated information is also shared with the joint tuna RFMOs' consolidated list of authorised vessels.

事務局は、概ね一週間に二度、許可畜養場及び船舶の更新情報を受領しており、これには一隻から百隻の漁船更新情報が含まれる。これらの情報を受領後、事務局は内部の許可船舶/畜養場データベース及び CCSBT ウェブサイトを更新する。更新後の情報は、許可船舶に関するマグロ類合同 RFMO 統合版リストとも共有される。

In addition, during 2012, the standard template for reporting farm authorisations was revised to more accurately align with the format used by Australia⁶. It was correspondingly updated on the CCSBT website.

さらに、2012年において、畜養場許可に関する報告書の標準的テンプレートについて、オーストラリア⁶によって使用されているフォーマットにより正確に一致させるよう改訂した。これを踏まえ、CCSBT ウェブサイト上のものも更新された。

Operational Issues

運用上の問題

The following item continues to be the main issue with the operation of the authorised vessel/farm resolutions that the Secretariat has observed since the Seventh meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC7):

以下に掲げる事項は、第7回遵守委員会会合 (CC7) 以降、事務局が気付いた許可船舶/畜養場決議の運用に関する主な問題点である。

1. There are some instances where vessels caught SBT and were not authorised at the time. Refer to paper CCSBT-CC/1310/04 for further details.
SBT を漁獲した船舶が、当該時期に許可を受けていなかった事例がいくつかあった。詳細は、文書 CCSBT-CC/1310/04 を参照されたい。

⁶ Australia is currently the only Member/CNM with active farming operations. オーストラリアは、現在、畜養を行っている唯一のメンバー/CNM である。

However, aNote that initially an analysis of CDS documents indicated that the extent of this problem appeared to have improved significantly during 2012 and the first quarter of 2013. However, as already mentioned, Indonesia noted in its national report to the Extended Commission/ CC8, that there were 360 vessels in its artisanal longline fleet (< 30GT) during 2012 that caught SBT but were not included in the CCSBT authorised vessel list.
しかしながら、CDS 文書の分析では、問題の程度は 2012 年中及び 2013 年上半期において顕著にな改善が見られたことに留意されたい。しかしながら、既に触れたとおり、インドネシアが、拡大委員会/CC8 に対する国別報告書の中で、2012 年に CBT を漁獲したが CCSBT 許可船舶リストには掲載されていない沿岸零細はえ縄漁船 (30 トン未満) が 360 隻存在することを指摘した。

Recommendations

勧告

There are no recommendations for change, but the Secretariat would like to note that, wherever possible, it is important that vessel authorisation renewals are submitted prior to current authorisations expiring.

事務局からは変更に関する勧告はないが、許可船舶の更新は、可能な場合には、現行の許可の期限が切れる前に提出することが重要であることを指摘したい。

Secretariat Recommended Changes to the CDS Resolution

Where practical, recommended changes to relevant parts of the CDS resolution are shown in tracked mode below.

1. Add a requirement more clearly defining how long original CDS documents need to be retained

6.1 Members, Cooperating Non-Members and OSECs shall retain all original CCSBT CDS Documents (or scanned electronic copies of the original documents) received by them for a minimum of 5 years after the most recent signed date on the form. Members, Cooperating Non-Members and OSECs shall also retain a copy of any CCSBT CDS Documents issued by them for a minimum of 5 years after the most recent issuing state/entity signed date on the form. Copies of these CDS Documents (except the Catch Tagging Form) shall be forwarded to the Executive Secretary on a quarterly basis.

2. Add a requirement that copies of any modified CDS forms are placed on the public area of the CCSBT website

6.4 The Executive Secretary will post on the public area of the CCSBT web site

a subset of the report comprising:

- Flag State/fishing entity;
- Harvest year;
- Product destination (including landings of domestic product);
- Gear code;
- Net weight;
- Estimated whole weight (calculated by applying a conversion factor to the net weight);
- copies of all modified CDS forms provided in accordance with paragraph 3.4.

3. Validation of transhipped, domestically landed SBT

The CMF form and associated instructions:

CMF Form:

“Validation by Authority (not required for exports transhippedments at sea): I validate that the above information is complete, true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.”

CMF Instructions:

“**Validation by Authority (not required for exports transhippedments at sea):** If this is not an export being transhippedment at sea, enter the name and full title of the official signing the document, together with the signature of the official, date (dd/mm/yyyy) and official seal. For SBT transhipped at sea and then landed domestically, validation should occur at the point of domestic landing (i.e. after transhipment).”

4. CMF Transhipment Section Instructions

CMF Instructions:

“**Certification by Master of Fishing Vessel** ~~(only required for transhipments at sea)~~: In the case of all transhipments ~~at sea~~, the master of the fishing vessel shall complete this section, with his/her full name, signature and date (dd/mm/yyyy) to certify that the form correctly records the catch/harvest information.”

5. Discarded Tags

CDS Resolution: Appendix 2

Minimum Procedural and Information Standards for CCSBT Member and Cooperating Non Member Tagging Programmes

2. Members and Cooperating Non-Members shall take steps to ensure that SBT tags cannot be re-used by implementing the following procedures for each fishing season:

a. Securely disposing of all unused tags.

b. Reporting to the Executive Secretary within 3 months after the completion of each fishing season the tag numbers of any:

- tagged SBT which were discarded overboard, or

- tags that were lost and/or not used.

