



Phase 1 & 2 combined - Quality Assurance Review On behalf of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna – INTERIM SUMMARY



Undertaken by Global Trust Certification Ltd.

Member Report: Japan

Report Version: English Summary of Final Report

Date of Report: September 18th 2015

Report Ref: QAR 1.2 Final Report (Summary) – Japan - 2015

Commission for the Conservation of Southern
Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)
81A Denison Street
Deakin
ACT
Australia
Tel: 612 6282 8396
Fax 612 6282 8407

Global Trust Certification
SAI Global Assurances
Marine Office
Quayside Business Park
Dundalk
Ireland
Tel: 00 353 42 9320912
Fax: 00 353 42 9386864

Executive Summary

This document is an English interim summary version of the final report and delivered as an interim report of the outcomes, recommendations and conclusions of the review.

Key Finding

Overall, Japan operates a compliant management system against the clauses of the MPR Obligations that were under review. There are a few items, of note that whilst not necessarily resulting in a risk to the intent of the MPR may currently require further clarification and establishment within the management system and its implementation

The QAR Phase 2 confirms that there were no recorded cases of exceeding TAC or national allocations reported and as reported in QAR 1, none recorded by Japan since the application of this management system.

This Quality Assurance Review (QAR) report provides an evidence-based review of Japan's Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) fishery against selected sections, as determined by the CCSBT Secretariat, of CCSBT's Compliance Policy 1, "Minimum performance requirements to meet CCSBT Obligations".

This QAR's consist of two phases;

- Phase 1 which was a desk based consultation which was completed August 31st 2013 with updates in 2015 for additional Minimum Performance Requirements*.
- Phase 2 which was an on-site inspection of the Member's MCS systems and processes documented in the Phase 1 QAR. The phase 2 site visit was conducted from April 15th to 17th 2015 and the report prepared during that period to 31st August 2015.

Minimum performance requirements section that has been added in Phase 2*. The following performance requirements have been added as part of this review.

2.3 allow carriers recording (part of the reprint resolution)

3.1 catch certificate system (AF)

3.3 (offshore) reprint monitoring plan

6.5 Repor to the Compliance Committee (a series of decision / resolution / recommendation)

Japan can be considered the significant market for SBT. In this regard, a focus on the transfer and accountability systems for SBT into the market has been a feature of this review.

- QAR Phase 1 up-dates consisted of a review of recent 2014 fishery data to up-date the MPR's and dialogue via conference calls with Japan in order to document the evidence against each outcome of the QAR and up-date the report.
- QAR Phase 2 consisted of an on-site visit to various locations in Japan to verify the Phase 1 audit by more classical audit techniques, witnessing of certain processes and cross examining records and materials. The SWOT conducted during this Phase 2 review, is based on the

findings from this activity and the summary of gaps identifies any differences between Phase 1 and Phase 2 outcomes.

Phase 2 review, allowing for an on-site audit of the Japanese system for implementing the CCSBT MPR's provided an effective method to verify the findings of QAR Phase 1. The audit allowed direct consultation with a range of organisations that take part in the management of SBT or the fishery itself including; Fishery Agency staff, Port Officials (Nagoya Custom/Shimizu Branch), the Tuna Fishing Associations, National Far Seas Fisheries Research Institute, staff from the Ministry of Trade (Tuna Trade customs) and a visit to Shimizu Port. Overall, most of the information, documentation and practices seen, verified the information already gathered in Phase 1 activities and the reviewers were confident that a well organized and established system is in place, effective at ensuring accountability of SBT according to Japan's national allocation. However, there were some additional findings that may be considered weaker elements of the system, which were not identified in Phase 1 activities. These are presented in the SWOT at the end of the report and also a list of gaps/differences identified based on Phase 2.

The possible points of improvement and recommendations identified in this review include consideration of:

- Better definition or integration of the meaning of release SBT / discard SBT and / or bycatch SBT to further support accuracy in recording in each system
- Strengthening the cross-referencing of data among RTMP, logbook and scientific observer data
- Increased efficiency of at-sea monitoring
- Further development of the DNA testing systems such as by establishing a more random selection of product
- Further risk-based compliance analysis as part of the verification systems used to investigate irregularities post validation.
- Investigate the opportunity to enhance market traceability data for SBT post the point of first sale data that is currently available from CDS.
- Japan is currently not estimating the mortality of commercial discard mortality of SBT. Japan is reporting commercial releases and discard of SBT by number collected through the RTMP at CCSBT data exchange) however, Japan notes that the calculation method for the estimate is still in discussion at the CCSBT Scientific Committee. Japan has informed the review team that once the methodology is agreed, the reporting requirement will be followed. With regard to the current estimate of catches that are released Japan has used a survival rate of 91% for post capture release and derived an estimated annual mortality arising from post capture release of SBT in 2014 of 30 tonnes.

Table 1. Summary of Quality Assurance Review Implementation Information

Phase 1 (already reported)	QAR Contract Period	<i>April-August 2013</i>
	Reviewers	<i>Yoko Tamura- Japanese Lead Reviewer Dave Garforth- Project Lead Reviewer Sam Peacock – Support Reviewer Oliver Wilson- Support Reviewer</i>
	Allocation Period covered	<i>2010 to 2013/14</i>
	Date of consultation meeting(s)	<i>June 24th, 2013</i>
	Length of consultation	<i>4 hour conference call</i>
	List of Member Agencies consulted with.	<i>Fisheries Agency of Japan</i>
	Report Draft for Member Review	<i>July 19th 2013</i>
	Receipt of Member Review Template/Comments	<i>August 14th 2013</i>
Final Report	<i>August 30th 2013</i>	

Phase 2	QAR Contract Period	<i>April-August 2018</i>
	Reviewers	<i>Yoko Tamura- Japanese Lead Reviewer Johanna Pierre – Support Reviewer Dave Garforth – Project Lead</i>
	Allocation Period covered	<i>2010 to 2014/15</i>
	Date of consultation meeting(s)	<i>April 15-17th 2015</i>
	Length of consultation	
	Main consultations	<i>Fisheries Agency , Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry , Ministry of Finance , International Fisheries Resources Institute , the National Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations , Japan bonito and tuna fishery cooperatives</i>
	Draft Report sent to Member	<i>30th May 2015</i>
Final Report to Member	<i>September 20th 2015</i>	

Site visit (Phase 2) Schedule

	15 (Wed)	16 (Thu)	17 (Fri)
Early Morning			[4:30-6:30am] Tsukiji Market Survey and fish auction with accompany of FA and OPRT
AM 8-10	Visiting FAJ [9:40] Greeting Japan commissioner Mr. Endo	[Train: Tokyo 8:03am - Shimizu 9:24am]	
AM 10-12	FAJ session 1: The method of monitoring Japanese LSTLVs for SBT fishery	[9:40-11:00] Nagoya Custom Shimizu Branch Frozn SBT import control [11:00am-12:00pm] Visit of Ports	FAJ Fisheries Coordination Office visit: Observation of RTMP, VMS control routine work, Import document confirmation / permit issuance procedure
PM 14-16	FAJ session 2: CCSBT CDS handling (especially at the time of import)	[1:00-3:00] Visit FAJ Shimizu Branch Landing inspection and landing report documents	FAJ session 3: CCSBT CDS handling (especially at the time of export) and follow-up through the review
PM 16-18	Ministry of Trade "Tuna trade, customs, coordination / control of tuna shipments into Japanese territory"	[3:40-5:00] National Far Seas Fisheries Research Institute to see scientists (who was on board LSTLV as a scientific observer)	[15:00-17:00] Meeting with fishery industry: Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association (Nikkatu) and National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association (Enkatsu)
Place	Tokyo	Shimizu	Tokyo

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Allocated Catch (Individual Member quota)
ASBTC	Attributable Southern Bluefin Tuna Catch
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CDS	Catch Documentation System
FA	Fisheries Agency
FRA	Fisheries Research Agency
IQ	Individual Quota
JAFIC	Japan Fisheries Information Center
JTFCA	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperation Association
JTFCC	Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperation Corporation
LSTLV	Large Scale Tuna Long-line Vessel
MPR	Minimum Performance Requirement
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
METI	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
QAR	Quality Assurance Review
NRIFSF	National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries
RTMP	Real Time Monitoring Programme
SBT	Southern Bluefin Tuna
TAC	Total Allowable Catch

Brief Overview of Japanese SBT Fishery

Japan's SBT fisheries are all commercial fisheries using longline fishing method only. The fishing season is from April 1st to the end of March of the following year. Government determines the total allowable catch (TAC) of SBT based on the national allocation determined at the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), and distributes it to each fishermen and vessels as non-transferable individual quota (IQ). IQ is assigned to individual fishing companies, and the catch is monitored through real time monitoring program (RTMP).

Systems such as Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) and physical inspections at landing ports are established to verify the RTMP data accuracy. As well, Japanese management systems are supported by well-established fisheries legislation and regulatory system with can administer sanctions against violations to support compliance and effective implementation.

Percentage of catch landed at each Port for Fishing Season April 2014 to March 2015.

