



CCSBT-CC/1110/04 rev4

COMPLIANCE WITH CCSBT MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Purpose

To provide a summary of compliance with CCSBT conservation and management measures by Members and Cooperating Non-Members.

Discussion

In order to assist with the review of compliance, the Secretariat has compiled a summary of Compliance with the main CCSBT measures for the period from July 2010 to June 2011. This is provided at **Attachment A**. The compliance with measures table has been expanded since CC5, particularly in relation to Data and the CDS.

There are numerous cells in Attachment A in which compliance with CDS information is well under 100%. However, most of this is for 2010 and teething problems are expected in the first year of implementation. Furthermore, due to limited resources within the Secretariat, the process for the Secretariat contacting Members/CNM's regarding missing data and discrepancies and obtaining responses is taking a long time to complete and it is expected that the percentages will improve through this process. Some common or reported CDS data issues are provided at **Attachment B**.

From a verification and compliance perspective, the CDS items in Attachment A of most concern are probably:

- The percentage of CDS Catch Monitoring Forms (CMFs) issued during 2010 for which not all corresponding Catch Tagging Forms (CTFs) were provided. All Member's CMFs had problems, with between 5% and 22% of Member's CMFs not having all the associated CTFs. This problem seems less severe for CMFs issued in 2011, but only data for the first quarter of 2011 is currently available.
- The percentage of Indonesian CMFs for which the vessels were not on the CCSBT record of authorised vessels. The percentage was worse for CMFs involving exports (23% of CMFs with no authorised vessel) than for those involving domestic landings (9%). This is surprising because the exports would need to be checked by both the exporting and importing Members as the CDS and authorised vessel resolutions do not permit, amongst other things, Members to export or import SBT caught by vessels that are not authorised to catch SBT.

The Total Allowable Catch is CCSBT's primary conservation measure and a comparison of catches against allocation for this measure is shown at **Attachment C**. The most up to date source of information for this comparison is usually the monthly catch reports. Catches from other reports to CCSBT have been included where available. Highlighted figures in the table indicate where the catch was higher than the Effective Catch Limit¹.

¹ Allocated catches (after agreed quota transfers) minus any additional agreed voluntary reductions.

The Fifth Meeting of the Compliance Committee noted that some of the information contained in the "Characterisation of global fisheries for southern bluefin tuna" was out of date, and agreed that the Secretariat should update this information with the most recent year's data. The updated information is provided at **Attachment D**.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Compliance with CCSBT measures for the period 01-Jul-2010 to 30-Jun-2011.

For CDS data, the table covers the 2010 Calendar year, and the first quarter of 2011 as data for Jan - Mar 2011 is provided on 30 June 2011.

With the exception of National reports and Quota, all compliance indicators are as at 11 October 2011. The notation used within the table is described on the next page.

		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
Data	Monthly Catch Reports	✓	P	✓	✓	✓	F	✓	F	P
	Quota Allocation & Final Catch per entity									
	• <i>Initial Allocation</i>	✓	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	• <i>Final Catch by Vessel</i>	✓	X	X ¹	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
	Scientific Data Exchange									
	• <i>Total Catch by Fleet</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	F
	• <i>Catch and Effort</i>	✓	X	F	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Size Data</i>	✓	X	F	✓	✓	✓	NRDE	✓	NRDE
	• <i>Direct Ageing</i>	✓	NRDE	F	X	✓	✓	NRDE	NRDE	NRDE
• <i>Other²</i>	✓	X	F	X	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	
CDS (during 2010 Calendar year)³	Validation Details Updated	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
	Documents Received	F	F	✓	F	✓	F	F	F	P
	% of CMFs with all corresponding CTFs	93%	78%	89%	87%	95%	91%	100%	100%	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish numbers exactly match CMF</i>	93%	88%	96%	92%	88%	89%	100%	0% ⁴	X
	• <i>% of CTFs where fish weights within 2.5% of CMF</i>	88%	95%	92%	97%	90%	92%	100%	0% ⁴	X
	% of Domestic Landing CMFs contain complete and accurate information ⁵	89%	75%	86%	n/a	80%	94%	n/a	87%	X
	% of Export CMFs contain complete and accurate information ⁵	84%	64%	n/a	86%	93%	88%	100%	82%	X
	% of Domestic Landing CMFs with valid authorised vessels/farms	100%	91%	100%	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	100%	X
% of Export CMFs with valid authorised vessels/farms	100%	77%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	X	