6. REEF Form Document Submission Requirements

The first two paragraphs of the REEF form instructions could be modified to more clearly specify:

“This form must accompany all re-exports of SBT and all exports of SBT that have previously been landed as domestic product, and a copy must be provided to the issuing State/Fishing Entity.

One REEF form must be issued for:

- each CMF that was previously landed as domestic product but is now being exported, or
- each REEF shipment that was imported and is being re-exported, together with its previously associated REEF(s) and CMF(s).

In addition, ~~this~~each REEF form must be accompanied by a copy of the associated Catch Monitoring Form and copies of any previously issued Re-Export/Export after Landing of Domestic Product Forms for the SBT being exported.

.....”

CCWG2 Recommendations for Clarification and/or Potential Amendment of the CDS Resolution

1. Clarify which items actually constitute the CDS Resolution

The CCWG2 made no recommendation regarding this item, however the Secretariat suggests that for clarity, Section 1.1 of the Resolution is amended as follows:

“1.1 The CDS Resolution includes the main Resolution text, all of the appendices (including the attached CDS forms and the associated form instructions), and tagging of SBT. All Members and Cooperating Non-Members shall implement the CCSBT CDS for southern bluefin tuna (SBT) to document the movement of all SBT as outlined in this resolution. ~~The CCSBT CDS incorporates CCSBT CDS documentation and tagging of SBT.~~”

2. Possible amendment to paragraph 1.2 of the CDS Resolution

“1.2... . However, the exportation/import of fish parts other than the meat³ (*i.e.* head, eyes, roe, guts, tails) may be allowed without the document.”

Footnote:

“³Any meat separated from fish parts is considered to be meat in this context.”

3. Possible amendment to the Catch Tagging Form instructions of the CDS Resolution

One option discussed at CCWG2 was to modify the instructions on the back of the CTF to read as follows:

“Enter the fork length of the fish, rounded to the nearest whole centimetre.

In cases where SBT can be measured at the time of kill:

Measure the straight line horizontal (not curved over body) length of the fish from the closed mouth to the fork of the tail before freezing and tailing as shown in the diagram below.

In cases where length cannot be measured at the measure of kill, but is instead measured upon landing, and after tailing and before freezing:

Measure the straight line horizontal (not curved over body) length of the fish from the closed mouth up to the point where the tail was removed, and then apply an appropriate conversion factor to this length measurement to convert it to a fork length measurement.”

Table 1: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the 2012 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	33	538,197	GG	24	303,973
Taiwan	15	207,931	GG	11	140,105
TOTAL	48	746,128		35	444,078

Table 2: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the first half of the 2013 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	3	31,971	GG	2	29,140
TOTAL	3	31,971		2	29,140

Table 3: Summary of Transhipments at sea versus CDS Forms versus Observer Reports for the 2012 Calendar Year⁷

Fishing Vessel Flag	Comment	Number of Transhipments	Total Weight (kg) from Transhipment Declaration	Total Weight (kg) from CDS	Total Weight (kg) from Observer Report
Japan	All data provided	16	304,802	278,059 321	297,577
Taiwan	All data provided	8	109,135	109,135	109,382
Japan	Observer report provided, no SBT weight specified	5	102,374	102,440	Weight not provided
Taiwan	Observer report provided, no SBT weight specified	1	9,428	9,428	Weight not provided
TOTAL		30	525,739	499,062324	406,959

⁷ This report is limited to transhipments where observer reports have been provided, and where the Secretariat has been able to match CDS information

Compliance with CCSBT measures for the period 01-Jul-2012 to 30-Jun-2013

For CDS data, these tables cover the 2012 Calendar year and the first quarter of 2013, because data for Jan - Mar 2013 is to be provided by 30 June 2013.

Table 1: Compliance with Measures

		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
Data	Monthly Catch Reports	✓	F	✓	✓	✓	F	F	F	F
	Quota Allocation & Final Catch per entity									
	• <i>Initial Allocation (2011/12)</i>	F	n/a	✓	F	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	• <i>Final Catch by Vessel (2011/12)</i>	✓	X	✓ ¹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
	Scientific Data Exchange									
	• <i>Total Catch by Fleet</i>	✓	P	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	P
	• <i>Catch and Effort</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Size Data</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Direct Ageing</i>	✓	NRDE	✓	X	✓	✓	NRDE	NRDE	NRDE
• <i>Other²</i>	P	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	
CDS (during 2012 Calendar year)³	% of Forms submitted where Validators were correctly authorised to validate	99.8%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ⁴	X
	CMFs submitted in accordance with timeframes	✓	P	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	F	X
	% of CMFs for Domestic Landings that contain complete and accurate information ⁵	94.9%	n/a	69.5%	n/a	95.3%	69.0%	n/a	91.7%	X
	% of CMFs for exports that contain complete and accurate information ⁵	96.7%	88.4%	n/a	92.3%	94.8%	93.3%	0%	77.0%	X
	% of CMFs with all correctly corresponding CTFs (where required)	99.4%	97.2%	97.1%	92.3%	97.8%	96.4%	100%	100%	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish numbers exactly match CMF</i>	96.8%	99%	96.1%	100%	99.1%	96.2%	100%	94.5%	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish weights within 2.5% of CMF</i>	98.0%	99%	95.1%	100%	98.9%	98.1%	100%	80.8%	X
	% of CMFs for Domestic Landings with valid authorised vessels	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	100%	X
% of CMFs for Exports with valid authorised vessels	100%	95.9%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	X	

