



# agriculture, forestry & fisheries

Department:  
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

## South Africa's Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission of the CCSBT

October 2014

### Table of Contents

I. Summary of MCS Improvements .....	2
1. Improvements achieved in the current fishing season.....	2
2. Future planned improvements.....	3
II. SBT Fishing and MCS Arrangements .....	4
(1) Fishing for Southern bluefin Tuna .....	4
(2) SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only) .....	14
(3) SBT Transshipment (in port and at sea) .....	14
(4) Landings of Domestic Product (from fishing vessels).....	16
(5) SBT Exports.....	18
(6) SBT Imports .....	19
(7) SBT Markets .....	21
(8) Other .....	21
III. Additional Reporting Requirements.....	21
(1) Coverage and Type of CDS Audit undertaken.....	21
(2) Ecologically Related Species .....	21
(3) Historical SBT Catch (retained and non-retained).....	26

## I. Summary of MCS Improvements

### 1. Improvements achieved in the current fishing season

As has been the case during the previous years, South Africa continues to maintain an enhanced Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) enforcement obligations. The South African Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) hereby register its commitment to do more than is required to meet its compliance obligations. These obligations include although not limited to sampling, monitoring, following up, investigations of contraventions, transshipment by vessels at sea etc. DAFF is grateful to the CCSBT for having raised, in the past, the issue of the Catch Monitor Forms (CMF) being duplicated or un-procedurally. These complaints / reports were addressed.

The Fisheries Research vessels as well as Fisheries Protection vessels (FPV's) were operational during the period under review. DAFF have been able to carry out the necessary vessels patrols to curb the illegal, Unregulated and Unreported fishing (IUU) to reduce as well as to keep IUU under acceptable levels.

1.2. As reported previously the following seven vessels were arrested by the South African Authorities and taken to the Cape Town Harbour.

Vessel	Vessel Registration Number	Call Sign	CAS Number and Court number
Bahari Nusantara 83,	1998KKBNo.151/N	YE8080	265/09/2013
Bahari Nusantara 19,	1998KKBNo147/N	YE8040	15/993/2013
Bahari Nusantara 5,	1998KKB No.10/N	None	262/09/2013
Bahari Nusantara 26,	1998KKBNo.151/N	YE5861	264/09/2013
Bintang Samudra 11, 15	19980GA No.4088/N	YE5942	263/09/2013
Samudra Gilontas 231	1998PD No.633/N	YE5861	261/09/2013
Mahkota Abadi 15	1997PD No.553/N	YE5716	285/09/2013

- 1.3. The reasons for the arrest and charging of these vessels were that among others, they had entered the South African Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) without the necessary and required EEZ permit, incorrect catch declaration, Human trafficking etc. All the fish in these vessels were seized and forfeited to the State. The fish was eventually sold and the proceeds thereof paid into the state coffers. The fish on the vessels was mainly Yellow Fin Tuna as well as albacore. Investigations proved that the fish on these vessels had been caught in the High Seas.
- 1.4. During January 2014 the cases against the Captains of these vessels were finalised. The Captains of the vessels were deported back to their countries of origin by the South African Department of Home Affairs. All seven vessels mentioned here above were sold at an auction during March 2015.
- 1.5. Further, the South African Government has issued an instruction for all the South African Government Departments as well as Stakeholders to operate in an integrated manner in the protection of the marine environment. This initiative has already commenced under "Operation Phakisa" LAB known as Marine Protection Services and Governance (MPS&G)
- 1.6. The Port of Entry Control Centre (PECC) which was established in the Port of Cape Town. As a pilot project to carry out inspections of vessels docking in Cape Town Harbour is proving successful with various cases of IUU and other transgressions resulting from joint operations. The primary functions of the PECC includes joint Fisheries directed operations and rummaging of foreign fishing vessels.
- 1.7. At the two main South African Ports, Durban and Cape Town a total of 391 foreign fishing vessels were inspected of which 150 of these inspections were pre-fishing inspections. A total of 10 inspections resulted in IUU cases and were pursued accordingly.

## **2. Future planned improvements**

South Africa has implemented very high MCS standards, and requires:

- 2.2. VMS on all long line vessels,
- 2.3. Observer coverage on 100% of charter vessels,
- 2.4. Vessel quotas for the tuna longline fishery,
- 2.5. 100% Monitoring of landings,
- 2.6. discarding/releasing of all Southern Blue Fin tuna when the fishery is closed,
- 2.7. Implementation of tags, CTs and CMFs and
- 2.8. Prohibition of Southern Blue Fin landings in other commercial tuna fisheries.