		Australia	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Taiwan	Philippines	South Africa	European Union
ERS Recommendations	ERS Compliance as advised by Member/CNM									
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Seabirds</i>	✓	✓	✓	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Implement IPOA – Sharks</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Implement FAO-Sea Turtles</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Comply with IOTC Measures</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
	• <i>Comply with WCPFC Measures</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	✓
	Report to the CC on action taken pursuant to paragraphs 1-3 of ERS recommendation									
• <i>2010</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	
• <i>2011</i>	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	✓	
Members Reports in 2011 providing all information as required by templates	CC/CCSBT	P ⁹	P	✓	P ⁹	P ⁹	P ⁹	P	P	P ⁹
	ESC	✓	F	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
	ERSWG	n/a								
	Compliance Action Plan	P ¹⁰	P	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	✓
VMS	Members Reports	P ¹⁰	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	P

- ✓ - For Data and CDS - Indicates Full compliance where the total number of days outside the due date was less than 28 (when added together for the entire period).
- For Members Reports – Indicates that reports contained all information as required by the template.
- For Authorised Vessels/Farms – indicates that data has been received and there is no evidence of periods of non-authorisation

- F - For Data and CDS - Indicates Full compliance but the total number of days outside the due date was greater than 28 (when added together for the entire period).
- For Members Reports – Indicates that reports contained partial information on all aspects of the template.
- For ERS – indicates that a plan is ‘Under Development’
- For Authorised Vessels/Farms – indicates that full information has been received; however there has been some period of non-authorisation

- P - Indicates Partial compliance (not all data received or no advice provided for a part of the period)
- For Members Reports – Indicates that report did not contain all of the information specified in the template.

- X - Indicates non compliance (no data received, or no advice provided)
- For ERS – indicates non-implementation of measure, or no advice provided.

n/a - Not Applicable

NRDE - Not specified as required for the ESC Data Exchange because this Member/Cooperating Non-Member is not currently able to provide this type of information. However they are encouraged to start collecting/providing this core information as soon as possible.

¹ The data is not provided to the Secretariat as required by the decision. However, Japan has advised that this data was provided to Diplomatic Posts.

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

³ The process for the Secretariat contacting Members/CNM's regarding missing data and discrepancies and obtaining responses is taking some time to complete and some figures in this table are subject to improvement through this process

⁴ South Africa has provided Catch Tagging data for 2010, however this data did not directly match to a single CMF form.

⁵ Documents where a range of months has been provided for one product type are considered to be incomplete even though the resolution does not specifically disallow this. Incomplete/Inaccurate information includes things such as missing information for one or more fields and incorrect information such as invalid codes/conversion factors etc.

⁶ Australia allows its farms to provide a single Catch tagging form at the end of their harvest period. Subsequently the data for the period 1-Jan-2011 to 31-Mar-2011 has not yet been received. It is expected that this data will be provided at the next submission of data due on 30-Sep-2011.

⁷ Correct information is interpreted to mean that the deployment requests contained information relating to SBT and were not revised.

⁸ Correct information is interpreted to mean that the Transshipment Declaration contains the same information on SBT (presence and/or weight) as the Observer reports, or has not been revised.

⁹ A common factor with all of these Reports is that they have not specified details on the level of coverage and type of audit undertaken, in accordance with paragraph 5.8 of the CDS resolution, and the level of compliance, as required by the template.

¹⁰ Australia has provided a comprehensive Compliance Action Plan detailing its verification and implementation measures, however it does not use the standard template, and as a result does not contain specific information as required by the template (such as vessels expected to fish for/target SBT, percent of catches Exported).

Common or Reported CDS Data Issues

Date Ranges provided on Forms

Some Members have provided a range of dates spanning months for a single row of fish on a CMF. Whilst the resolution does not specifically disallow this, the form and associated instructions require a single month of Catch/Harvest. Using a range of months can cause problems with consolidation of catch against quota if the range of months spans the start or end months of a Member/CNMs quota year.