Port of Discharge	Percentage
Yokosuka	3.0%
Misaki	5.5%
Yaizu	26.7%
Shimizu	62.6%
Oigawa	2.1%
Total	100%

(Source: Fisheries Agency, April 2015 meetings)

At Port Inspections

The Port inspection procedure was described in detail to the auditors during the site visit, including a meeting with FA Inspectors at the actual Portside. A full description of the method of inspection from pre-notification to post inspection reporting with reference to CCSBT MPR is provided in the main report. This proved highly valuable in providing a clear understanding of each step in the inspection process and also helped to identify possible weaknesses based on the harbour patrols carried out (refer below).

Fisheries Agency Shimizu office staff perform a harbour patrol when there is no landed report (generally once a day and amounting to about 200 times a year), in order to monitor landings other than the inspected vessels. This would include foreign vessels and if arising, would include the identification of unreported SBT that could be potentially landed. The local Harbour Patrol also collects intelligence and works with the FA if suspicion of unreported catch arises.

The FA and OPRT also cooperate for the collection of samples of tuna for DNA testing.

First sale of SBT

The FA staff described the procedure with examples for certification of the sales of SBT using the CTF of the CMF, including the identification of and listing of tag numbers for all fish. Similarly, the procedure and forms (REEF) for exporting or re-exporting of landed tuna was presented. Once first sale is complete, the requirement for maintaining the tags on or associated with the fish ends (except for Re-export and Exporting) to buyers in other Countries.

Confirmation of Domestic Catch and Cross Checking

The procedure and documents were presented by FA staff that described the system for accounting for the accumulated annual catch from CDS forms and when discrepancies are investigated based on CMF and the RTMP data comparisons. The system for investigation discrepancies, possible uses of the Scientific Observation Programme was discussed and also the transition to electronic logbooks, which is aimed to be in place for 2016. A full description of the procedure audited is provided in the final report.

Violations and Penalties

No cases of violations and issued penalties had occurred so far at the point of conducting the audit for the 2014/15 SBT fishery (undertaken April 2015). A fuller description about the current approach to enforcement, fishing behaviour and prevention of violations is provided in the full report.

Import/Export Management of SBT in Japan

The audit team met staff at the 'Ministry of Trade' to review the level of coordination between customs and officials concerned with the control of tuna shipments into Japanese territory under the Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Law. Japan operates the world's largest sashimi market for SBT and Japan imports in the range of four times it's own catch. As a comparison, Japan exports of SBT are less than 0.05% of their catch. A description of the coordination between FA and the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry and procedures in place and the forms examined during the site visit is provided in the full report.

Compliance Risk Assessment and DNA testing Programmes

The audit team enquired into the current procedure and developments in risk assessment to support compliance with the FA. An up-date to the DNA testing programme was also provided. Refer to full report.

SBT DNA survey number (domestic SBT target than 2014)		
	Imports- number of fish/(location of sample on body)	Domestic landings
2012	1500検体 (60隻) (25体/隻)	
2013	1500検体 (60隻) (25体/隻)	
2014	1350検体 (54隻)	150検体 (6隻)

3 Member Management System Implementation- Compliance with National Allocations

3.1 Obligation 1.1 (i)

3.1.1 MPR 1 – “Rules in place to ensure that the total ‘Attributable SBT Catch’ of each Member does not exceed the Member’s Allocated Catch for the relevant period.”

<p>Summary</p> <p>Japan's SBT Attributable Catch governs the fishing effort, so as to observe maximum allowable catch levels.</p> <p>As reported by Japan for the years of the review investigation (2010-2015), the SBT Attributable Catch, which is subject to the Member’s Allocated Catch, is below the Maximum Allowable Catch and the Member’s Allocated Catch.</p> <p>Key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Japanese SBT fishing season starts annually on 1 April and finishes at the end of March. • Japan decided to carry 54 tons of uncaught fish from the 2012 allocation over to 2013, and notified the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna of this decision on 30 May 2013. • Japan decided to carry 9 tons of uncaught fish from the 2013 allocation over to 2014, and notified the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna of this decision on 27 May 2014. • Where the TAC or additional distribution by the CCSBT lead to an increase, Japan will adjust its domestic maximum fishing allocation, and make the additional allocation available to fishing vessels or other applicants. • No rebate measures are required for surplus catches over the years 2012 – 2014.
--

Fishing Year	National Allocation	Carry Forward	Domestic total quota	Total Catch
2010*/11	2,200	0	2,200	2,083
2011*/12	2,600	117	2,717	2,585
2012/13	2,519	N/A	2,519	2,465
2013/14	2,703	54	2,757	2,694
2014/15	3,403	9	3,412	3,361
2015/16	4,847	41	4,888	(not available)

3.1.2 MPR 2a(i): [Operating systems and processes established to implement annual catching arrangements, including] Specification of allocations by company, quota holder or vessel

Summary - The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries will allot individual fishing quotas within the range of the maximum allowable catch to those in possession of a permit for pelagic bonito and tuna fishing (hereafter called 'pelagic bonito and tuna fishing permit holders') per fishing quota applicant and their vessel(s), on the basis of the Permit of designated fishery, as well as Article 57 of the Ordinance relating to its regulations and such (regulations based on the Fisheries Act and the Act on the Protection of Fishery Resources). Where the total fishery catch amount desired exceeds the maximum allowable catch, quotas will be decided proportionally on the basis of the permit holder's fishery performance during the preceding three years, and taking into account operating capacities. In Japan only commercial fisheries are involved in catching SBT, and by-catches and such are not allotted to sectors such as recreational fishing. Mortality rates that occur as a result of research are allocated separately as Research Mortality Allowances (RMA). They are reported to the CCSBT, and are not included in the quotas by country.

Key points

- In order to catch SBT, Japanese fishery operators require a license for pelagic fishing of bonito and tuna as well as a written fishing quota directive, issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- After the Fisheries Agency has set the limits of the maximum allowable catch, it will receive individual quota applications and fundamentally apportion individual allocations of non-transferable quotas by fishery operator and by fishing vessel.
- Fishery quotas may only be transferred between vessels (in possession of a SBT fishing quota) owned by the same fishery operator.

3.1.3 MPR 2a (ii): [Operating systems and processes established to implement annual catching arrangements, including] Arrangements for daily recording of all catches;

Summary - Under the RMTP, Japanese fishing vessels involved in SBT fishing must report the details of their catch daily throughout the fishing season. The reported data are compiled by the Japan Fisheries Information Service Center. Through the compiled database the Coordination Division of the Fisheries Agency monitors fishing conditions as a daily routine, so as to ensure that the attributable catch does not exceed the allocation limit.

Key points

- Monitoring via the Real Time Monitoring Program (RTMP)
- RTMP information is reported daily by the fisheries operator in person, and provides confirmation of attributable catch information under the Catch

Documentation System (CDS).

- Information from the pelagic longline tuna fishing logbook may be used as reference if this is required for the verification of data. Since 2013, mutual verification has taken place with scientific observers. No obvious statistical discrepancies have been identified. This has occurred under the High-level Code of Practice for Scientific Data Verification Agreement of the CCSBT, and is not an ongoing arrangement.

3.1.4 MPR 2a (iii): [Operating systems and processes established to implement annual catching arrangements, including] Weekly reporting of catches by large scale tuna longliners and monthly reporting of catches by coastal fishing vessels.

Summary

Fishery operators are obliged to present their logbook entries to the Fisheries Agency every ten days. After a fishing vessel's logbook is faxed or otherwise sent to its operator (the individual or company that owns the vessel), it is forwarded to the Fisheries Agency by mail.

Japanese fishing vessels catch SBT on the open seas, and do not engage in coastal fishing.

Key points

- The main purpose of logbook entries is the checking of compliance to conditions for pelagic longline fishing of tuna and information gathering on the catch, rather than the monitoring of allocations.
- The National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries is commissioned by the Fisheries Agency to Check, Compile and analyze logbook data. Where the need arises, data are used as references for inspections.

3.1.5 MPR 2b: [Operating systems and processes established to], in accordance with the CCSBT timeline, monitor all fishing-related mortality of SBT.

Summary - Mortality rates related to commercial fishery are reported under the Real Time Monitoring Programme (RTMP) in numbers of fish released or discarded. On the vessel, released and discarded SBT are each visually assessed as below 20kg, above 20kg, below 40 kg and above 40kg, and recorded as alive or dead on the RTMP information form. Japan presents statistics compiled and analyzed by JAFIC under the RTMP on released and discarded fish in numbers of fish to CCSBT data exchanges when the opportunity arises.

Key points

- In 2013 the National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries conducted an

investigation into post-release survival rates, and reported a roughly estimated survival rate of 91% to the CCSBT Scientific Committee.

- In 2014 it implemented a survey that estimated mortality amounts for released and discarded SBT (CCSBT-OMMP/1406/08), and reported that on average, 73% of the fishing vessels released or discarded SBT, with an annual mortality of 30 tonnes.
- With regard to releases and discards, the Fisheries Agency verifies general trends on an annual basis, using, among others, data compiled by scientific observers. According to these, no obvious cases of increased release or discards occurred while scientific observers were on board.
- Japan has no SBT by-catches through recreational fishing or other fishing operations, and no mortality occurs because of such activities.
- Catches as a result of research activities also contribute to SBT mortalities. These are allotted to a separate Research Mortality Allowance (RMA), which is reported to the CCSBT.