As a port state South Africa has also closely monitored vessels with Southern Blue Fin and required confirmation by flag states before foreign vessels were allowed to enter port. The only other improvements remaining are to move from an Olympic system to a quota system for swordfish longline vessels. This can only be considered in future when South Africa is given a more sizeable quota. Further improvements are for DAFF and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to amend the regulations in terms of the Marine Living Resources Act, and also the Act No 18 of 1998. This is to reduce the Southern Blue Fin bag limits for the recreational fishery; Specific amendments addressing EEZ and High seas Permits for non-gear carrying vessels (Reefer Vessels)

Further Improvements is that following the VMS upgrade, a long term VMS tender process are to follow, bringing about a stringent monitoring and surveillance regime by applying the most advanced VMS technology.

2015 will also see The Fisheries Protection and Research vessels being managed in terms of a long term management contract bringing about optimum efficiency and effectiveness during deployments.

The Cape Town Port of Entry Control Centre will be extended to the Air Border Environment and a third phase will be on the land border post to prevent the illegal export of fish and fish products to South Africa's neighbouring countries.

## II. SBT Fishing and MCS Arrangements

### **(1) Fishing for Southern bluefin Tuna**

*(a) Specify the number of vessels that caught SBT in each sector (e.g. authorised commercial longline, authorised commercial purse seine, authorised commercial charter fleet, authorised domestic fleet) during the previous 3 fishing seasons.*

<b>Fishing Season</b> <i>(e.g. 2011/12)</i>	<b>Sector 1 (domestic longline fleet)</b>	<b>Sector 2 (charter longline fleet)</b>
	Number of vessels	Number of vessels
2010	9	2
2011	9	11
2012	9	8
2013	11	9
2014	11	4

(b) Specify the historic national SBT allocation, together with any carry-forward of unfished allocation and the total SBT catch counted against the national allocation (Attributable Catch) during the 3 previous fishing seasons. All figures should be provided in tonnes. Some CCSBT Members use slightly different definitions for the catch that is counted against the allocation, so in the space below the table, clearly define the catch that has been counted against the national allocation:-

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	National SBT allocation (t) (excluding carry-forward)	Unfished allocation carried forward to this fishing season (t)	SBT catch counted against the national allocation (t)			
			Sector 1 (domestic longline fleet - swordfish)		Sector 2 (charter longline fleet - tuna)	
			Domestic allocation	Actual Catch Against Allocation	Domestic allocation	Actual Catch Against Allocation
2005	40			2.5		21.5
2006	40			9.4		0
2007	40		8 (Olympic)	15.2	32 (Olympic)	26.2
2008	40		8 (Olympic)	0.3	32 (Olympic)	45.2
2009	40		10 (Olympic)	14.8	30 (Quota)	13.2
2010	40		0 (SBT only permitted as by-catch to swordfish)	34.3	40 (Quota)	0.1
2011	40		11 (Olympic)	26.7	29 (Quota)	21.9
2012	40		11 (Olympic)	54.9	29 (Quota)	21.7
2013	40		11 (Olympic)	43.3	29 (Quota)	22.3
2014	40		29.26	47.4	10.65	2.9

			(Quota)		(Quota)	
--	--	--	---------	--	---------	--

*(c) Describe the system used for controlling the level of SBT catch. For ITQ and IQ systems, this should include details on how the catch was allocated to individual companies and/or vessels. For competitive catch systems this should include details of the process for authorising vessels to catch SBT and how the fishery was monitored for determining when to close the fishery. The description provided here should include any operational constraints on effort (both regulatory and voluntary):-*

South Africa has a complicated management system for its large pelagic longline fishery. The fishery was split into two main components when long-term commercial fishing rights were allocated in 2005, namely swordfish longline (18 vessels) and tuna longline (26 vessels). The rationale for this was to limit the fishing effort on swordfish due to excessive decline in the swordfish CPUE during the experimental phase of the fishery. Both long line sectors catch Southern bluefin as by-catch. In the commercial period only the tuna longline sector were given opportunities to enter into charter agreements with foreign vessel owners to improve catch performance of tuna and to provide a platform for transferring skills to South Africans.

In 2005 and 2006 the South African Southern bluefin allocation of 40 t was managed on an Olympic system for both the swordfish and tuna longline sectors combined. In 2007 and 2009 the South African allocation was split thereby allowing the swordfish longline sector to catch 8 t and the tuna longline sector to catch 32 t. Sectors were managed on separate Olympic systems. Due to the exceeding of the sbt tuna longline quota in 2008, which resulted in the early closure of the fishery, the management of this sector changed to a quota system in 2009. The tuna longline sector was given a total of 30 t, which was equally divided between the 26 tuna longline right holders (26 vessels) at the start of the season. The Department also made provision for tuna right holders to transfer their quota should the right holder not be operating for the year or if the vessel was not catching any Southern bluefin tuna. The swordfish sector (18 right holders = 18 vessels) was given 10 t to fish on an Olympic system. The Department changed the management of the system again in 2010 by transferring the entire allocation (40t) to the tuna longline sector on a quota system. The management also had to take into account that an additional three rights would be allocated in swordfish and a further three rights allocated in tuna longline. The quota was equally divided by 29 right holders, which translated to 1.37 t per right holder. The swordfish vessels were only permitted to catch Southern bluefin as by-catch to swordfish fishing. The Department made provision for the transfer of Southern bluefin quota between tuna and

swordfish right holders. In 20011 and 2012 South Africa reverted back to a split quota between the swordfish and tuna longline sectors. The tuna longline sector was given 29 t, which was divided equally between 29 right holders. The Department once again made provision for the transfer of quotas between right holders. The swordfish longline sector was given 11t to fish on an Olympic system between 21 right holders.