		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
CDS (during 2012 Calendar year): Continued	Number of export CMFs where an export copy has not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by the exporter, but an importer copy has been received	All received	27	n/a	All received	4	All received	All received	All received	n/a
	Number of CMFs where the importer copy of the CMF has not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by the importer	These statistics will be provided in the 2014 Compliance with Measures paper								
	% of import CMFs received where the import section contains complete and accurate information	These statistics will be provided in the 2014 Compliance with Measures paper								
CDS (during first quarter of 2013)³	% of Forms submitted where Validators were correctly authorised to validate	91.7%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CMFs submitted in accordance with timeframes	✓	P	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	% of CMFs for Domestic Landings that contain complete and accurate information ⁵	50% ⁶	n/a	61.9 79.1 %	n/a	80%	50 50%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	% of CMFs for Exports that contain complete and accurate information ⁵	0%	57.6% ⁷	n/a	100%	67.6%	67.7 100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	% of CMFs with all correctly corresponding CTFs (where required)	0% ⁸	98.1% ⁸	81%	100%	81.4%	40%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	• % of CTF where fish numbers exactly match CMF	0% ⁸	97.2%	100%	100%	94.3%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	• % of CTF where fish weights within 2.5% of CMF	0% ⁸	99.6%	100%	100%	88.5%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	% of CMFs for Domestic Landings with valid authorised vessels	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	% of CMFs for Exports with valid authorised vessels	100%	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number of export CMFs where an export copy has not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by the exporter, but an importer copy has been received	All received	78	n/a	All received	2	All received	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number of CMFs where the importer copy of the CMF has not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by the importer	These statistics will be provided in the 2014 Compliance with Measures paper								
	% of import CMFs received where the import section contains complete and accurate information	These statistics will be provided in the 2014 Compliance with Measures paper								

Transshipments	Deployment Requests Received	n/a	n/a	P	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Deployment Requests contain correct information ⁹	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Transshipment Declarations received	n/a	n/a	P	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Transshipment Declarations contain correct information ¹⁰	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Carrier vessel authorised at time of transshipment	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Fishing Vessel authorised at time of transshipment	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Members Reports submitted in 2012	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Members Reports submitted in 2013	n/a	n/a	P ¹¹	nya	n/a	nya	n/a	n/a	n/a
Authorised Vessels/Farms	Fishing Vessel authorisations received	✓	p ¹²	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Carrier Vessel authorisations received	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a
	Farm authorisations received	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
ERS Recommendations	ERS Compliance <u>as advised by Member/CNM</u> (from national report to CC8)									
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Seabirds</i>	✓	X	✓	nya	✓	nya	nya	nya	✓
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Sharks</i>	✓	✓	✓	nya	✓	nya	nya	nya	✓
	• <i>Implement FAO - Sea Turtles</i>	✓	✓	✓	nya	✓	nya	nya	nya	✓
	• <i>Comply with ICCAT Measures</i>	n/a	X	✓	nya	n/a	nya	nya	nya	✓
	• <i>Comply with IOTC Measures</i>	✓	X	✓	nya	n/a	nya	nya	nya	✓
Members Reports in 2013 providing all information as required by templates	CC/CCSBT	✓ ¹³	p ¹³	✓ ^{11,13}	nya	✓ ¹³	nya	nya	nya	✓
	ESC	✓	F	F	F	F	F	X	F	X
	ERSWG	✓	P	F	F	✓	F	X	P	F

Table 2: Number of CMFs from which the CDS Data Percentages were Derived**a) CATCHING MEMBER/CNM CMFs**

CDS Data Submission Period	Number of CMFs on the System	Number of CMFs on the CDS System for each Member/ CNM									Total number of CMFs
		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union	
2012	Domestic Landings CMFs	197	0	105	0	43	10	0	12	0	367
2012	Export CMFs	718	989	0	13	402	45	1	61	0	2229
2012	TOTAL CMFs	915	989	105	13	445	55	1	73	0	2596
First Quarter of 2013	Domestic Landings CMFs	10	0	21	0	10	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	43
First Quarter of 2013	Export CMFs	2	258	0	4	34	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	301
First Quarter of 2013	TOTAL CMFs	12	258	21	4	44	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	344

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

¹ The data were not provided to the Secretariat. However, Japan has advised that the 2011-12 season data were provided to diplomatic posts on 14 September 2012.

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

³ The reconciliation process whereby the Secretariat contacts Members/CNMs with regard to missing data and discrepancies and obtains responses about these is still in progress for the 2012 (4th quarter) and 2013 data. Some figures in this table are likely to improve as this process continues.

⁴ One CMF was submitted to the Secretariat which was not validated by South African authorities. South Africa is investigating and a court case is pending in relation to the company concerned. South Africa issued a replacement CMF validated by the appropriate authority in order to address this initially unvalidated CMF.