3.1.6 MPR 2c: Ensure accuracy of the “Attributable SBT Catch”, including (for fishing Members) a physical inspection regime of SBT caught by the Member’s fishing vessel

Summary - In order to ensure the veracity of the ‘Attributable SBT Catch, as Part of the Member’s Allocated Catch’, Japan uses a system of certification that enables the tracking of each step during the processing from ship to market of SBT catches by Japanese fishing vessels in accordance with formal regulations. There are eight domestic ports for bringing SBT ashore, and all (100%) of SBT caught is subject to physical inspection.

Key points

- With the objective of inspecting all SBT brought ashore in Japan and based on vessel operators’ requests Fishery Agency inspectors attend the bringing ashore of the catches and inspect these, checking the following:
 - Visual appearance; weight (quantity of entire catch brought ashore as well as individual fish selected by the inspector); the entries, signatures and RTMP in the CDS; duplicates and port of call information; and collating with satellite Vessel Monitoring System trajectories.
- Examination of 100% of the catches brought ashore occurs at the request of the fishery operator.
- Inspectors are involved in port patrols, but such patrols are largely restricted to Shimizu Port; patrolling rarely occurs at other ports.

3.1.7 MPR 3: All fishing-related SBT mortality is reported annually to the Extended Scientific Committee, for incorporation into stock assessment analysis, and to the Commission

Summary: In Japan, data on mortality are reported to the CCSBT Extended Scientific Committee as commercially retained catches, and discard and mortality (in numbers of fish released or discarded).

- Commercial SBT mortality is reported daily under the RTMP as catch size (commercially retained catch) and numbers of released SBT (commercial discard and mortality), which are compiled by JAFIC.
- The data compiled by JAFIC are recompiled and analysed by the National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries, and are then made available at the CCSBT data exchange.
- Japan has been given Research Mortality Allowance (RMA) of up to 1 tonne per year, which is reported separately.

3.1.8 MPR 4: Operating systems and processes applied to monitor compliance with annual catching arrangements, and impose sanctions or remedies where necessary.

Summary:

The management of attributable catches on Japanese fishing vessels is delegated separately to fishery operators and vessels. Upon individual application by the fishery operator RTMP data are verified by weighing the catch brought ashore. From hauling the catch in through to bringing the catch ashore at the designated port, the particulars of transshipment at sea or in foreign ports, calling in at foreign ports and the like, are recorded by means of a system of certification. Individual management procedures for landed inspection are managed under the law, and violators will have sanctions imposed such as fines, imprisonment, or exclusion from fishing allotments.

Port patrols are conducted by employees of the Fisheries Agency, although these are mostly limited to Shimizu Port. Until the 2013 fiscal year, a small number of patrol boats were dispatched to the fishing waters annually but these were discontinued in 2014 due to a lack of boats. It is doubtful that performance checks and verification methods contribute to effective monitoring. At present, utility time in foreign ports is restricted to Cape Town only, but information exchange is thorough.

Key points

- After collecting the Catch Monitoring Form (CMF), the Fishery Agency Coordination Division checks its entries, as well as signatures, and production and trade processes.
- The reported weight of the SBT is compared with the weight at the time of the landed inspection, and if the difference is 2% or more, an investigation into the cause will be held.
- There have been no recent occurrences of violations or imposition of penalties in relation to SBT fishery in Japan.



3.2 Compliance with National Allocations 2 (CCSBT Obligation 1.1(iii))

3.2.1 MPR 1a: [Operating systems and processes must be in place to ensure that]An accurate, verified and robust figure for the final Attributable Catch is available before the notification to the Secretariat of the carry-forward, and a report on the adoption and use of the carry-forward procedure is included in each annual report to the Extended Commission.

Summary –

Refer to 3.2.2 response below, which is also addresses this MPR.

3.2.2. MPR 1b: The Executive Secretary is formally notified of the catch for the concluded quota year together with the available catch limit (Catch Allocation + carry-forward) for the new quota year within 60 days of the start of the new quota year.

Summary :

On 30 May Japan formally reported its Member's Allocated Catch (2689 tonnes) + carry-over (54 tonnes) to the Commission.

Procedures are established and implemented for the verification of the CDS SBT total fishery volume largely through cross checking with RTMP and the system of validation that Japan operates. Possible weaker areas are presented in the SWOT at the end of the report, most specifically related to official inspections of declared SBT.

3.3 Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels (CCSBT Obligation 2.3(i) + (ii))

MPR 1a: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] All owners and operators of authorised farms, fishing vessels, and carrier vessels, and all SBT processors, importers exporters and re-exporters, are aware of their CCSBT obligations.

MPR 1b: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] CDS documents accompany SBT as relevant, including

(i) a Catch Monitoring Form (CMF) for all transshipments, landings of domestic product, exports, imports and re-exports;

(ii) a Re-export/Export After Landing of Domestic Product (REEF) for all exports of SBT landed as domestic product then exported, and for all re-exports of imported SBT (any REEF must also be accompanied by a copy of the associated CMF and copies of any previously issued REEFs for the SBT being exported); and

(iii) a Farm Transfer Form (FTF) for all transfers of SBT between authorised farms within the Member's jurisdiction;

MPR1c: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] All entities with CDS certification obligations have certification requirements, including that the certifier for the Catch Tagging Form (CTF) should be the Vessel Master or other appropriate authority for any wild harvested SBT, and the Farm Operator or other appropriate authority for any farmed SBT.

MPR 1d: [farming States only]. Error! Bookmark not defined.

MPR 1e: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] Compliance with certification procedures is verified. Error! Bookmark not defined.

Summary – In Japan, obligations with regard to compliance with CCSBT resolutions in relation to transshipments are imposed on SBT carrier vessels; carrier vessels are registered when accepting transshipment, and reported to the CCSBT Executive Secretary.

Key points

- In Japan, the posting of a carrier vessel carrying SBT from a licensed SBT fishing vessel to the list of registered carrier vessels (and published on the Fisheries Agency web page) will in fact, on the basis of Article 59 point 4 of the 'Ministerial Ordinance on the Permission, Regulation, Etc. of Designated Fisheries', license the transshipment; carrier vessels posted on this list are reported to CCSBT.
- In Japan, a request is sent to a local fisheries management body that has jurisdiction over the area where a transshipment at sea is to take place (when SBT is transshipped, this will be IOTC or ICCAT) for a detachment of transshipment observers. IOTC or ICCAT then dispatches neutral observers under a local programme that is part of the observer programme administering transshipments. Furthermore, CCSBT have signed a memorandum of understanding with IOTC and ICCAT, and observers from both these agencies act as CCSBT observers. In accordance with their obligations with regard to compliance with CCSBT resolutions, licensed carrier vessels must conform to this dispatch programme.
- Each time a modification has occurred in the information about a registered carrier vessel, the Fisheries Agency will report this to the Executive Secretary, using data submission protocols.

3.4 Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels 2 (CCSBT Obligation 2.3(iii))

Summary

Presentation of a 'VMS Location Information Licensing Agreement' is one of the conditions for the Fishery Agency issuing a license to carrier vessels applying for a permit to carry SBT.

3.5 Catch Documentation System 1 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (i) – (v))

3.5.1 MPR 1a: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] All owners and operators of authorised farms, fishing vessels, and carrier vessels, and all SBT processors, importers exporters and re-exporters, are aware of their CCSBT obligations.

3.5.2 MPR 1ab: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] CDS documents accompany SBT as relevant, including

(i) a Catch Monitoring Form (CMF) for all transshipments, landings of domestic product, exports, imports and re-exports; (ii) a Re-export/Export After Landing of Domestic Product (REEF) for all exports of SBT landed as domestic product then exported, and for all re-exports of imported SBT (any REEF must also be accompanied by a copy of the associated CMF and copies of any previously issued REEFs for the SBT being exported); and (iii) a Farm Transfer Form (FTF) for all transfers of SBT between authorised farms within the Member's jurisdiction;

Summary - In Japan, holders of SBT as well as SBT fishery entrepreneurs/operators/carriers, together with all those involved in the processing, importing, exporting or re-exporting of SBT are notified of their obligations associated with the SBT fishing industry and the handling of SBT catches via web pages and such when applying for a permit. No export permits will be issued without the prescribed forms.

Key points

- The Fishery Agency takes the necessary steps towards compliance with and visibility of the Catch Documentation System by notifying operators associated with the SBT fishery industry of the rules for compliance such as the 'Matters to be Observed in Relation to SBT', and through the distribution of CDS forms and tags and such via organizations belonging to the fishery industry. Permits for transshipment, import, export or re-export of SBT will not be issued without an appropriately completed Catch Monitoring Form.

3.5.3 MPR1c: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] All entities with CDS certification obligations have certification requirements, including that the certifier for the Catch Tagging Form (CTF) should be the Vessel Master or other appropriate authority for any wild harvested SBT, and the Farm Operator or other appropriate authority for any farmed SBT.

Summary –

The Catch Tagging Form must be signed by the vessel's master or chief fisherman, and by an

authorized representative of the Fishery Agency.