The quotas both in the swordfish longline and tuna longline sectors are managed by monitoring electronic landing summaries submitted by industry within two weeks after the vessel has landed and by monitoring observer reports submitted every five days while observers are at sea. Through this system when the Department becomes aware that a quota has been exceeded it immediately responds to close the Southern bluefin fishery. When this occurs the vessels are required to release all Southern bluefin tuna caught after this date. The Southern bluefin fishery was closed in July of 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.

*(d) Provide details of the methods used to monitor catching in the fishery by completing the table below. Details should also be provided of monitoring conducted of fishing vessels when steaming away from the fishing grounds (this does not include towing vessels that are reported in Section 2).*

Monitoring Methods	Description
Daily log book	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <p><i>i. Whether this was mandatory. If not, specify the % of SBT fishing that was covered:-</i> Mandatory</p> <p><i>ii. The level of detail recorded (shot by shot, daily aggregate etc):-</i> Date, latitude, longitude, time of start and end set, number of hooks set, reason for set, float line length, branch line length, bait type, drift, observer present (y/n), drift, light stick info, catch by species, weight and number, discards and releases.</p> <p><i>iii. Whether the effort and catch information collected complied with that specified in the “Characterisation of the SBT Catch” section of the CCSBT</i></p>

	<p><i>Scientific Research Plan (Attachment D of the SC5 report), including both retained and discarded catch. If not, describe the non-compliance:-</i></p> <p>Although provision is made for this type of info, it is seldom recorded and there is no way to verify this info. The only means of obtaining accurate information on this is through an observer programme, which is in place to collect information from part of the large pelagic longline fishery.</p> <p><i>iv. What information on ERS was recorded in logbooks:-</i></p> <p>Bird/turtle mortality and releases of birds, turtles and sharks.</p> <p><i>v. Who were the log books submitted to<sup>1</sup>:-</i></p> <p>Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries: Fisheries Research and Development</p> <p><i>vi. What was the timeframe and method<sup>2</sup> for submission:-</i></p> <p>The pages in the logbook are perforated, which allows the original to be removed after the fishing trip. The original log pages are generally submitted by hand to DAFF. In return DAFF countersigns the logbook to indicate that the catch statistics have been submitted for a particular trip. Right holders are required through permit conditions to submit log books before the 15<sup>th</sup> of the following month in which the trip was undertaken.</p> <p><i>vii. The type of checking and verification that was routinely conducted for this information:-</i></p> <p>Data capturing is checked by a second person to ensure that no typing errors occur when entering the data. The information from logbooks are only estimates and hence they are not used in quota control. Independent landing declarations verified by Fishery Control Officers and Fishery Monitors are used to compare against electronic landing summaries and CMFs submitted by industry.</p> <p><i>viii. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i></p> <p>Marine Living Resources Act, Act No 18 of 199 The Regulations promulgated the MLRA</p>
--	---

<sup>1</sup> If the reports are not to be submitted to the Member's or CNM's government fisheries authority, then also specify whether the information will later be sent to the fisheries authority, including how and when that occurs.

<sup>2</sup> In particular, whether the information is submitted electronically from the vessel.



	<p>Swordfish and tuna longline permit conditions.</p> <p>Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of a fishing right in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.</p> <p><i>ix. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-</i></p> <p><i>x.</i></p>
--	---

---

<sup>3</sup> Including information on ERS, and comments on the effectiveness of the controls or monitoring tools and any plans for further improvement.