⁵ Incomplete/Inaccurate information includes things such as missing information for one or more fields and incorrect information such as invalid codes/conversion factors etc.

It does not include the following items as these items are accounted for separately in other rows of the table:

- forms that include a vessel which was not authorised
- forms that were signed off by validators who were not correctly authorised to validate.

⁶ Australia has not yet submitted tagging data for 2013 and all the errors recorded on these forms were due to that tagging data having not yet been received

⁷ This figure includes 78 CMFs where the Secretariat has received the importer copy of the CMF, but has not yet received Indonesia's copy of the CMF. Forms not received are counted as not complete.

⁸ Australia allows its farms to provide a single Catch Tagging Form at the end of their harvest period. Subsequently the data for the period 1-Jan-2013 to 31-Mar-2013 have not yet been received. It is expected that these data will be provided at the next submission of data due on 30-Sep-2013.

⁹ Correct information is interpreted to mean that the deployment requests contained information relating to SBT and were not revised.

¹⁰ Correct information is interpreted to mean that the Transshipment Declaration contains the same information on SBT (presence and/or weight) as the Observer reports, or has not been revised.

¹¹ A transshipment report was provided but did not include an assessment of the content and conclusions of the reports of the observers assigned to carrier vessels which received transshipments from their tuna longline fishing vessels with freezing capacity (LSTLVs).

¹² Indonesia indicated that there were 360 vessels in its artisanal longline fleet (<30GT) during 2012 that caught SBT but that were not included in the CCSBT authorised vessel list.

¹³ Under section III.(2) – ERS (b) – no Member/CNM provided information on the estimates of total mortality and the methods of scaling used to produce the estimates. That level of detail may be better incorporated into the ERSWG National Reports in future.

Table 1: Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 19 (the “2013 season”)

	Season	Total Allocated Catch (tonnes) ¹	Quota Carried Forward from Previous Season (tonnes)	Effective Catch Limit (tonnes) ²	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report)	Estimated Catch from CDS Documents (tonnes)	Partial Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports ³	Partial 2013 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports ³
Australia	1-Dec-12 to 30-Nov-13	4,713	0	4,678.4 ⁴	Not yet Available	Not yet Available	4,453.5	4,258.8
Indonesia	1-Jan-13 to 31-Dec-13	709	0	709			379.1	379.1
Philippines	1-Jan-13 to 31-Dec-13	45	0	45			19.6	19.6
South Africa	1-Jan-13 to 31-Dec-13	40	0	40			49.9	49.9
European Union	1-Jan-13 to 31-Dec-13	10	0	10			0	0
Taiwan	1-Apr-13 to 31-Mar-14	948	182.2 ⁵	1130.2			509.7	522.2
Japan	1-Apr-13 to 31-Mar-14	2,703	54 ⁵	2,757			2,009.7	2036.6
Korea	1-Apr-13 to 31-Mar-14	948	22 ⁵	970			485.3	485.3
New Zealand	1-Oct-12 to 30-Sep-13	833	0	833			639.6	636.6

Table 2: Allocations Carried Forward to the Season Following CCSBT 19 (the “2013 season”)

Details for the Year and Season in which Fishing Occurred				Details of the Carry-Forward and the Adjusted Allocation for the Year/Season it will be used in					
CCSBT TAC Year	Member	Member's Fishing Season	Allocated Catch (t)	Date the Secretariat was Notified of Carry-Forward	CCSBT Carry-Forward TAC Year	Season that the Member's Catch is to be Carry-Forward to	Allocated Catch (t) ¹	Carry-forward amount to season following CCSBT 19 (t)	Adjusted Allocation (t)
2012	Korea	1 Apr 2012 - 31 Mar 2013	911	07 May 2013	2013	1 Apr 2013 - 31 Mar 2014	948	22.0	970.0
2012	Taiwan	1 Apr 2012 - 31 Mar 2013	911	27 May 2013	2013	1 Apr 2013 - 31 Mar 2014	948	182.2	1,130.2
2012	Japan	1 Apr 2012 - 31 Mar 2013	2,519	30 May 2013	2013	1 Apr 2013 - 31 Mar 2014	2,703	54.0	2,757.0

Table 3: Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 18 (the “2012 season”)

Cells highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported season’s catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit.

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where CDS estimates of the season’s catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates.

	Season	Total Allocated Catch (tonnes)	Effective Catch Limit (tonnes)	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁶	Estimated Catch from CDS Documents (tonnes)	Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2012 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-11 to 30-Nov-12	4,528	4,508.93 ⁷	4,543.5(OL)	4,516.7	4,542.9	4,737.6
Indonesia	1-Jan-12 to 31-Dec-12	685	685	909.7 (CC)	824.6	700.3	700.3
Philippines	1-Jan-12 to 31-Dec-12	45	45	45.5 (DE)	45.5	45.5	45.5
South Africa	1-Jan-12 to 31-Dec-12	40	40	76.6 (DE)	76.9	72.2	72.2
European Union	1-Jan-12 to 31-Dec-12	10	10	4.04 (CC)	No documents received	10.8	10.8
Taiwan	1-Apr-12 to 31-Mar-13	911	911	505 (DE)	464.2	506.1	498.1
Japan	1-Apr-12 to 31-Mar-13	2,519	2,519	2,465 (CC)	2,292.8	2,464.1	2,524.9
Korea	1-Apr-12 to 31-Mar-13	911	911	889 (DE)	888.8	815.4	922.2
New Zealand	1-Oct-11 to 30-Sep-12	800	800	775.15 (DE)	774.7	775.1	775.5

Table 4a: Members' Catch and Allocation for the Two Seasons Combined (2010 & 2011)⁸ Following CCSBT 16 (the "2010 and 2011 seasons")**(Note: This table is for a two year Catch and Allocation)**

Cells highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported season's catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit.

