



CCSBT-ERS/1703/07

Information from the Compliance Committee on the Types of Information Collected on Bycatch Mitigation Measures under Members' Compliance Programs

Introduction

The Eleventh meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG 11) requested that the Compliance Committee collate information from Members on the types of information collected on bycatch mitigation measures under compliance programs for SBT vessels (e.g. port inspections and other monitoring and surveillance programs). In response to this request, the October 2015 meeting of the Compliance Committee added the following section to the annual reporting template for the Compliance Committee and Extended Commission.

“(d) Monitoring usage of bycatch mitigation measures:

- i. Describe the methods being used to monitor compliance with bycatch mitigation measures (e.g. types of port inspections conducted and other monitoring and surveillance programs used to monitor compliance). Include details of the level of coverage (e.g. proportion of vessels inspected each year):*
- ii. Describe the type of information that is collected on mitigation measures as part of compliance programmes for SBT vessels:”*

Information Received

The following table provides the information received from each Member and Cooperating Non-Member for the October 2016 Compliance Committee meeting from the new section of the reporting template.

	Methods being used to monitor compliance with bycatch mitigation measures, including coverage level	Type of information collected
Australia	Australia uses a number of methods to monitor compliance, including compliance with bycatch mitigation measures. These methods include electronic monitoring, Observer reports, aerial surveillance, at sea inspections and port inspections. As provided previously (Section 1d), in 2014/15 Australian fisheries officers conducted 27 inspections of SBT/ETBF boats, 15 inspections at sea and 12 inspections in port.	The information collected on mitigation measures includes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether bycatch mitigation, such as tori lines, is being carried on board the vessel, • whether bycatch mitigation has been deployed appropriately • whether the bycatch mitigation complies with specifications.
EU	<i>No information</i>	<i>No information</i>
Indonesia	<i>No information</i>	Catch composition including by-catch and ERS

	Methods being used to monitor compliance with bycatch mitigation measures, including coverage level	Type of information collected
Japan	During 2015/2016 fishing season, Japan has dispatched monitoring and control vessel, Mihama of FAJ. She inspected 9 Japanese fishing vessels registered with the CCSBT through vessel radio communication and visual confirmation relevant to bycatch mitigation measures. The coverage is 10% (9 vessels / 90 vessels).	Fishers have been mandated to write down seabird bycatch mitigation measures applied their operations in the logbook since 2014.
Korea	The Korea NFQS inspector conducts port inspection for all the SBT fishery vessels by comparing the bycatch report with remaining bycatches in the fish box.	The NIFS requests that tori line and weights used as seabird bycatch mitigation measures should be recorded in the logbook since 2013. In addition, the NIFS produces the statistics for bycatch species after reviewing the observer report and logbook data submitted by the fishing vessels.
New Zealand	Compliance with these measures is monitored through at sea and in port inspections from Fisheries Officers, aerial surveillance from military aircraft, and the placement of observers on board vessels. Observer reports indicating problems with use of mitigation equipment are prioritised for follow-up with vessel operators. In the 2015 calendar year, the inspections undertaken found four incidents where breaches of seabird mitigation regulations may have occurred across the New Zealand surface longline fleet. Each of these breaches resulted in an official warning.	Fishery Officers collect information about tori line and line-weighting gear that is present on vessels. Observer reports provide information about mitigation gear usage, gear descriptions, and fisher attitudes toward seabird mitigation.
South Africa	All large pelagic longline vessels are subjected to port inspection in line with Port State Measures and as per attached Annexure 5 ¹ of the large pelagic longline permit conditions. This port inspection is carried out by the Fishery Compliance Officers in conjunction with the Observers. This includes the Tori line measurements, checking the availability of the dehooking devices as well as line cutters. In addition, Patrol vessels are from time to time tasked to randomly board the large pelagic longline vessels for the inspection of the above.	Through section B and C of the attached Annexure 5 ¹ of the large pelagic longline permit conditions, an Observer is required to confirm the deployment of Tori line every day as well as weighted lines.
Taiwan	We dispatch observer to monitor compliance with bycatch mitigation measures. The coverage is about 18% (13 vessels / 72 vessels) in 2015/2016 fishing season.	Observers shall record the mitigation measures adopted by the vessel on the observer's logbook since 2014.
Philippines	<i>No information</i>	<i>No information</i>

The information requested by the Compliance Committee overlaps with the information specified in section 7 of the template for the Annual Report to the ERSWG, which requires reporting of the “Compliance Monitoring System (i.e. how is compliance measured)” for mitigation measures and the “Level of Compliance for each [mitigation] measure”.

¹ Provided here as **Attachment A**

The information requested by the Compliance Committee does not include the estimated percentage of vessels which implement each type of mitigation measure. It may be useful to include this in a future revision of the Compliance Committee's template, although the ERSWG template does have something similar (i.e. level of compliance with each mitigation measure).

Not all Members provided the information requested by the Compliance Committee. In some cases, no information was provided, and in other cases, information was provided that did not match the information being sought.

The ERSWG is invited to comment on the usefulness of this information and to provide suggestions for improvement.