3.5.4 MPR 1d: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] All entities involved in towing and farming SBT have procedures to (i) record the daily mortality of SBT during catching and towing, and the quantity (number and weight in kilograms) of SBT transferred to each farm; and (ii) use these records to complete the Farm Stocking Form at the end of each fishing season and before the SBT are recorded on a CMF.

Summary –

No SBT farming is carried out in Japan.

3.5.5 MPR 1e: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that] Compliance with certification procedures is verified.

Summary –

In addition to daily monitoring by means of the Real Time Monitoring Programme (RTMP) and VMS, when a Catch Tagging Form is submitted, its contents are verified through transshipment reports and such, and SBT weighing and visual inspection are carried out at the landed inspection to confirm the details of SBT landed and declared as accurate through certification signature. Following the initial purchase, the CMF is collected, and is compared with the attributable catch report to ascertain that there are no discrepancies, and that the CMF is signed at each stage.

3.5.6 MPR 2: Any use of specific exemptions to CDS documentation (allowed for under obligation 3.1 A (ii) for recreational catch) must be (a) explicitly allowed and this decision advised to the Executive Secretary; and (b) have associated documented risk-management strategies to ensure that associated mortalities are accounted for and that recreational catches do not enter the market.

Summary –

There is no recreational fishing of SBT in Japan and therefore no exemptions requested in this regard.

3.5.7 MPR 3: Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure all CDS documents are uniquely numbered and completed fully and in accordance with the document's instructions.

Summary – The CMF must contain the ship's call sign and the form's unique numbers, including the serial numbers showing the order of catch. Once the process is completed, the

CMF is collected by the Fishery Agency, where the completed form and the total attributable catch are compared and collated with other catch data.

3.6 Catch Documentation System 2 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (vi))

3.6.1 MPR 1: Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that at all times only carrier vessels authorised on the CCSBT Record of Carrier Vessels for the transshipment date are permitted to receive at-sea transshipments from the Member's LSTLVs.

Summary –

When a SBT transshipment from a domestic vessel is reported before the event, the CMF/CTF forms received from the Fishery Agency together with the vessel's registration and permit numbers are signed by the observers. After the transshipping, the transshipment report, containing the observers' signatures and the vessels' registration numbers, is forwarded to the Fishery Agency.

3.6.2 MPR 2: Rules established and implemented to prohibit (a) the landing, transshipment, import, export or re - export of SBT caught or transhipped by non - authorised fishing/carrier vessels, and (b) the transfer of SBT to, between or harvested from farms which were not authorised to farm SBT on the date(s) of the transfers/ harvests.

Summary –

Documentation requirements:

- For bringing ashore SBT from a domestic vessel: a planning report for landing, accompanied by the vessel's call sign and permit numbers;
- For transshipment: an application prior to transshipment, and a post-transshipment report with the observers' signatures;
- When importing: the registration number of the fishing vessel or carrier vessel, a fishing permit signed by a government official from the country where the fish was caught (or farmed), a re-export permit signed by a government official from any stopover countries, and an original letter from the Fishery Agency, confirming that the shipment does not contravene policies regarding legally listed authorized vessels or fish farms;
- When exporting or re-exporting: documentation relating to the trading of the SBT.

3.7 Catch Documentation System 3 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (vii) – (ix))

3.7.1 MPR 1: The Executive Secretary shall, in consultation with Members, determine whether proposed modifications are minimal or significant with respect to this obligation.

Summary –

Since at landing multiple buyers may become first recipients of the catch from a single vessel, the recipient lines in the domestic sale section on the form have been increased, in order to enable all buyers to be recorded onto a single CMF. Japan notified the Executive Secretary on 13 January 2015 that this will be applied to CDS and CTF from April 2015. The office accordingly circulated the amended contents to its members on 19 January.

3.7.2 MPR 2: Modified documents remain compatible with approved forms to ensure data series remain continuous and so they can be uploaded by the Secretariat.

Summary

Modified documents remain compatible with approved forms.

3.7.3 MPR 3: Modified documents are provided to the Executive Secretary in electronic format at least 4 weeks prior to the use of such documents and with proposed modifications clearly highlighted.

Summary

Japan informed the Executive Secretary of the application of this modification to CDS and CTF from April 2015 by electronic means about 2½ months earlier, on 13 January. The Executive Secretary accordingly circulated the amended contents to its members on 19 January.

3.8 Catch Documentation System 4 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (x) - (xii))

3.8.1 MPR 1(a): [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that CCSBT Catch Tagging Program requirements are met, including] Ensuring all SBT tags meet the minimum specifications in paragraph s of appendix 2 of the CDS Resolution.

Summary –

The SBT tags that are used by all CCSBT member countries except Australia are procured according to specifications set by CCSBT. The manufacturer, 'Tanaka Marine Supplies' (Tanaka Sen'yohin) delivers to domestic fishery industry associations to order, and the tags are used on domestic fishing vessels.

3.8.2 MPR 1(b): [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that CCSBT Catch Tagging Program requirements are met, including] recording the distribution of SBT tags to (i) entities authorised to fish for, or farm, SBT; and (ii) where applicable, entities which received tags to cover exceptional circumstances.

Summary –

SBT tags are widely distributed among fishery operators by Japanese bonito and tuna fishery associations and Japanese pelagic bonito and tuna fishery associations, and records are kept of the numbers distributed. Leftover tags are incinerated at the end of each fiscal year.

3.8.3 MPR 1(c): [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that CCSBT Catch Tagging Program requirements are met, including] requiring a valid tag to be attached to each SBT brought on board a fishing vessel and killed (including SBT caught as incidental bycatch) or landed and killed from a farm.

Summary –

In article 58 of the ‘Ministerial Ordinance on the Permission, Regulation, Etc. of Designated Fisheries’, the Fishery Agency has made it compulsory to apply proper tags for SBT. In accordance with this directive, fishery associations manage and supervise compliance.

3.8.4 MPR 1(d): [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that CCSBT Catch Tagging Program requirements are met, including] requiring tags to be attached to each fish as soon as practicable after the time of kill.

Summary –

According to the conditions in relation to SBT set by the Fishery Agency, the physical condition of a SBT when caught must be checked before freezing, and operators should ascertain the sex as they remove the internal organs and tail and weigh the fish. Article 58 of the Ministerial Ordinance on the Permission, Regulation, Etc. of Designated Fisheries prescribes application of a tag showing the vessel’s call sign and a serial number in the order of catch to each SBT in order of being caught.

3.8.5 MPR 1(e): [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to ensure that CCSBT Catch Tagging Program requirements are met, including] requiring details for each fish to

be recorded as soon as practicable after the time of kill including month, area, method of capture, as well as weight and length measurements carried out before the SBT is frozen.

Summary –

As noted in 3.8.4, The SBT's length and weight should be measured before freezing, and detailed information such as date, method and area of capture should be recorded in the associated catch documentation. In Japan the same information as that on the tag is written on a sheet of paper that is attached to the fish, in order to facilitate reading the information for each fish at a glance.

3.9 Catch Documentation System 5 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xiii) - (xviii))

3.9.1 MPR 1: Operating systems and processes established and implemented to:

- (a) meet procedural and information standards set out in appendix 2 of the CDS resolution;**
- (b) identify any unauthorised use of SBT tags;**
- (c) identify any use of duplicate tag numbers;**
- (d) identify any whole SBT landed, transhipped, exported, imported or re-exported without a tag;**
- (e) ensure that tags are retained on whole SBT to at least the first point of sale for landings of domestic product; and**
- (f) ensure a risk management strategy (including random or risk based sampling) is in place to minimise the opportunity of illegal SBT being marketed.**

Summary –

At the landed inspection in Japan of SBT caught by a domestic vessel, the presence of tags on each SBT is established visually by physical inspection. Cross checking of CDS Tagging records forms part of the validation procedure which also includes the CTF and REEF for confirmation of transfer of tags as part of the verification activity.

Particularly in Shimizu Port, frequent surveillance patrols occur and coordination with FA occurs to identify and eliminate the opportunity for unreported landings and unauthorized use of tags.

Key points

- Unloading without tags applied is prohibited, and all SBT is subject to a visual check at the landed inspection. At transshipments, a CTF containing the tag numbers is required with the transshipment report.
- For imports, a CTF is required, and when exporting, tag numbers are provided on a hard copy of appended form 3, and the documentation is checked.
- In order to verify that no other fish species (in particular yellowfin and bigeye tuna) are concealed, certain fish are selected, either randomly or on the basis of risk factors, and subjected to a DNA test (consent is required for the execution of this test in advance)
- Some ambiguity of the rules for tags to be present on all dressed (gutted) SBT for import and export is understood by all operators and inspectors at time of entry, or whether this is effective as some inspectors performing physical checks appeared to be unaware of the tags.

3.9.2 MPR 2 Operating systems and processes established and implemented to (a) monitor compliance by operators with control measures in section 3.9.1, above; (b) impose sanctions on operators where non-compliance is detected; and (c) report any cases of whole SBT being landed without tags to the Executive Secretary, and minimise their occurrence in future.

Summary –

If the Fishery Agency, at inspections, surveillance and documentation checks, identifies discrepancies in document entries or inspection outcomes, the cause is investigated, and where foul play is in evidence, appropriate sanctions are imposed and reported to the Committee. (No such sanctions have been imposed in recent years).