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where CDS estimates of the season's catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates.

	2 Year Fishing Season	Two Season Total Allocated Catch for 2010 & 2011 (tonnes)	Two Season Total Effective Catch Limit for 2010 & 2011 (after Quota transfers) (tonnes)	Two Season Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁶	Two Season Estimated Catch from CDS Documents (tonnes)	Two Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2010 & 2011 Calendar Years Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-09 to 30-Nov-11	8,540	8,030	8,049 ⁷ (DE)	8,050.8 ⁹	8,046.3	7,858.7
Indonesia	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-11	1,302	1,302	1,477.9 ¹⁰ (CC)	1,345.1	1,474.8 ¹⁰	1,474.8 ¹⁰
Taiwan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	1,718	1,718	1642 ¹¹ (DE)	1,669.7 ¹²	1,679.3	1,781.5
Japan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	4,522	4,800 ¹³	4,668 (ESC,DE, CC)	4,532.6 ¹²	4,667.9	4,741.5
Korea	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	1,718	1,718	1,606.1 (ESC & ERSWG)	1,581.3 ¹²	1,606.2	1,572.8
New Zealand	1-Oct-09 to 30-Sep-11	1,508	1,140 ¹³	1,047.2 (ESC)	1,038.0 ¹²	1,046.7	1,074.6

Table 4b: Cooperating Non-Members Catch and Allocation for the Two Seasons separately (2010 & 2011) Following CCSBT 16 (the “2010 and 2011 seasons”)

Cells highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported season’s catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit.

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where CDS estimates of the season’s catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates.

	Fishing Season	Total Allocated Catch per Season (tonnes)	Effective Catch Limit for Season (tonnes)	Season: Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁶	Season: Estimated Catch from CDS Documents (tonnes)	Season: Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2010 & 2011 Calendar Years Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Philippines	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10	45	45	42.5 (DE)	42.5	42.5	42.5
Philippines	1-Jan-11 to 31-Dec-11	45	45	45 (DE)	45	45	45
South Africa	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10	40	40	34.4 (DE)	28.3 ¹⁴	34.4	34.4
South Africa	1-Jan-11 to 31-Dec-11	40	40	48.6 (DE)	53.3 ^{14,15}	53.9	53.9
European Union	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10	10	10	10.8 (DE)	No documents received	2.8	2.8
European Union	1-Jan-11 to 31-Dec-11	10	10	3.3 (OL) ¹⁶	No documents received	9.9	9.9

Table 5: Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 15 (the “2009 season”)

Cells highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported season’s catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit.

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where TIS estimates of the season’s catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates¹⁷.

	Season	Allocated Catch (tonnes)	Effective Catch Limit ¹⁸ (tonnes)	Season: Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁶	Season: Estimated Catch from TIS Documents ¹⁷ (tonnes)	Season: Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2009 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-08 to 30-Nov-09	5,265	5,265	5,242 (CC)	5,005.4 ¹⁹	5,222	5,088.6
Indonesia	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	750	750	641 (CC)	22	640.7	640.7
Philippines	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	45	45	47 (OL + CC)	46.6	44.6	44.6
South Africa	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	40	40	32 (CC)	0	34.3	34.3
European Union	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	10	10	1.77 (OL)	0	1.77	1.77
Taiwan	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	1,140	1,000	949 (ESC)	387	936.8	912.1
Japan	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	3,000	3,000	2,816 (CC)	0	2814	2,657.7
Korea	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	1,140	1,000	1,166 (CC)	593.3	1,123	1,165.5
New Zealand	1-Oct-08 to 30-Sep-09	420	420	417.3 (CC)	182	416.4	318.6

Table 6: Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 14 (the “2008 season”)

Cells highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported season’s catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit.

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where TIS estimates of the season’s catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates¹⁷.