<p><i>Additional reporting methods (such as real time monitoring programs)</i></p>	<p><i>If multiple reporting methods exists (e.g. daily, weekly and/or month SBT catch reporting, reporting of tags and SBT measurements, reporting of ERS interactions etc), create a separate row of in this table for each method. Then, for each method, specify:</i></p> <p><b>Electronic Landing Summaries</b></p> <p><i>i. Whether this was mandatory. If not, specify the % of SBT fishing that was covered:-</i> Mandatory for swordfish and tuna longline sectors.</p> <p><i>ii. The information that was recorded (including whether it relates to SBT or ERS):-</i> All landed species including SBT</p> <p><i>iii. Who the reports were submitted to and by whom (e.g. Vessel Master, the Fishing Company etc)<sup>1</sup>:-</i> Rights holder submits to DAFF: Marine Resource Management</p> <p><i>iv. What was the timeframe and method<sup>2</sup> for submission:-</i> Within two weeks after landing</p> <p><i>v. The type of checking and verification that was routinely conducted for this information:-</i> Compared with landing declarations verified by Fishery Control Officers/ Fishery Monitors and occasionally checked with logbooks.</p> <p><i>vi. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i> Section 13(2) of the MLRA Swordfish and tuna longline permit conditions. Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of a fishing right in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.</p> <p><i>vii. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-</i></p>
--	---

Scientific  
Observers

Specify:

i. The percentage of the SBT catch and effort observed and the total number of days that observers were actually deployed for in the three previous seasons for each sector (e.g. longline, purse seine, commercial charter fleet, domestic fleet). The unit of effort should be hooks, sets and tows for longline, purse seine and towing respectively:-

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Domestic longline			Charter longline		
	% effort obs.	% catch obs.	Obs. days deployed	% effort obs.	% catch obs.	Obs. days deployed
2010	15 (% of fishing trips)			100 (% of fishing trips)		
2011	0	0	0	44 (% of hooks)		
2012	0	0	0	37 (% of hooks)		
2013	0	0		100% (of SBT hooks set)	100% (of nr of SBT caught)	
2014	13% (of SBT hooks set)	12% (of nr of SBT caught)		100% (of SBT hooks set)	100% (of nr of SBT caught)	

ii. The system used for comparisons between observer data and other catch monitoring data in order to verify the catch data:-

Observer data is sometimes used to compare with landing declaration, but the main purpose of the observer programme is to collect length frequency info, info on by-catch and incidental catch, and on discards. The observer programme is also used to ensure compliance with bird mitigation measures.

	<p><i>iii. Excluding the coverage, specify whether the observer program complied with the CCSBT Scientific Observer Program Standards. If not, describe the non-compliance. Also indicate whether there was any exchange of observers between countries:-</i></p> <p>The observer programme complies with the CCSBT Scientific Observer Program Standards.</p> <p>There has been no exchange of observers between countries.</p> <p><i>iv. What information on ERS was recorded by observers:-</i></p> <p>Observations of bird mitigation measures used.</p> <p>Bird mortality by species.</p> <p>Discards and releases by species.</p> <p>Length frequencies</p> <p><i>v. Who were the observer reports submitted to:-</i></p> <p>DAFF:FRD</p> <p><i>vi. Timeframe for submission of observer reports:-</i></p> <p>Within two weeks of the disembarking of the observer. Observers are also debriefed by the observer company and FRD scientist</p> <p><i>vii. Other relevant information (including plans for further improvement – in particular to reach coverage of 10% of the effort):-</i></p>
<p>VMS</p> <p><i>The items of “ii” are required in association with the Resolution on establishing the CCSBT</i></p>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <p><i>i. Whether a mandatory VMS for SBT vessels that complies with CCSBT’s VMS resolution was in operation. If not, provide details of non-compliance and plans for further improvement:-</i></p> <p>Mandatory and has been in operation since 1998. VMS complies with CCSBT’s VMS resolution. In addition charter vessels are required to report to the Department’s national VMS centre.</p> <p><i>ii. For the most recently completed fishing season, specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The number of its flag vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List that were required to report to a National VMS system:-</i></li> </ul>

<p><i>Vessel Monitoring System</i></p>	<p>Twenty domestic longline vessels in 2012 were required to report to the Department's national VMS centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The number of its flag vessels on the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List that actually reported to a National VMS system:-</i> Twenty domestic longline vessels in 2012 reported to the Department's national VMS centre.</li> <li>• <i>Reasons for any non-compliance with VMS requirements and action taken by the Member:-</i> Nothing to report</li> <li>• <i>In the event of a technical failure of a vessel's VMS, the vessel's geographical position (latitude and longitude) at the time of failure and the length of time the VMS was inactive should be reported:-</i> Procedures are in place in terms of permit conditions that the vessel would have to follow in the event that the vessel experiences technical failure of the VMS while at sea.</li> <li>• <i>The procedures used for manual reporting in the event of a VMS failure (e.g. "manual position reporting on a 4 hourly basis"):-</i> A report needs to be submitted via fax or e-mail on a daily basis. The report is to provide detailed information on a three hourly basis on the vessel's position, course and speed. Manual reporting is subject to approval by the Department. Info approval granted the vessel would have to return to port.</li> <li>• <i>A description of any investigations initiated in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of the CCSBT VMS resolution including progress to date and any actions taken:-</i> Nothing to report</li> </ul> <p><i>iii. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-</i> Section 13(2) of the MLRA Swordfish and tuna longline permit conditions. Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of a fishing right in</p>
--	--

	the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.
<i>At-Sea Inspections</i>	<p><i>Specify:</i></p> <p><i>i. The coverage level of at sea inspections (e.g. % of SBT trips inspected):-</i> Although South Africa has four offshore patrol vessels there have been inspections of long line vessels at sea over the last year. 2014 will see the Fisheries Protection and Research vessels being managed in terms of a long term management contract bringing about optimum efficiency and effectiveness during deployments which would include inspections for the tuna and swordfish longline sectors.</p> <p><i>ii. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-</i></p>
<i>Other (use of masthead cameras etc.)</i>	Masthead cameras are not in use.