3.10 Catch Documentation System 6 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xix) - (xxi))

3.10.1 MPR 1a: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] Authorise validators to validate Farm Stocking, Catch Monitoring and Re - Export/Export after Landing of Domestic Product Forms.

Summary –

Validation procedures for CDS - catch monitoring as well as for re-exporting or exporting landed domestic products are available and validation is by a representative of the Fishery Agency.

3.10.2 MPR 1b: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] Demonstrate that all persons with authority to validate CDS documents are (i) government officials or other individuals who have been duly delegated authority to validate; (ii) are aware of their responsibilities, including inspection, monitoring and reporting requirements; and (iii) are aware of the penalties applicable should the authority be misused.

Summary –

Procedures for catch monitoring as well as for re-exporting or exporting landed domestic products are certified and signed for by a representative of the Fishery Agency. Such representatives perceive this responsibility and the measures in connection with misuse of authority within a civil servant system. All transshipment observers who sign CMFs are aware of their individual responsibility as a result training exercises prior to dispatch.

3.10.3 MPR 1c: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] Appropriate individuals certify each CDS form type by each signing and dating the required fields.

Summary – Appropriate individuals carry out verifications during import and export inspections, transshipments and landings.

3.10.4 MPR 1d: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] The same individual does not both certify and validate information on the same CDS form

Summary –

All catch monitoring forms are collected and checked for signatures from appropriate representatives. Validation is by official FA staff who do not perform certification of the CDS forms.

3.10.5 MPR 1e: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] Inform the Executive Secretary of (i) the details for all validators and keep this information up to date; and

(ii) of any individuals removed from the list of validators no later than the end of the quarter in which the removal occurred.

Summary -

The Fishery Agency annually draws up a list of validators and routinely sends updates to CCSBT. In addition, each change is reported to government representatives in charge of SBT management.

3.10.6 MPR 1f: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented to] Ensure that no individual conducts validations (i) prior to the Executive Secretary being fully informed of his/her current validation details, or (ii) after that individual's authority to validate has been removed.

Summary -

Only official registered validators are allowed under the procedure to conduct validation activities.

A clear organizational structure exists with roles and responsibilities defined for all staff to ensure that only Government officials involved in SBT management and reporting are engaged in SBT CDS activities and only certain individuals can receive reports from the CCSBT Executive Secretary.

3.10.7 MPR 2 Operating systems and processes established and implemented to monitor performance (compliance and effectiveness) of validators.

Summary –

Procedures for transshipment reporting and catch monitoring as well as for re-exporting or exporting landed domestic products are in place. Each certified form is validated and signed by the official representative of the Fishery Agency. There is a clear organizational structure within the Resources Management Division of FA. Performance of validators occurs through direct management and internal reporting systems of the FA.

3.11 Catch Documentation System 7 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xxii) - (xxv))

3.11.1 MPR 1a: [Operating systems and processes established to ensure] CDS forms are only validated (i) where all the SBT listed on the form are tagged (except in cases where tags are no longer required due to processing having occurred); (ii) in the case of farmed SBT, for SBT harvested from farms on a date that the farm was authorised on the CCSBT record of

Authorised Farms; and (iii) in the case of Wild Harvest SBT, for SBT taken by FVs on a date when that FV was authorised by the flag Member.

Summary –

With regard to the domestic portion of the catch, in addition to checking CMF and CTF, Government representatives confirm as part of verification whether tags are applied to all landed SBT.

When SBT are imported, A CTF showing information about the catch by a vessel in possession of a permit from the government of its flag state must be produced at the time of application for importation. (With perishable products, this occurs after the importation.)

3.11.2MPR 1b: [Operating systems and processes established to ensure] validated documentation accompanies all SBT consignments whether transhipped, landed as domestic product, exported, imported or re-exported, and (MPR 1c) no SBT is accepted without validation documentation.

Summary –

Validated CMF and CTF are required for the transshipment, landing, import, export and re-export of SBT. Domestic landings are inspected as part of the procedure.

For importation, on the basis of Article 3 no. 7 of the Import Announcement of the foreign exchange and Foreign Trade Law - no import license can be issued for SBT without presentation of prior verification issued by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry based on the presence of correct CMF/CTF (and also documentation verifying that the catch is from a vessel listed as having a legal permit), a CMF, and Inspection certification as well as other importation application documentation.

For the importation of perishable or frozen SBT, no prior verification forms are required, but a CMF or REEF must be presented. On the basis of Article 10 of the Law of Special Measures for Strengthening, Conservation and Management of Tuna Resources the Fishery Agency also requires an 'SBT Import Report' and presentation of a CTF issued by each country, at least ten days prior to importation when frozen, and up to ten days before importation and a check of both CMF and CTF is carried out.

3.11.3 MPR 1d: [Operating systems and processes established to ensure] Validation does not occur where (i) validator authorisation procedures were not correctly followed or (ii) any deficiency or discrepancy is found with the CDS form.

Summary – Validation procedures are in place and alongside training and careful staff management (Of the registered validators), this ensures that procedures are correctly followed. Verification is carried out routinely to confirm that CDS documentation is accurate and correctly documented.

Any changes to the list of authorized persons are reported to CCSBT. When irregularities or contradictions become apparent during validation, the cause is investigated prior to validation proceeding. CCSBT is notified of any investigations and their causes.

3.11.4 MPR 2a: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for a Member to validate SBT product against CDS documents, including] requirements to check accuracy of information by ensuring every CDS document is complete, valid and contains no obviously incorrect information by cross-checking data on the form being validated against (1) data on preceding CDS forms including the Catch Tagging Form; (2) relevant lists of authorised farms, vessels or carriers; and (3) result of any physical inspection by the authority.

Summary –

CMF and CTF presented by fishery operators are checked by Fishery Agency employees in person, and signed. The list of vessels with legal permits ('Positive list') and the Allotted Catch and the RTMP are also consulted as part of this process. All entries on the CDS are then checked after landing.

3.11.5 MPR 2b: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for a Member to validate SBT product against CDS documents, including] notification of any inconsistencies or inaccuracies to the Member's enforcement authorities.

Summary –

If any inconsistencies or inaccuracies come to light during the checking of CDS after landing, the cause is investigated and human faults other than typing errors and such are reported to the Executive Secretary.

3.12 Catch Documentation System 8 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xxvi))

3.12.1 MPR 1: Documents and/or scanned electronic copies stored in a secure location for a minimum of three years under conditions that avoid damage to the legibility of the documents or the data files.

Summary –

All originals of CCSBT CDS and issued CDS received by the Fishery Agency are stored electronically for at least three years. In addition, hard copies are stored for six year by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry.

3.13 Catch Documentation System 9 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xxvii) + (xxviii))

3.13.1MPR1: Copies of all completed CDS documents issued by catching Members or received by importing or receiving Members, sent to Executive Secretary in accordance with timeframes specified in the CCSBT documentation.

Summary –

Evidence demonstrates that Japan issues copies of CDS promptly and within prescribed deadlines.

3.13.2MPR2: Catch Tagging Form information shall be provided to the Executive Secretary using the electronic Data Provision Form developed by the Secretariat and in accordance with the Data Provision Form's instructions.

Summary –

Japan submits data via email using the prescribed electronic format downloaded from the CCSBT web site (Excel Files)

3.14 Catch Documentation System 10 (CCSBT Obligation 3.1 (xxix) + (xxx))

3.14.1MPR 1: Operating systems and processes established and implemented to (a) assign unambiguous responsibility to individuals or institutions for implementing verification procedures; and (b) ensure no verification procedure is carried out for a CDS document by an individual who has validated or certified the same CDS document.

Summary –

Holders of the authority to verify CDS forms are listed on a 'Validator List' which is submitted to CCSBT. The Fishery Agency checks the validity of signatures on CDS after collection. These individuals do not conduct verification duties post the completion of validation activities.

3.14.2MPR 2a: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for verification, including] Selecting and inspecting, where appropriate, a targeted sample of vessels and export, import and market establishments based on risk. The intent of these inspections should be to provide confidence that the provisions of the CDS are being complied with.

Summary –

As part of an analysis of actual domestic distribution in Japan, investigations are conducted into the disguising of the origins of imported, domestically produced or manufactured SBT products (DNA testing) by selecting foreign vessels from a list (since the 2014 fiscal year, Japanese vessels have also been included) to see whether they are bringing in bigeye tuna, or smuggling SBT. The Fishery Agency conducts tag checks on the market twice a month, in order to verify that SBT have the correct tags with the correct information (to see whether the information on the tag matches that of the RTMP).

3.14.3MPR 2b: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for verification, including] Reviewing and analysing information from CDS documents at least once every 6 months, including (i) checking the completeness of data on CDS forms and cross-checking the consistency of the data on CDS forms received with other sources of information; (ii) cross-checking data from the Executive Secretary's CDS six-monthly report; and (iii) analysing any discrepancies.

Summary –

Japan routinely checks the contents of issued CDS, but FA notes that there has been no opportunity to arrange for regular and comprehensive internal reviews every 6 months. However, each year at the end of the catch the CDS are checked for consistency against the overall attributable catch, RTMP and observer data.