	Season	Allocated Catch (tonnes)	Effective Catch Limit ¹⁸ (tonnes)	Season: Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁶	Season: Estimated Catch from TIS Documents ¹⁷ (tonnes)	Season: Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2008 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-07 to 30-Nov-08	5,265	5,265	5,234 (CC)	5,202 ¹⁹	5,233	5,033.1
Indonesia	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	750	750	900 (CC)	112	873	873
Philippines	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	45	45	44.9 (OL + CC)	50	44.7	44.7
South Africa	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	40	40	45.5 (CC)	0	45.5	45.5
European Union	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	10	10	14.3 (CC)	0	14.3	14.3
Taiwan	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	1,140	1,000	926 (CC)	649	926.6	876.5
Japan	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	3,000	3,000	2,919 (CC)	3	2921	2952
Korea	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	1,140	1,000	1,135 (CC)	1,286	1,140.3	1,134.5
New Zealand	1-Oct-07 to 30-Sep-08	420	420	318.8 (CC)	103.2	318.1	318.6

¹ These allocations in Tables 1 and 2 take into account that South Africa did not accede to the Convention by 31 May 2013, and therefore there was 40t of additional quota which was allocated between Members for the 2013 TAC year

² The effective allocation for this season comprises the allocated catch for the season, plus any amount of unused allocation from the previous season which has been carried forward, minus any voluntary reductions in accordance with the Corrective Actions Policy

³ Data from monthly catch reports are available for catches up to the end of July 2013, therefore the figures in this column represent catches to July 2013 only

⁴ Australia's original allocation for the 2013 fishing season was 4,698t. When South Africa didn't accede to the Convention by 31 May 2013, Australia's allocation for the 2013 season became 4,713t. Australia advised that it had exceeded its allocation for the 2012 fishing season by 34.6t. In accordance with the Corrective Action Policy, Australia then voluntarily reduced its allocation for the 2013 season by the previous season's over-catch of 34.6t, resulting in its current 2013 allocation of 4,678.4t.

⁵ Refer to Table 2, second to last column entitled "Carry-forward amount to season following CCSBT 19 (t)"

⁶ In order of preference, the following information sources were used, (but with most recent data reports taking highest preference regardless of the order below):

- OL – Official Letter
- CC – National Reports to the Compliance Committee
- ESC – National Reports to the Extended Scientific Committee
- ERSWG – National Reports to the Ecologically Related Species Working Group
- DE – Data Exchange (2013)

⁷ On 25 January 2012 (see CCSBT Circular #2012/002), Australia advised that it had exceeded its 2010 and 11 fishing seasons allocation by 19.07t and that it had consequently voluntarily reduced its 2012 allocation to 4,508.93t in accordance with Compliance Policy Guideline 3 (Corrective Actions Policy)

⁸ CCSBT17 decided that that the current TAC allocation decided at CCSBT 16 was to be considered a 2 year total TAC, and could be distributed across the two year period, with unused catch from the first year carried forward to the second year

⁹ This figure has been corrected. A Secretariat error in CCSBT-CC/1209/04 (Rev 3) had incorrectly recorded the estimate as 7,802.9t.

¹⁰ Indonesia, in cooperation with the Secretariat, re-counted its 2010 and 2011 monthly catches and applied conversion factors to convert net weights to whole weights (previously monthly and annual catch weights had been provided as processed weights). This resulted in Indonesia's 2010 and 2011 annual catch estimates increasing from 471t to 635.5t, and from 673t to 839.27t respectively. Indonesia subsequently provided another small update to its 2011 reported catch (it increased slightly to 842.4t) in its report to CC/EC, therefore giving a revised 2011 reported catch total of 1477.9t.

-
- ¹¹ Taiwan's 2011-12 catch was revised as part of the 2013 data exchange process
- ¹² This figure has been updated as part of the Secretariat's ongoing CDS reconciliation work
- ¹³ The effective catch limits for Japan and New Zealand agreed at CCSBT 16 were 2261t and 709t respectively. The figures shown here include a 139t transfer from New Zealand to Japan
- ¹⁴ In December 2012, South Africa requested that the Secretariat update all South Africa's existing CDS catch records of SBT with a product type of dressed ('DR') to instead be recorded as product type 'gilled and gutted with head off' (GGH). This is because South Africa considers the 'GGH' product type description better fits this SBT product than the 'DR' code used previously. 'GGH' has a lower associated Conversion Factor (1.5) than 'DR' (1.8). Therefore, estimates of South Africa's catch derived from the CDS have reduced as a consequence, i.e. CDS catch estimates for South Africa have been reduced for the period from 1 Jan 2010 to the present.
- ¹⁵ This figure includes a total of 2.3t of exports recorded on CDS forms that have been reported as fraudulent by South Africa
- ¹⁶ An update of the EU's 2011 catch was provided in June 2013
- ¹⁷ As reported in CCSBT/ESC/1009/04, the Trade Information Scheme has a number of limitations in estimating global catches, and the TIS should generally underestimate the true weight of the total catch.
- ¹⁸ Includes agreed and voluntary reductions in catch
- ¹⁹ The TIS scheme does not record the month of harvest for farmed product. These figures are taken from the annual TIS farm summaries provided by Australia, and are the weights of product captured for farming.