Total weights on CTF forms not matching within 2.5% of CMF

In 2010, the Secretariat advised that it was using a 2.5% tolerance factor on weights between CTF and CMF forms, to allow for minor 'administrative' discrepancies between the two (such as discrete measurement differences, icing of frozen product etc).

Examination of the 2010 CDS data shows that in 9% of cases, there was a discrepancy of 2.5% or more between the weights in CMF and CTF forms. If the tolerance factor was increased from 2.5% to 4.5%, then this would allow 95% of the forms to be accepted without question on this criteria. However, this would also increase the number of incorrect forms getting through. In fact, examination of the frequency distribution of discrepancies indicates a large reduction in the frequency of cases with a discrepancy of 1.0% or more, suggesting that a 2.5% or less discrepancy between the forms should be achievable. The frequency distribution is shown in paper CCSBT-CC/1110/07.

Destination field not being completed in Export section of CMF

There have been a number of cases where the "*Destination (State/Fishing Entity)*" field has not been completed for Export CMF documents. This causes problems in following up with the Importing State/Entity if that document has not yet been received by the Secretariat and also prevents examination of exports to destinations other than Members, CNMs and OSECs.

Invalid Codes or Conversion Factors provided

Some Members have provided documents that contain invalid codes, such as invalid Statistical Areas, or invalid Conversion Factors in the "*Description of Fish*" section of the CMF. Conversion Factors with a value less than 1 are considered invalid, as the Conversion Factor is used to convert to whole weights by multiplying processed weights with the conversion factor. If a Conversion Factor less than 1 is provided, then this is not used by the Secretariat in producing summary reports that contain Estimated Whole Weights.

South Africa has been unable to directly match CTF information with a single CMF for 2010 and part of 2011.

South Africa has provided Catch Tagging Data for 2010, however has not been able to directly match a CTF (or individual rows on a CTF) with an associated CMF. Subsequently, it has not been possible to directly consolidate the weights and numbers provided in tagging data against a single CMF. However, the Secretariat has been able to aggregate the data for

checking purposes, and has been able to verify that the total weights and numbers across multiple CMF's match the tagging data provided.

South Africa has committed to providing the data with a direct match as required by the CDS resolution for future data, noting that the first half of 2011 will still be aggregated until the revised processes can be implemented.

Catch and Allocation for the Two Seasons Following CCSBT 16 (October 2009 and October 2010)¹

(Note: This table is for a two year Catch and Allocation)

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

	Season	Two year Total Allocated Catch for 2010 & 2011	Two year Total Effective Catch Limit for 2010 & 2011 (after Quota transfers) ¹	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report)	Estimated Catch from CDS Documents	Partial 2 year Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports ²	2010 & Partial 2011 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports ²
Australia	1-Dec-09 to 30-Nov-11	8540	8030	Not yet Available	Not yet Available	7937.4	7750
Indonesia	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-11	1302	1302			584.5	584.5
Philippines	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-11	90 ³	90 ³			80	80
South Africa	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-11	80 ³	80 ³			85.1	85.1
European Union	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-11	20 ³	20 ³			2.9	2.9
Taiwan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	1718	1718			1634.3	1740.9
Japan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	4522	4800 ⁴			4186	4347.4
Korea	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-12	1718	1718			1161.4	1161.4
New Zealand	1-Oct-09 to 30-Sep-11	1508	1140 ⁴			1040.2	1038.5

Catch for the Season Following CCSBT 16 (October 2009)

(Note: This table is for a single year Catch only)

	Season	CCSBT 17 decided that the TAC allocation decided at CCSBT 16 was considered a 2 year total TAC, and could be distributed across the two year period.	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report)	Estimated Catch from CDS Documents ⁵	Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2010 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-09 to 30-Nov-10	See above table for 2 year Total Allocations	4091 (CC)	4092	4088.8	3901
Indonesia	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10		473.2 (CC)	670.6 ⁶	544.3	544.3
Philippines	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10		42.5 (CC)	42.5	42.5	42.5
South Africa	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10		34 (DE)	29.2	34.4	34.4
European Union	1-Jan-10 to 31-Dec-10		2.9 (CC)	n/a	2.9	2.9
Taiwan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-11		1140 (CC)	1126.5	1159.4	1226.2
Japan	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-11		2081 (CC)	1876.7	2083	2223.3
Korea	1-Apr-10 to 31-Mar-11		869.1 (ESC)	780.5	869	867.4
New Zealand	1-Oct-09 to 30-Sep-11		501.8 (CC)	n/a	499.5	417.7

Cells Highlighted in yellow indicate that the reported catch is greater than the Effective Catch Limit

Cells highlighted in green below indicate where TIS estimates of the catch are higher than the nationally reported estimates⁸.

Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 15 (October 2008)

	Season	Allocated Catch	Effective Catch Limit ⁹	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ¹⁰	Estimated Catch from TIS Documents ¹¹	Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2009 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-08 to 30-Nov-09	5265	5265	5242 (CC)	5005.4 ⁷	5222	5088.6
Indonesia	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	750	750	641 (CC)	22	640.7	640.7
Philippines	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	45	45	47 (OL + CC)	46.6	44.6	44.6
South Africa	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	40	40	32 (CC)	0	34.3	34.3
European Union	1-Jan-09 to 31-Dec-09	10	10	1.77 (OL)	0	1.77	1.77
Taiwan	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	1140	1000	949 (ESC)	387	936.8	912.1
Japan	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	3000	3000	2816 (CC)	0	2814	2657.7
Korea	1-Apr-09 to 31-Mar-10	1140	1000	1166 (CC)	593.3	1123	1165.5
New Zealand	1-Oct-08 to 30-Sep-09	420	420	417.3 (CC)	182	416.4	318.6

Catch and Allocation for the Season Following CCSBT 14 (October 2007)

	Season	Allocated Catch	Effective Catch Limit ⁸	Whole weight (tonnes) from other reports to CCSBT (type of report) ⁹	Estimated Catch from TIS Documents ¹⁰	Fishing Season Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports	2008 Calendar Year Estimated Whole weight (tonnes) from Monthly Catch Reports
Australia	1-Dec-07 to 30-Nov-08	5265	5265	5234 (CC)	5202 ⁸	5233	5033.1
Indonesia	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	750	750	900 (CC)	112	873	873
Philippines	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	45	45	44.9 (OL + CC)	50	44.7	44.7
South Africa	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	40	40	45.5 (CC)	0	45.5	45.5
European Union	1-Jan-08 to 31-Dec-08	10	10	14.3 (CC)	0	14.3	14.3
Taiwan	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	1140	1000	926 (CC)	649	926.6	876.5
Japan	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	3000	3000	2919 (CC)	3	2921	2952
Korea	1-Apr-08 to 31-Mar-09	1140	1000	1135 (CC)	1286	1140.3	1134.5
New Zealand	1-Oct-07 to 30-Sep-08	420	420	318.8 (CC)	103.2	318.1	318.6

¹ CCSBT 17 decided that that the current TAC allocation decided at CCSBT 16 was considered a 2 year total TAC, and could be distributed across the two year period, with unused catch from the first year carried forward to the second year.

² Data from Monthly Catch Reports is available for Catches to the End of August 2011. Subsequently, the figures in this column represent catches to this date only.

³ Unlike Members, Cooperation Non-Members had an annual allocation, but it is shown here as a 2 year allocation for simplicity.

⁴ The effective catch limits for Japan and New Zealand agreed at CCSBT 16 were 2261t and 709t respectively. The figures shown here include a 139t transfer from New Zealand to Japan.

⁵ This includes catch from documents received from the Importer that have not yet been received from the Exporter.

⁶ Excluding documents received from the Importer, but not yet been received from the Exporter, this figure is closer to the Reported catch.

⁷ The TIS scheme does not record the month of harvest for farmed product. These figures are taken from the annual TIS Farm Summaries provided by Australia, and are the weights of product Captured for Farming.

⁸ Includes agreed and Voluntary reductions in catch

⁹ In order of preference, the following information sources were used, (but with the report with the most recent data taking highest preference regardless of the order below):

- OL – Official Letter
- CC – National Reports to the Compliance Committee
- ESC – National Reports to the Extended Scientific Committee
- ERSWG – National Reports to the Ecologically Related Species Working Group
- DE – Data Exchange (2011)

¹⁰ As reported in CCSBT/ESC/1009/04, the Trade Information Scheme has a number of limitations in estimating global catches, and the TIS should generally underestimate the true weight of the total catch.