**(2) SBT Towing and transfer to and between farms (farms only)**

South Africa does not farm Southern bluefin tuna, hence this section is not applicable.

**(3) SBT Transshipment (in port and at sea)**

*(a) In accordance with the Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels, report:*

*i. The quantities of SBT transhipped during the previous fishing season:-*

<b>Fishing Season</b> (e.g. 2011/12)	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped at sea	Percentage of the annual SBT catch transhipped in port
2012	0	21%
2013	0	
2014	0	

ii. *The list of the LSTLVs registered in the CCSBT Authorised Vessel List which have transhipped at sea during the previous fishing season:-*

None

iii. *A comprehensive report assessing the content and conclusions of the reports of the observers assigned to carrier vessels which have received transhipment from their LSTLVs:-*

Not applicable

*(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transhipments in port. This should include details of:*

i. *Rules for and names of designated foreign ports of transhipment for SBT and for prohibition of transhipment at other foreign ports:-*

Vessels may only tranship in ports, which have been designated as landing ports in terms of the tuna and swordfish longline permit conditions.

ii. *Port State inspections required for transhipments of SBT (include % coverage):-*

All vessels fishing in the South African fishery which wishes to tranship in port needs to apply for a transhipment permit. The application form makes provision for the applicant to provide all the relevant information such as vessel names, quantities by species to be transhipped and port where transhipment will take place. Only on the authority of a permit and subject to monitoring may the vessel tranship. Monitoring is mandatory.

iii. *Information sharing with designated port states:-*

As a port state South Africa requires flag states to acknowledge the quantity of southern bluefin on board their vessels before the vessel is authorised to enter port. Vessels fishing in the South African fishery have only landed or transhipped product in designated South African ports.

iv. *Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT transhipped:-*

Fishery Control officers/ Fishery Monitors are required to monitor every offload and transhipment of vessels fishing in the South African large pelagic longline fishery. Fish are sorted by species on deck before being weighed in order to determine the

weight by species. The FCOs/FMs record the information and signs off a landing declaration form which the representative of the right holder is also required to sign.

- v. *Process for validating<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, Catch Tagging Form):-*

The landing declaration forms which are signed off by the FCO/FM are used together with the CTs to verify the maximum Southern bluefin that an entity may export on a consignment basis.

- vi. *Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*

Section 13(2) of the MLRA

Swordfish and tuna longline permit conditions.

Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of a fishing right in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.

- vii. *Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-*

*(c) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring transshipments at sea. This should include details of:*

Permits are not issued for transshipments at sea. Hence, this activity is not permitted.

#### **(4) Landings of Domestic Product (from fishing vessels)**

*(a) Specify the approximate percentage of the annual SBT catch that was landed as domestic product.*

Approximately 72% of Southern bluefin was landed as domestic product in 2012.

<b>2014</b>	<b>Domestic</b>	<b>Foreign</b>
Number of boats which caught SBT	11	4
Total number of SBT	588	35
Total weight of SBT caught in Kgs (round weight)	47392.2	2907.2



*(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring domestic landings of SBT. This should include details of:*

*i. Rules for designated ports of landing of SBT:-*

Landing ports in South Africa have been designated in terms of the permit conditions. If a company would like to land product outside of South Africa then the right holder is responsible for arranging for a South African FCO to be present at the landing of the product in a foreign port. This provision in permit conditions is yet to be tested.

*ii. Inspections required for landings of SBT (including % coverage):-*

There is 100% inspection and monitoring of SBT landings.

*iii. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT landed:-*

Fishery Control officers/ Fishery Monitors are required to monitor every offload of vessels fishing in the South African large pelagic longline fishery. Fish are sorted by species on deck before being weighed in order to determine the weight by species. The FCOs/FMs record the information and signs off a landing declaration form which the representative of the right holder is also required to sign. The landing declarations are used for quota control.

*iv. Process for validating collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form, and depending on circumstances, Catch Tagging Form):-*

The landing declaration forms which are signed off by the FCO/FM are used together with the CTs to verify the maximum Southern bluefin that an entity may export on a consignment basis.

*v. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*

Section 13(2) of the MLRA

Swordfish and tuna longline permit conditions.

Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of a fishing right in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.

*vi. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-*

**(5) SBT Exports**

(a) Specify the quantity of the domestic catch that was exported and provide an estimate of the total quantity of the domestic SBT catch (in tonnes to 1 decimal place ) that was retained within the country/fishing entity (i.e. the quantity can be estimated by subtracting the total export from domestic catch) during each of the last 3 fishing seasons to each country/fishing entity.

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Estimate of SBT retained within the country/fishing entity (Domestic catch-Export) Consumption	SBT Exported to							
		Japan	USA	:	:	:	:	:	:
2010	6.6	13.7	9.6						
2011	8.3	23.7	10.3						
2012	17.0	31.7	17.9						
2013									
2014									

(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring exports of SBT (including of landings directly from the vessel to the foreign importing port). This should include details of:

South Africa has never landed any Southern bluefin tuna in foreign ports. Hence, the information provided below addresses measures implemented for product landed in South African ports.

*i. Inspections required for export of SBT (including % coverage):-*

All Southern bluefin tuna is inspected and monitored when a vessel offloads or tranships in port. There is insufficient capacity to monitor product at the points of export. Only through random sampling or through a tip off are consignments inspected at the airports.

*ii. Monitoring systems for recording the quantity of SBT exported:-*

The main system used to record the quantity of SBT exported are the CMFs. In addition, all marine product to be exported requires an export permit. In terms of the export permit conditions the exporter has to provide prior notification to our compliance office of all consignments to be exported. Monthly summaries of export by species are also required to be electronically submitted by the exporter to Marine Resource Management.

iii. Process for validating<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> and collecting the relevant CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form and depending on circumstances, Catch Tagging Form or Re-export/Export after landing of domestic product Form):-

It is an export permit condition that validated CDS documents accompany the consignments of all Southern bluefin tuna for export. The exporter can only obtain a validated CMF by providing the CT and signed landing declaration to Marine resource Management.

iv. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-

Section 13(2) of the MLRA

MLRA Regulation 27(f)

Export permit conditions.

Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of the export permit in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.

v. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-

## **(6) SBT Imports**

(a) Specify the total quantity of SBT (in tonnes to 1 decimal place) imported during each of the last 3 fishing seasons from each country/fishing entity.

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	SBT Imported from								
	Country / Fishing Entity 1	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2010	0								
2011	0								
2012	0								
2013	0								
2014	0								

*(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring imports of SBT. This should include details of:*

*i. Rules for designated ports for import of SBT:-*

There are no specific rules designating ports for the import of southern bluefin. However, foreign vessels are limited in that they can use only one of three ports, namely Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Durban. It is possible for Southern bluefin to be imported by air freight, but this is unlikely as South Africa is unable to pay the international market price for southern bluefin.

*ii. Inspections required for import of SBT (including % coverage):-*

There are no routine inspections in place for the importing of southern bluefin.

*iii. Process for checking and collecting CCSBT CDS documents (Catch Monitoring Form and depending on circumstances, Re-export/Export after landing of domestic product Form):-*

The import of any marine product, including Southern bluefin tuna requires an import permit. The import permit conditions require that a validated CDS document be submitted to Marine Resource Management for all imported consignments of Southern bluefin tuna.

*iv. Reference to applicable legislation and penalties:-*

Section 13(2) of the MLRA

MLRA Regulation 27(e)

Import permit conditions.

Penalties could range from revocation, or suspension of the export permit in the case of serious offences in terms of section 28 of the MLRA or fines could be imposed in terms of criminal proceedings.

*v. Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>:-*

### **(7) SBT Markets**

South Africa is not regarded as a market state for southern bluefin. Hence the questions below are not relevant to South Africa.

*(a) Describe any activities targeted at points in the supply chain between landing and the market:-*

None

*(b) Describe the system used for controlling and monitoring of SBT at markets (e.g. voluntary or mandatory requirements for certain documentation and/or presence of tags, and monitoring or audit of compliance with such requirements):-*

None

*(c) Other relevant information<sup>3</sup>*

### **(8) Other**

*Description of any other MCS systems of relevance.*

## **III. Additional Reporting Requirements**

### **(1) Coverage and Type of CDS Audit undertaken**

*As per paragraph 5.9 of the CDS Resolution, specify details on the level of coverage and type of audit undertaken, in accordance with 5.8<sup>4</sup> of the Resolution, and the level of compliance.*

All landings by the longline fleet are inspected and monitored by a Fishery Control Officer/ Fishery Monitor. These officials are required to produce a landing declaration, which is used to validate the CMFs.