Characterisation of Global Fisheries for Southern Bluefin Tuna

Includes: (A) Catching Sector, (B) Transporting / landing, (C) Markets, and (D) Monitoring

(A) Catching Sector (2012 calendar year)

Domestic Catch	Catch (t) ¹	No. of vessels ²	Size of authorised vessels in Fleet ³
Longline within domestic waters	1610.6	195	
Australia	58.2	11	21.01m average (17.0m – 22.9m)
Indonesia	700.3	125	21.7m average (12.9m – 28.2m)
New Zealand	775.5	42 ⁴	20.4m average (12.0m – 49.9m)
South Africa	76.6	17 ⁴	37.5m average (21.5m – 49.9m)
Surface within domestic waters	4444.4	5	
Australia	4444.4	4	34.3m average (27.4m – 41.2m)
Recreational	Unknown		
Australia	Insufficient data available to determine		
New Zealand ⁵	0.1		
South Africa	Allowance of 10/day per person but the practicalities of reaching the grounds means that recreational take is unlikely		
High Seas Catch			
High Seas Catch	3992.8	127	
EU	0.3	Unknown	Unknown
Japan	2528	84	49.3m average (43.7m – 57.2m)
Korea	922	7	48.9m average (46.9m – 51.0m)
Philippines ⁶	45.5	1	50.7m average (50.7m – 50.7m)
Taiwan	497	35	48.9m average (30.6m – 57.0m)

¹ Based on the catch data provided to the Secretariat (*i.e.* Data exchange)

² The figures indicate the number of vessels which actually caught SBT based on CDS documents provided to the Secretariat

³ Represents the size range of vessels that actually caught SBT, *i.e.* not the size range of all authorised vessels in the fleet. Unable to differentiate between domestic and high seas based on available information.

⁴ The figure includes vessels flagged to Japan that caught SBT under Joint Venture/Charter agreements with Japan

⁵ NZ has a recreational allowance of 4t, customary allowance of 1t, and allowance for other sources of mortality of 2t

⁶ All Philippines catch assumed to be taken on high seas based on CDS Data from 2012

(B) Transporting / landing (2012 calendar year)

	Australia	EU	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Philippines	South Africa	Taiwan
Number of transshipments at sea (and flag transhipped to) ⁷	0	0	0	Japan: 6 Panama: 7 Vanuatu: 20	0	0	0	0 ⁸	Japan: 1 Panama: 4 Taiwan: 2 Vanuatu: 8
Number & flag of carrier vessels authorised ⁹	0	0	0	Japan: 3 Panama: 12 Singapore: 1 Vanuatu: 14	0	0	Japan: 3 Panama: 13 Singapore: 3 Vanuatu: 10	0	Japan: 2 Panama: 13 Singapore: 1 Taiwan: 3 Vanuatu: 16
Main ports: Domestic ¹⁰	Port Lincoln	None	Jakarta, Benoa (Bali), Cilacap, Pelabuhanratu	8 designated ports (Shimizu, Yaizu, Tokyo, Kawasaki, Yokohama, Yokosuka, Misaki, Oigawa)	Busan	Gisborne, Tauranga, Napier	Unknown	9 designated ports (Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Durban, Port Nolloth, Saldanha, Hout Bay, Hermanus, Gansbaai, Mossel Bay)	Cianjhen fishing port in Kaohsiung
Main ports: Foreign ¹⁰	N/A	Durban, (South Africa) Papeete (Tahiti, French Polynesia)	Unknown	15 designated ports - Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Durban (South Africa), Port Louis (Mauritius), Walvis Bay (Namibia), Mahe (Seychelles), Montevideo (Uruguay), Benoa (Indonesia), Auckland, Wellington, Nelson (New Zealand), Busan (Korea), Dalian (China), Suva (Fiji), Noumea (New Caledonia)	5 designated ports – Shimizu (Japan), Cape Town, Durban, (South Africa), Port Louis (Mauritius), Bali (Indonesia)	N/ A	Cape Town (South Africa)	Unknown	2 designated ports - Cape Town (South Africa), Port Louis (Mauritius)

⁷ Based on the transshipment at sea reports provided to the Secretariat

⁸ At sea transshipments not permitted

⁹ The figures are for vessels which were on the CCSBT authorised carrier vessel list on 1 April 2012

¹⁰ Based on most recent information in Compliance Action Plans and/or National Reports

(B) Transporting / landing (2012 calendar year) continued

	Australia	EU	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Philippines	South Africa	Taiwan
Exports by destination country¹¹	7241.9	none	674.6	0	759.3	671.6	39.6	48.5	307.9
<i>Japan</i>	7220.3		413.3		759.3	664.7	39.6	31.7	305
<i>Korea</i>	19.4		90.5			0	0	0	0
<i>USA</i>	0		169.1		0	3.4	0	16.8	0
<i>Australia</i>			0		0	3.4	0	0	0
<i>EU</i>	0		0		0	0	0	0	0
<i>South Africa</i>	0		0		0	0	0		2.9
<i>China</i>	2.2		0		0	0	0	0	0
<i>All others</i>	0		1.9		0	0.1	0	0	0
Domestic Consumption¹²	31t	0%	No data provided	14.6t	Not yet available	<1%	Not yet available	Not yet available	Not yet available

¹¹ Export quantities (t) calculated using information from CDS Catch Monitoring Forms (using the figures for overall net weights)

¹² This information is provided as part of Members' annual reports to CC8/CCSBT20