3.14.4MPR 2c: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for verification, including] investigating any irregularities suspected or detected and (MPR 2d) taking action to resolve any irregularities.

Summary –

FA advised that where suspected or detected irregularities have occurred, these are always investigated. FA notes that improvement measures are also explored.

3.14.5MPR 2e: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for verification, including] notifying the Executive Secretary and relevant Members/OSECs, of any consignments of SBT whose CDS documentation is considered doubtful, or incomplete or un-validated.

Summary –

FA note that dubious or incomplete CDS in relation to SBT consignments, such as landed inspections, applications for import verification or customs procedures, are investigated, including a physical examination where necessary, and if required, reported to the CCSBT Executive Secretary.

3.14.6MPR 2f: [Operating systems and processes established and implemented for verification, including] notifying the Executive Secretary of any investigation into serious irregularities, in order to present these in an annual summary report to the Compliance Committee. Notifications should include reporting (i) the commencement of an investigation if doing so will not impede that investigation; (ii) progress, within 6 months of starting the investigation if doing so will not impede that investigation; and (iii) the final outcome within 3 months of completing the investigation.

Summary –

In Japan, contents and signatures of CDS are checked and upon receipt, all totals are cross-checked against other data. Where discrepancies occur, these are reported and the causes are investigated. To date, no significant incidences of illegal activity have been found.

3.14.7 MPR 3: Ensure that no SBT is accepted (for landing of domestic product, export, import or re-export) without validated documentation attached.

Summary –

In Japan, legal instruments and a system of verification and inspection is in place. This includes SB validation at landing and for import/export. Without validation of CDS, SBT are not accepted for landing, import or export.

3.15 Transshipment (at sea) Monitoring Program 1 (CCSBT Obligation 3.3 (i) – (v))

3.15.1MPR1a: [Operating systems and processes to ensure] The authorisation document, including details of the intended transshipment provided by the master or owner of the LSTLV, is available on the LSTLV prior to the transshipment occurring.

Summary –

A list of authorized carrier vessels is supplied by Japan to CCSBT. Carrier ships involved in transshipment must submit overseas unloading report (notification of change) and be in receipt of a permit at least ten days before transshipment.

3.15.2MPR1b: [Operating systems and processes to ensure] Any carrier vessel receiving the transhipped SBT is meeting its obligations to provide access and accommodation to observers, and to cooperate with the observer in relation to the performance of his or her duties (see Carrier Vessel Authorisation minimum performance requirements, CCSBT documentation).

Summary –

In addition to being posted on the list of authorized carrier vessels, and in accordance with CCSBT regulations, carrier vessels must apply for an observer dispatch from the Fishery Agency (/proprietor) between 2 months and 15 days prior to transshipment, and consent to cooperation with the CCSBT(IOTC/ICCAT) observer programme.

3.15.3MPR2a-d: [Rules in place to ensure] (a) all SBT transshipments receive prior authorisation; (b) fishing vessels are authorised on the CCSBT authorised fishing vessel register on the date(s) the SBT are harvested and carrier vessels are authorised on the CCSBT authorised carrier vessel register on the date(s) any transshipments occur; (c) a named CCSBT observer is on board the carrier vessel; and (d) no SBT transshipment occurs without an observer onboard.

Summary –

Fishing vessels involved in transshipments must Submit an overseas landing report at least ten days prior to transshipment, and a CCSBT vessel registration number must be shown on the CMF for a pre-transshipment permit. A CMF signed by CCSBT (local) observers after the transshipment must be presented at landing.

3.15.4MPR2e: [Rules in place to ensure] Transshipment declarations are completed signed and transmitted by the fishing vessel and the carrier vessel, in accordance with paragraphs 11-14 of the Transshipment Resolution, in particular that the LSTLV shall transmit its CCSBT Registration Number and a completed CCSBT Transshipment Declaration to its flag State / Fishing Entity, within 15 days of the transshipment.

Summary –

Within 15 days following a transshipment, a complete CCSBT transshipment report, including the CCSBT registration number, must be submitted to the Fishery Agency Shimizu Office.

3.15.5 MPR3a,b: [Operating systems and processes to] Issue transshipment authorisations and verify the date and location of transshipments.

Summary –

When the Fishery Agency receives an overseas landing report for a pelagic bonito or tuna catch from a fishing vessel; the vessel's registration number, VMS tracking and attributable catch size are confirmed. If no problems arise, the report will be signed and will be regarded as a transshipment permit. Following that, the fishing vessel (within 15 days after transshipment) and the carrier vessel (within 24 hours after transshipment) will both submit transshipments reports, and date and location of the transshipment are verified.

3.15.6MPR3c-f: [Operating systems and processes to] Request placement of observers on board carrier vessels; notify any cases of 'force majeure' (where transshipment occurs without an observer on the carrier vessel) to the Executive secretary as soon as possible; ensure observers can board the fishing vessel before transshipment takes place, and have access to personnel and areas necessary to monitor compliance; enable observers to report any concerns about inaccurate documentation or obstruction, intimidation, or influence in relation to carrying out their duties.

Summary –

When the Fishery Agency lists an authorized carrier vessel, verification takes place subject to:

- 1) Observation of the regulations laid down by the CCSBT regarding transshipment, and
- 2) Presentation of VMS loading and VMS data.

When a carrier vessel receives SBT via transshipment it must, in accordance with resolutions

in relation to establishment planning for transshipment for large fishing vessels, submit an observer dispatch application to the Fishery Agency before the appointed day. On the basis of this, the Fishery Agency will organize an observer dispatch via the local fishery organization.

To date, no transshipment has been reported to have taken place without observers on board as a result of circumstances beyond anyone's control.

With regard to observers boarding the vessels, as a guide to observation of regulation in relation to offering adequate facilities, cooperation with equipment arranging and facilities for boarding, the office forwards to the carrier vessel operator the 'Resolutions Regarding Establishment Planning for Transshipment by Large Fishing Vessels'.

The observers will report any interference, intervention, pressure the experienced during the execution of their duties in their report, as well as through their bulletin to the dispatch company.

3.15.7MPR3 g,h: [Operating systems and processes to] monitor compliance with the control measures; and impose sanctions or corrective action programmes for any non-compliance detected.

Summary –

With regard to the compliance status after transshipment, VMS tracking will be checked once per day, and comprehensive checks will be made of the transshipment report and the vessel entering port for unloading. In addition, the Fishery Agency will manage receipt of the transshipment observers' reports from the observers on board and this information is forwarded to the Agency by the local fishery organization at each Port. Any queries will be referred to the carrier vessel's company and if there is no resolution, the vessel may be struck from the authorized vessel list. To date, no incidences of non-observance have been uncovered.

3.16 Transshipment (at sea) Monitoring Program 2 (CCSBT Obligation 3.3 (vi))

3.16.1MPR1: Operating systems and processes are in place to (a) identify and resolve any discrepancies between the fishing vessel's reported catches, CDS documents and the amount of fish counted as transhipped; and (b) 100% supervision of all fish transhipped.

Summary –

The fishing vessels RTMP report data and CDS submitted are checked. Pre-and post-transshipment reports are required from both vessels involved in a transshipment, and their information is collated.



3.16.2MPR2: Operating systems and processes are in place to allow any CDS forms for domestically landed SBT that were transhipped at sea to be validated at the time of landing.

Summary –
Transshipment reports are checked, and their consistency with the landed inspection report is validated.

3.17 Transshipment (at sea) Monitoring Program 3 (CCSBT Obligation 3.3 (vii))

3.17.1MPR1: Rules, systems and procedure to ensure all transhipped product is accompanied by signed Transshipment Declaration until the first point of sale.

Summary –
Rules of procedure are in place; including for landed inspections, requirements for signatures on transshipment reports, transshipment permits in CDS and transshipment observer reports.

3.18 Annual Reporting to the Compliance Committee (CCSBT Obligation 6.5 (i-vii))

3.18.1 MPR1: Submit information and report electronically to Executive Secretary at least 4 weeks before the annual Compliance Committee meeting.

Summary –
Japan issues annual reports before the day of the meeting. Templates for the 16th annual national report sections II (1)(d) : VMS, II (3)(a) i-ii, III(2)(a)-(c), I(3), III(3) have all been completed.

5. Management System Effectiveness (Integrated for Phase 1 & 2)

SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threats) analysis was conducted integrating the results of FA consultation in Phase 2 and the site visit and documents review in Phase 2. To meet the objective of this QAR review, we will report the analysed “Opportunity” replaced as “Recommendation” and “Threats” as “Risk” for compliance for requirements).