### **(2) Ecologically Related Species**

*(a) Reporting requirements in relation to implementation of the 2008 ERS Recommendation:*

---

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph 5.8 of the CDS Resolution specifies that "Members and Cooperating Non-Members shall undertake an appropriate level of audit, including inspections of vessels, landings, and where possible markets, to the extent necessary to validate the information contained in the CDS documentation."

i. *Specify whether each of the following plans/guidelines have been implemented, and if not, specify the action that has been taken towards implementing each of these plans/guidelines:-*

- *International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catches of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries:*

Published in August 2008 and implemented, with good results in reducing seabird mortality in the swordfish/tuna longline fishery.

- *International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks:*

The NPOA-sharks was redrafted in July 2012 and was published for public comment. Comments have been incorporated in the final draft and the Department is in the process of publishing the final version. In the meantime South Africa has taken many steps to conserve and manage sharks. Some notable actions have been: the protection status given to great white sharks; the termination of the pelagic shark longline fishery in favour of developing a tuna and swordfish longline fishery where sharks are managed as by-catch; the banning of many pelagic shark species (hammerheads, silky, oceanic white-tp and threshers) in the tuna/swordfish longline fishery, the ban of wire tracers in the longline fishery, the unilateral introduction of shark by-catch limits; the appointment of a shark researcher; improved data collection, and; stock assessments conducted for two important demersal species.

- *FAO Guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing operations:*

Dehooking and release procedures included in tuna and swordfish longline permit conditions. Turtles are not allowed to be landed.

ii. *Specify whether all current binding and recommendatory measures<sup>5</sup> aimed at the protection of ecologically related species<sup>6</sup> from fishing of the following tuna RFMOs are being complied with. If not, specify which measures are not being complied with and the progress that is being made towards compliance:-*

- *IOTC, when fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*

The contract for South Africa's national observer programme expired in March 2011. Since then DAFF was not able to place observers on domestic vessels. South Africa has not been able to meet the 5% observer coverage as specified by IOTC on the domestic longline vessels. The department is currently in the process

---

<sup>5</sup> Relevant measures of these RFMOs can be found at: [http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch\\_mitigation.php](http://www.ccsbt.org/site/bycatch_mitigation.php).

<sup>6</sup> Including seabirds, sea turtles and sharks.

re-establishing the national observer programme by developing the specifications for the tender. All other IOTC measures are complied with.

- *WCPFC, when fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*

South Africa does not fish in the WCPFCs Convention Area. Hence, not applicable to South Africa.

- *ICCAT, when fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*

The contract for South Africa's national observer programme expired in March 2011. Since then DAFF was not able to place observers on domestic vessels. South Africa has not been able to meet the 5% observer coverage as specified by ICCAT on the domestic longline vessels. The department is currently in the process re-establishing the national observer programme by developing the specifications for the tender. All other ICCAT measures are complied with.

*iii. Specify whether data is being collected and reported on ecologically related species in accordance with the requirements of the following tuna RFMOs. If data are not being collected and reported in accordance with these requirements, specify which measures are not being complied with and the progress that is being made towards compliance:-*

- *CCSBT<sup>7</sup>:*

ERS information provided in ERS annual report.

- *IOTC, for fishing within IOTC's Convention Area:*

The charter fleet mainly fishes in the Indian Ocean. This fleet has 100% observer coverage. The ERS data (seabirds and turtles) obtained by the observers are provided to IOTC. Shark data is obtained from logbooks of both the domestic and charter fleet and provided to IOTC.

- *WCPFC, for fishing within WCPFC's Convention Area:*

South Africa does not fish in the WCPFCs Convention Area. Hence, not applicable to South Africa.

- *ICCAT, for fishing within ICCAT's Convention Area:*

---

<sup>7</sup> Current CCSBT requirements are those in the Scientific Observer Program Standards and those necessary for completing the template for the annual report to the ERSWG.

The charter fleet has 100% observer coverage. The ERS data (seabirds and turtles) obtained by the observers are provided to ICCAT. Shark data is obtained from logbooks of both the domestic and charter fleet and provided to ICCAT.

*(b) Specify the number of observed ERS interactions including mortalities, and describe the methods of scaling used to produce estimates of total mortality (information should be provided by species –including the scientific name – wherever possible<sup>8</sup>):*

**South African Southern Bluefin tuna catch per vessel for 2014**

<b>Vessel</b>	<b>No. of hooks</b>	<b>No. of S. bluefin</b>	<b>Total SBT (kg) Conversion applied</b>	<b>Dressing method</b>
ATU-S	12600	25	2660.4	DRT
BALANCE	2950	4	486	DRT
FUKUSEKI MARU 31	13475	7	542.8	GGT
KOEI MARU 1	39061	12	1039.6	GGT
KOEI MARU 88	12144	5	403.65	GGT
PRINS WILLEM 1	3900	11	1116	DRT
RYOEI	19980	32	4197.6	DRT
SAXON	21600	31	3002.4	DRT
SEAWIN DIAMOND	20900	77	4214.75	GGT
SEAWIN EMERALD	47550	106	6342.25	GGT
SEAWIN SAPPHIRE	13334	102	7453.8	DRT and GGT
SOUTHERN CRUSADER	19200	56	5770.8	DRT
TAIYO MARU 58	20652	11	921.15	GGT
TWO BOYS	16500	51	5634	DRT
VIKING RUBY	51000	93	6712.2	DRT
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>314846</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>50497.4</b>	

<sup>8</sup> Where species specific information is available, insert additional line(s) for each species below the relevant Seabird, Sharks, and/or Sea Turtles sub headings.