(C) Markets (2012 calendar year) Quantities are net weights in tonnes¹³

Importers	Exporters									
	Australia	EU	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Philippines	South Africa	Taiwan	Total
Australia		0	0	0	0	3.4	0	0	0	3.4
Canada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
China	2.2	0	0	0	0	0.04	0	0	0	2.24
France	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greece	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong	0	0	0	0	0	0.04	0	0	0	0.04
Indonesia	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	7220.3	0	413.3		759.25	664.7	39.57	31.7	305	9433.83
Korea	19.4	0	90.5	0		0	0	0	0	109.9
Malaysia	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Philippines	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		2.9	2.9
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thailand	0	0	1.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.69
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Arab Emirates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Kingdom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United States	0	0	169.11	0	0	3.4	0	16.8	0	189.26
Total	7241.9	0	674.6	0	759.3	671.6	39.6	48.5	307.9	

¹³ Export quantities (t) calculated using information from CDS Catch Monitoring Forms (using the figures for overall net weights)

(D) Monitoring (2011 or 2012 fishing year unless otherwise stated)

	Observer Coverage¹⁴			
	As a Percentage of Catch		As a Percentage of Effort (purse seine set or longline hook)	
	2011 fishing year	2012 fishing year	2011 fishing year	2012 fishing year
Australia	12.2% (purse seine) 19.9% (longline sector ¹⁵)	13.8% (purse seine) 7.4% (longline sector ¹⁵)	19.8% (purse seine) 24.0% (longline sector ¹⁵)	11.1% (purse seine) 32.8% (longline sector ¹⁵)
EU	Unknown ¹⁶	Unknown ¹⁶	Unknown ¹⁶	Unknown ¹⁶
Indonesia	0.11%	0.28%	1.57%	4.79%
Japan	14.2%	6.9% (provisional)	10.9%	8.5% (provisional)
Korea	Exact percentage unknown ¹⁷	Exact percentage unknown ¹⁷	Exact percentage unknown ¹⁷	Exact percentage unknown ¹⁷
New Zealand ¹⁸	82.2% (charter) 9.1% (domestic)	82% (charter) 10% (domestic)	74.5% (charter) 10.3% (domestic)	84.6% (charter) 9.5% (domestic)
Philippines	Unknown ¹⁹	Unknown ¹⁹	Unknown ¹⁹	Unknown ¹⁹
South Africa	Exact percentage unknown (charter) ²⁰ 0% (domestic)	Exact percentage unknown (charter) ²⁰ 0% (domestic)	Exact percentage unknown (charter) ²⁰ 0% (domestic)	Exact percentage unknown (charter) ²⁰ 0% (domestic)
Taiwan	0.02%	34.9%	4.2%	31.3%
Vessel Monitoring Systems(2012 fishing year)				
Australia	VMS is mandatory for all SBT vessels. All 51 vessels actually reported to a national VMS (2012 fishing season)			
EU	VMS requirements under CCSBT, CCAMLR, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC apply. All vessels are required to report to the Fisheries Monitoring Centre (FMC) of the flag state and there were no cases of non-compliance.			
Indonesia	(i) Foreign fisheries vessels and other fisheries vessels 100 GT above are compulsory to procure their own transmitter, (ii) fisheries vessel with 60 – 100 GT may borrow transmitter belongs to government (if any stock) and (iii) fisheries vessels below 60 GT will be provided by VMS off line procured by government, although the requirement for VMS for vessels between 30 – 60 GT is currently transitional. 184 out of 258 vessels on the CCSBT authorised vessels list reported to the national VMS during the most recently completed fishing season (as of 5 September 2013).			
Japan	Mandatory for all far seas fishing vessels. All 94 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS in the 2012 fishing season.			
Korea	Mandatory for all SBT fishing vessels. The number of authorised vessels that actually reported to a national VMS is currently unknown, pending receipt of National Report.			
New Zealand	Mandatory in large-scale vessels (>28m), as well as foreign charter vessels; New Zealand flagged and registered vessels operating outside of New Zealand waters; vessels issued with a foreign license to fish in New Zealand waters; and other vessels as specified by the Chief Executive. All 29 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS in 2011/12.			
Philippines	The Philippine Fisheries Administration formally operationalized its VMS to track its flagged vessels operating in IOTC, ICCAT and WCPFC. The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) required commercial fishing vessel owners to submit vessel tracking agreements, authorising BFAR to monitor and track their respective vessels.			
South Africa	Mandatory for all vessels. All authorised vessels fishing in the South African fishery reported to a national VMS.			
Taiwan	Mandatory for all SBT fishing vessels. The number of authorised vessels that actually reported to a national VMS is currently unknown, pending receipt of National Report.			

¹⁴ Based on Members/CNMs' National reports or Compliance Action Plans¹⁵ Includes data only for Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery as no SBT have been caught in the WTBF in recent years. Data are for shots where SBT were caught only¹⁶ The EU complies with IOTC, ICCAT and WCPFC observer requirements; the minimum observer requirements for these RFMOs are fixed at 5%, which in some cases is exceeded by EU vessels¹⁷ Korean observer coverage for 2012 was reported as 12%, but it was not clear if this was 12% of catch or 12% of effort¹⁸ Figures are for a calendar year¹⁹ Observer data was not reported on the basis of catch or effort. The Philippines' 2011 National Report notes that 80 observers were ready for deployment.²⁰ Observer data was not reported on the basis of catch or effort. South Africa's 2011 and 2012 National Reports note that 100% coverage was obtained for foreign fishing vessels, but that no coverage of domestic vessels has occurred since March 2011.