Table 4 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks (threats) (SWOT) analysis conducted for Japan’s systems determining compliancy to CCSBT Minimum Performance requirements (MPR’s)

a) STRENGTHS

Strengths associated with Japan’s SBT fishery and associated management in relation to CCSBT’s MPRs

Obligation	MPR	Strengths
1.1 (i)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal requirement that maximum catch of SBT be set in line with CCSBT AC. Reported landings have been below CCSBT AC in the years examined by this review (2010-2014).
	2a (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well established individual quota (IQ) system in place with good function / compliance history. Transfer of quota is minimized and the system well established.
	2a (ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real Time Monitoring Program collects data every day directly from fishing ground and provides real-time information to authority. Mandatory logbooks record catch and effort on a set by set basis.
	2a (iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory logbook submission every 10 days to FA is implemented.
	2b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research Mortality Allowance (RMA) is reported to CCSBT. The general trends of discards are checked every year analyzing scientific observer data. There is no case observed that discards were increased when vessels carrying observers, thus there seems to be accuracy in the reports.
	2c (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All vessels that have reported to land SBT are subject for landing inspection by Fishery Agency. (Refer to weaknesses). CDS scheme in place for every SBT catch / transshipment process until sold.
	2c (ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – Japan does not farm SBT.
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Japan is reporting SBT mortality (commercial retained catch and commercial discard mortality) as required to CCSBT scientific extended committee.
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust laws and regulation with sanction system is established. Specific Law on strengthening report of tuna catch / import / export

		<p>established to supplement CDS. (Tuna law)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VMS onboard all SBT fishing and transshipment vessels and monitored by FA. • Japan compares the total amount of annual SBT catch and the annual catch estimated from CDS documents and discrepancies greater than +/- 2% is investigated, exceeding the mandatory 5%. • Market distribution survey has been carried out to generally understand the outline and trends of SBT distribution in markets, including import and export although detail is not clear.
1.1 (iii)	1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry forward has been determined and reported to CCSBT in compliance with Regulation.
	1b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japan has been reporting the maximum catch limit and carryover amount to CCSBT committee within the required timeframe.

b) WEAKNESSES**Weaknesses associated with Japan's SBT fishery and associated management in relation to CCSBT's MPRs**

Obligation	MPR	Weaknesses
1.1 (i)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to the requirement.
	2a (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to the requirement for allocations to quota holders.
	2a (ii)	<p>There is no opportunity for ensuring whether pre-landed SBT has been reported correctly through RTMP by a third party.</p> <p>The data used for confirming CDS for catch verification comes from RTMP report, which is self-declared by fishing operators. Whilst there are a number MCS requirements (VMS, notification prior to landing, transshipment, DNA sampling) [NB at sea inspection has not been conducted in 2014 and was ineffective in 2013]. As an additional note, Tag numbers are also assigned based on the fishing operator's RTMP report as the sole source of information and CDS documents are created using this information.</p>
	2a (iii)	None specific to the requirement.
	2b	None specific to the requirement.
	2c (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landing inspection is required 100% of time on all SBT-carrying vessels, but this is based on the fishing operator's pre-landing report prior to an inspector being despatched to inspection site. The reviewers were uncertain of the inspection circumstances for a tuna vessel that does not declare SBT and lands other tuna species. Port patrols are also carried out, but this is only mostly limited to Shimizu port, and other ports are patrolled only several times a year. SBT are landed in 5 ports and Yaizu port had 27% landing of SBT during 2014. The coverage of port patrol appears largely biased to the main tuna landing port but does not negate a potential weakness in patrol frequency at other ports.
	2c (ii)	N/A – Japan does not farm SBT.
	3	None specific to the requirement.
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were 2 times (a year) of one-month long at-sea inspections by a surveillance vessel specific to SBT fishery until 2013, however there was no physical inspection conducted and only radio communication was made upon encounter to the SBT fishing Japanese vessel. Moreover, during the 2 years, only 1 vessel was inspected and the surveillance effectiveness is extremely low. From 2014, the surveillance trip had

		<p>stopped and there is no plan to start again. Therefore no at-sea surveillance effect can be expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no system to understand distribution of SBT that are sold outside of traditional market, and with the diversification of SBT marketing routes the lack of information is creating difficulty in understanding accurate volume of SBT consumption. • Although there are sanctions or penalties set for management violations, there is no case of actual application nor the document to show the record. Surveillance control effects and transparency are lacking in their implementation. • Catch report and CDS system are based on fishing operator's report, however the detailed risk analysis for the cases of intentional under-reporting and violation of rules does not seem to exist in the system. The surveillance system is unclear.
1.1 (iii)	1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None specific to the requirement.
	1b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None specific to the requirement.

c) THREATS (RISKS)**Threats (Risks) associated with Japan's SBT fishery and associated management in relation to CCSBT's MPRs**

The weaknesses identified by the QAR have been used to determine potential threats or risks associated with the Japanese SBT fishery. Risks have not been quantified with regard to their relative impact on each MPR Obligation although are presented against one or more MPR where impacts on non-compliance would most likely occur. Potential risks analysed are summarized in the table below.

Obligation	MPR	Risks (Threats)
1.1 (i)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR. Reported catch has been below Japan's CCSBT AC.
	2a (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	2a (ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential risk of not able to detect intentional mis-reporting of RTMP report, and creating CDS documents based on the false information. This is due to the fact that sole source of information to verify CDS is fishermen's report. <p>[Also, there is no at-sea surveillance mechanism (which is the case since 2014) and no other physical pre-landing checking system].</p>
	2a (iii)	None specific to this MPR.
	2b	None specific to this MPR.
	2c (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landing inspections are conducted in response to the fishermen's pre-landing report (mandatory), and random-checking port patrols to check SBT landings are very infrequent other than Shimizu port. There may be a potential risks for authorities to be unaware of undeclared SBT landings in these other ports and if vessels do not declare SBT and land other tunas with SBT inclusions.
	2c (ii)	N/A Japan does not farm SBT.
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low effectiveness of surveillance (or no surveillance since 2014) at sea, and potential for not aware of IUU activities. Potential for not aware of transshipment risk at foreign ports other than Cape Town. Potential for not aware of overall CDS scheme's effectiveness or existing risks in Japan's system objectively, that creates tendency to lack effectiveness on pre-determined measures and internalization of issues.
1.1 (iii)	1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	1b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.

Recommendations for Improvement (Opportunities of SWOT)

Based on the SWOT analysis and review of the effectiveness of management systems against the CCSBT minimum performance requirements from this QAR approach, the review team has provided recommendations for improvement of Japan's fishery management systems.

Obligation	MPR	Recommendations (Opportunities)
1.1 (i)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	2a (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	2a (ii)	<p>Establishment of a checking or surveillance system that conduct random physical checks on vessels to ensure no violation is conducted.</p> <p>Continuation and increase of accuracy of periodical cross-checkings between logbooks, scientific observer data and RTMP data based on analyzed and potential risks required by extended scientific committee.</p>
	2a (iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	2b	None specific to this MPR.
	2c (i)	Implementation on port patrol/ surveillances on ports other than Shimizu based on risk analysis and (if not currently implemented) other methodology to deter SBT landings on other ports than Shimizu, such as thorough announcement of identification method of SBT from other tuna species, and prohibition of SBT landing.
	2c(ii)	N/A Japan does not farm SBT.
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to the requirement.
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUU control and surveillance mechanism that compliments no at-sea surveillance from 2014. Analysis of transshipment risks and control measure implementations including mandatory information exchange at foreign ports other than Cape Town. Consideration of market statistics system (with traceability utilizing CDS system) to monitor market distribution volumes of SBT and IUU monitoring in coordination with port patrol / surveillance system. Introduction of periodical integrated analysis for non-reporting risks on monitoring and control mechanism, and establishment and announcement of clear risk management strategy.
1.1 (iii)	1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.
	1b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specific to this MPR.

The High-level Code of Practice for Scientific Data Verification requires that periodical cross-verification between observer data with catch and logbook records be conducted in effective and accurate methodology, then this can be removed from "weakness".)

Summary SWOT table referring to Additional Criteria/Market State

	Strength	Weaknesses	Threats (risks)	Recommendations
2.3 Carrier Vessels	<p>Updating the Record of authorized Carrier Vessels and reporting to CCSBT.</p> <p>Notifying all necessary compliance requirement regulations to registered carrier vessels.</p> <p>FA is sharing observer reports on Japanese fishing vessels with ICCAT / IOTC secretariat.</p>	<p>Permission processes of Carrier Vessels are only document-based application and verbal communication.</p>	<p>Not identified</p>	<p>Implementation of interviews to transshipment observers and transshipment report reviews.</p>