	<b>Sector 1</b> <i>(Domestic Longline)</i>	<b>Sector 2</b> <i>(Charter Longline)</i>		
<b>2014</b>				
<i>Total number of hooks (shots for PS)</i>	1 766 781	1 264 726		
<i>Percentage of hooks (shots) observed</i>	24	100		
	<i>Total number of observed interactions/mortality</i>			
	<i>Interactions</i>	<i>Mortality</i>	<i>Interactions</i>	<i>Mortality</i>
<i>Seabirds</i>	0	0	89	43
<i>Sharks</i>	3236	1406	3691	2648
<i>Sea Turtles</i>	0	0	4	0

(c) *Mitigation – describe the current mitigation requirements:*

**Seabirds**

Swordfish vessels are required to use a tori line and line weighting (minimum 60 g weight).

Tuna vessels are required to use a tori line and can only set at night.

A 25 seabird limit applies to a vessel. Once this limit is reached the vessel is required to use additional mitigation measures. For swordfish vessels they must use a double tori line and are only allowed to set at night. For tuna vessels they must fly a double tori line and all lines must be weighted.

A 50 seabird limit also applies to vessels to allow the Department an opportunity to investigate the reason of high seabird mortality and to apply remedial action.

Release tools and procedures are prescribed in permit conditions.

**Sharks**

Charter vessels are not allowed to use wire tracers.

Charter vessels are restricted to a shark by-catch limit of 10% of the catch of tuna and swordfish landed.

Domestic vessels are restricted to a shark by-catch limit of 50% of the catch of tuna and swordfish landed.

The entire longline fleet is restricted to a Precautionary Upper Catch Limit of 2000t.

The following shark species are banned: hammerheads; silky; threshers, and; oceanic whitetip.

#### Sea Turtles

Turtles may not be landed.

Release tools and procedures are prescribed in permit conditions.

Longline vessels typically use branch lines that are longer than buoy lines, which allow hooked turtles to make it back to the surface to breath.

Industry is encouraged to use circle hooks.

Tuna vessels typically set deeper and use fish bait, which may explain the lower incidence of turtle interaction for this fleet.

### **(3) Historical SBT Catch (retained and non-retained)**

*Specify the best estimate (weight and number as available) of the historical fishing amounts of SBT for each sector (e.g. commercial longline, commercial purse seine, commercial charter fleet, domestic fleet, recreational) in the table below. The table should include the most recently completed fishing season. Figures should be provided for both retained SBT and non-retained SBT. For longline and recreational, "Retained SBT" includes SBT retained on vessel and "Non-Retained SBT" includes those returned to the water. For farming, "Retained SBT" includes SBT stocked to farming cages and "Non-Retained SBT" includes towing mortalities. If the number of individuals is known but the value in tonnes is unknown, enter the number of individuals in square brackets (e.g. [250]). Table cells should not be left empty. If the value is zero, enter "0". It is recognised that for some sectors, the information requested in this table may not yet be available. Therefore, if the value is unknown, enter "?". However, estimates are preferred over unknown entries. Cells containing estimates with a high degree of uncertainty should be shaded in light grey. A description of any estimation methods should be provided below the table.*

Fishing Season (e.g. 2011/12)	Retained and Non-Retained SBT					
	Sector 1 (domestic longline)		Sector 2 (charter longline)		Sector 3 (recreational fishery)	
	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT	Retained SBT	Non-Retained SBT
2005	2.5t (36)	?	21.5t (303)	?	Likely to be 0, but not able to verify	Likely to be 0, but not able to verify
2006	9.4t (133)	?	0t (0)	0	0	0
2007	15.2t (224)	?	26.2t (532)	29	0	0
2008	0.3t (3)	?	45.2t (806)	106	0	0
2009	14.8t (204)	?	13.2t (204)	6	0	0
2010	34.3t (561)	?	0.1t (4)	26	0	0
2011	26.7t (359)	?	21.9t (349)	19	0	0
2012	54.9t (865)	?	21.7t (393)	300	0	0
2013	43.3t (451)	?	22.3t (250)	126	0	0
2014	47.4t (588)	16 (data obtained from observer data. 13% SBT hooks observed)	2.9t (35)	1	0	0