<p>3.1 Catch Certificate System (A-F)</p>	<p>Within CDS system, at each phase of transshipment, landing, import and export of SBT, document confirmation systems are well established and implemented.</p> <p>Physical landing inspection for domestic catch is implemented for all reported SBT landing.</p> <p>FA has been conducting twice a month market surveillance to check consistency of SBTs in market from tag numbers and reported RTMP data.</p>	<p>Import and exports are checked only through documents and physical examinations are rarely performed. (→ Management of import - export as a market country)</p> <p>(Please also refer to 1.1 (i) 2a (ii), 4.)</p>	<p>No confirmation of tag No. on Round SBT nor the tracing back of Tag No. to ensure consistency with original catch information are carried out at the process of import permission.</p> <p>There is no established process of checking for transshipment at foreign ports other than Cape Town.</p>	<p>Inform all relevant authorities (especially ones that deal with imported SBT) about the requirement of tags on round SBT.</p> <p>Consider establishment and implementation of communication system for verifying domestic vessel's transshipment and other activities at foreign ports other than Cape Town.</p>
<p>3.3 Transshipments</p>	<p>The management of at-sea transshipment observers are outsourced to CCSBT and other relevant RFMOs.</p>	<p>Same as 2.3.</p>	<p>Same as 2.3.</p>	<p>Same as 2.3.</p>
<p>6.5 Report to Compliance Committee</p>	<p>Japan is strictly following the reporting requirements of the compliance committee.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>Management of import / export SBT as a market country</p>	<p>Japan is carrying out a program to promote establishment of DNA analysis methods and market analysis, to find out any existing clear inconsistency between domestic market distribution volume and reported SBT catch.</p>	<p>There is a possibility that DNA analysis test has low efficacy because of its necessity of pre-agreement for research cooperation prior to the test.</p> <p>For imported / exported SBT, the accuracy of CDS documents are considered as responsibility of exported country and there is no physical checking system nor the tracing of the reported tag No. in the CDS document. (Different from domestic catch checking system that require physical checking.)</p> <p>Monitoring method of imported SBTs distribution volume in domestic market is not yet established.</p> <p>FA has been checking the differences between sums of imported SBT volume and each country's catch total, however fresh products or processed SBT products can not be checked within this method and monitoring is limited.</p>	<p>There is possibility of not aware of unfaithfully reported or non-reported volume of imported SBT that delivered into domestic markets. Especially when SBTs are imported to enter domestic markets from developing countries that has no CDS system established yet. This is due to the fact that confirmation measures of total volumes through domestic statistics has undeveloped.</p>	<p>Establishment of effective and transparent DNA test method and increase of the test cover rate.</p> <p>Strict implementation of monitoring of SBT volumes within domestic market and differences between imported volume and total catch volume for each countries, and periodical check of Tag No.s in CDS document to check accuracy of information declared.</p> <p>Integrated risk-based management strategy and it's clear declaration.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

6 Management Improvement Opportunities and Recommendations

The following table provides a summary of recommendations/Opportunities for based on the Phase 2 review.

MPR	Recommendations (Opportunities)
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of an IUU control and surveillance mechanism that compliments no at-sea surveillance that conduct random physical checks on vessels before landing to ensure no violation is conducted at sea. • Continuation of periodical conduct and increase of accuracy of cross-checkings between logbooks, scientific observer data and RTMP data. Periodical conduct and increased accuracy of discards mortality data analysis. • Periodical conduct of integrated analysis on unfaithful or non-reporting risks and internal reviews. • Clear establishment and announcement of integrated risk management strategy.
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Transshipment observer report and interview to observers to understand existing risks in transshipment.
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of transshipment risks at foreign ports other than Cape Town and implementation of information exchange at foreign ports other than Cape Town. • Correction of imbalance of port patrol / surveillance implementation on Shimizu and other SBT landing ports. Annoucement and cooperation request to all ports for implementation of SBT landing control.
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Same as 2.3)
6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None specific to the requirement.
Import/Export	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of effective and transparent DNA inspection method and improvement of inspection cover rate. (Especially for imported and processed products from countries without established CDS system.) • Thorough confirmation of import SBT volume in domestic markets and cross-verification with exporting country's total catch, periodical monitoring of CDS accuracy with tracing of Tag No. • Increased awareness on Round SBT's needs for tags among relevant SBT dealers. • Consideration of establishment of domestic market traceability utilizing CDS.

7 GAP analysis of Phase 2 findings and Recommendations for Improvement

Phase 2 QARs are based on a deeper analysis and including an on-site audit in order to both up-date the QAR with relevant information and to provide verification activities to establish the extent of implementation and effectiveness of Member MPR based systems for compliance of SBT allocations.

The following bullet points summarize the key gaps, up-dates or differences that were identified from the previous QAR 1 during the QAR 2 review.

- The landing inspection system for SBT has been further clarified during Phase 2; it is implemented according to a well defined procedure. However, clarification has lead to the identification of possible weaknesses relating to the 100% inspection system that refers to landings of declared SBT rather than landings of all vessels that could potentially carry SBT and the level of routine surveillance for secondary Ports where SBT may be landed is far less than at the major Port.
- RTMP is a critical source of information for the confirmation of the CDS system and hence the importance of accuracy of the RTMP report is extremely important.
- Estimates of discarded SBT have been provided.
- Phase 1 identified possible weaknesses in the maritime surveillance for LTLV's and Phase 2 provides further evidence that there has been no at sea inspections in the 2014 fishery. The current system of at sea inspection appears suspended although as previously identified, there is a requirement for 100% observation of transshipments of SBT.
- Phase 1 suggested some ambiguity in document availability from SBT landed in foreign ports. Evidence from Phase 2 demonstrates that CDS for SBT imports from SBT transhipped/landed in Cape Town show good compliance with the CCSBT MPR. However, there is less information available to confirm how the monitoring system is in place or will be effective in other Ports registered for SBT landings/transshipments to Japan.
- The DNA testing system for SBT has been further developed and now includes both imported and domestic landed SBT.

Evidence reviewed/submitted as part of QAR Phase 2 (in translation)

添付 1	1	ミナミマグロ遵守事項 SBT Compliance Requirements
	2	遠洋かつお・まぐろ漁業の漁獲物等の国外陸揚げ等報告書 (変更届) Foreign landing such report of catches such as pelagic bonito and tuna fishing (notification of change)
	3	国内陸揚げ予定報告書 (変更届)
	4	船舶の概要 (RTMP 調査船用)
	5	ミナミマグロ RTMP 報告書 (2012 年度版)
	6	CCSBT Catch Monitoring Form, CDS
	7	Transshipment Declaration forms (ICCAT, IATTC, IOTC, WCPCF)
添付 2	1	遠洋まぐろ延縄漁業操業日誌 (The Logbook for Large Scale Tuna Longline Vessels)
	2	原魚重量への換算方法について (Conversion Factors for Round Weight)
	3	遠洋まぐろ延縄漁業操業日誌と記載要領 The Logbook for Large Scale Tuna Longline Vessels)
	4	混獲生物等の情報記載フォームと記載要領
添付 3	1	船舶の概要 (RTMP 調査船用) 記入済み
	2	ミナミマグロ RTMP 報告書 (2013 年度版) 記入済み
	3	遠洋まぐろ延縄漁業操業日誌 (The Logbook for Large Scale Tuna Longline Vessels) 記入済み
	4	遠洋まぐろ延縄漁業操業日誌と記載要領 The Logbook for Large Scale Tuna Longline Vessels) 記入済み
	5	混獲生物等の情報記載フォームと記載要領 記入済み
	6	CCSBT Catch Monitoring Form, CDS 記入済み
	7	CCSBT Catch Tagging Form, CDS, 記入済み
添付 4	1	みなみまぐろの漁獲量の限度の合計を定める件についての意見・情報の募集 告示 (24 年 12 月 25 日)
	2	官報告示 (みなみまぐろの年間の漁獲量の限度の割当の基準を定める件) (25 年 2 月 14 日)
	3	農林水産省告示に関する省令の規定に基づくみなみまぐろの年間の漁獲量の 限度の割当の基準 (告示第 1204 号)
	4	みなみまぐろ年間漁獲量割当申請書 (25 年 2 月 21 日)
	5	漁業者 (漁船) への割当の指令書サンプル
	6	2013 年漁期の船別の漁獲割当 (Japan's quota allocations in 2013/14 fishing season)
添付 5	1	輸入公表 7 の (3) に基づく経済産業大臣の輸入に関する確認について
	2	輸入に関する確認申請書
	3	CCSBT Catch Monitoring Form (Original) and Instruction Sheet
	4	Re-Export / Export After Landing of Domestic Product Form and Instruction Sheet
添付 6	1	輸入注意事項の一部改正について (正規許可船リスト対策又は正規畜養場対 策に反しない貨物である事を証する水産庁の確認書発行について
	2	正規許可船・畜養場リスト対策確認証発行申請書
添付 7	1	まぐろ資源の保存及び管理の強化に関する特別措置法第 10 条に基づく報告

		の徴収について（農林水産省指令）
	2	みなみまぐろの輸入に関する報告書
	3	冷凍まぐろ類を輸入しようとする場合の報告書
	4	冷凍まぐろを輸入した場合の報告書
	5	冷凍まぐろを運送した場合の報告書
他参考文献	1	ミナミマグロ漁業における日本の科学オブザーバの活動報告：2011年漁期・日本のミナミマグロ漁業での科学オブザーバ活動の報告：2012年及び2013年
	2	遠洋まぐろ延縄科学オブザーバ調査マニュアル（WCPFC/CCSBT/IOTC/IATTC 海域）2014年7月版
	3	23 年度流通実態事業報告書
	4	平成 26 年度水産庁委託事業『国際漁業・輸入管理強化推進事業の国内流通実態分析事業』事業報告書
	5	平成 27 年度日本水産学会春季大会ポスター みなみまぐろの日本国内における流通特性の把握
	6	日本延縄漁業におけるミナミマグロ小型魚放流: 2011年
	7	日本延縄船から放流・投棄したみなみまぐろの死亡量の推定 CCSBT-OMMP/1406/08
	8	延縄船から放流されたみなみまぐろの放流後生残率 CCSBT-ESC/1309/34
	9	日本が収集しているみなみまぐろのデータセットでの相互検証：2012年 CCSBT-ESC/1309/35
	10	日本のミナミマグロ漁業のレビュー：2011年