Characterisation of Global Fisheries for Southern Bluefin Tuna

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

* Please Note that information provided in sections (A),(B) and (C) are taken from data provided to the Secretariat. Some Members have provided different figures for parts of these tables and the Secretariat is working with these Members to resolve these differences.

(A) Catching Sector (2010 calendar year)

Domestic Catch	Catch (t) ¹	No. of vessels ²	Size of authorised vessels in Fleet ³
Longline within domestic waters	1163.6	213	
Australia	160.3	15	21.1m average (15.8m – 28.0m)
Indonesia	467.9	151	23.8m average (12.9m – 49.4m)
New Zealand	501	40 ⁴	20.6m average (13.4m – 49.9m) ⁵
South Africa	34.4	7	24.8m average (21.5m – 29.7m)
Surface within domestic waters	4039	6	
Australia	4039	6	32.5m average (18.7m – 47.0m)
Recreational	Unknown		
Australia	Insufficient data available to determine		
New Zealand ⁶	0		
South Africa	Allowance of 10/day per person but practicality of reaching grounds means that recreational take is unlikely		
High Seas Catch			
High Seas Catch	4343.4	167	
EU	2.9	2	35.7m average (12.0m – 52.0m)
Japan	2223	77	49.2m average (43.7m – 54.8m)
Korea	867	7	48.0m average (43.5m – 51.0m)
Philippines ⁷	42.5	1	47.2m average (40.8m – 56.0m)
Taiwan	1208	80	51.3m average (30.2m – 59.2m)

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

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

³ The figures are for vessels which were on the CCSBT authorised fishing vessel list in 2010 (regardless of its authorised period) using gear type filter. Unable to differentiate between domestic and high seas based on available information.

⁴ The figure includes vessels flagged to Japan that caught SBT under Joint Venture agreement with Japan.

⁵ Size range of vessels that caught SBT (including 4 Japanese-flagged charter vessels), not all authorised vessels in fleet.

⁶ Recreational allowance of 4t , customary allowance of 1t, and allowance for other source of mortality of 2t.

⁷ All Philippines catch assumed to be taken on high seas based on statements in the most recent Philippines National report (2010).

(B) Transporting / landing (2010 calendar year)

	Australia	EU	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Philippines	South Africa	Taiwan
Number of transhipments (and flag transhipped to)⁸	0	0	0	Japan: 3 Panama: 8 Singapore:3, Vanuatu: 7	Japan: 2 Panama: 4	0	Panama: 1	0 ⁹	Japan: 3 Panama: 16 Singapore: 6 Vanuatu: 12
Number & flag of carrier vessels authorised¹⁰	Australia: 0	0	0	Japan: 3 Panama: 17 Singapore: 3 Vanuatu: 12	Japan: 2 Panama: 5	0	Japan: 4 Panama: 17 Singapore: 3 Taiwan: 2 Vanuatu: 10	0	Japan: 2 Panama: 16 Singapore: 3 Taiwan: 2 Vanuatu: 14
Main ports: Domestic¹¹	Port Lincoln	none	2 designated ports (Jakarta, Bali)	8 designated ports (Shimizu, Yaizu etc.)	Busan	Gisborne Tauranga Napier	Unknown	9 designated ports (inc. Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Durban)	Kaohsiung
Main ports: Foreign¹²	N/A	Durban, South Africa / Papeete, Tahiti	Unknown	15 designated ports (includes. Cape Town etc.)	5 designated ports (Shimizu, Cape Town, Durban, Port Louis, Bali)	N/A	Cape Town	Unknown	2 designated ports (Cape Town, Port Louis)
Exports by destination country¹³:	6164.1	none	368.7		913.5	429.2	37.0	20.9	937.5
<i>Japan</i>	6093		257.8		913.5	428.6	37.0	12.5	935.9
<i>Korea</i>	7.4		44.6	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>USA</i>	26.4		64.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	0.0
<i>Australia</i>			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>EU</i>	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>South Africa</i>	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		1.6
<i>All others</i>	37.3		2.3	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Domestic Consumption	Unknown (believed to be limited)	Unknown (believed to be limited)	Unknown (approx. 800t)	Unknown (approximates total catches + imports)	Unknown (believed to be limited)	Limited	Unknown (believed to be limited)	Nil	150t (estimated)

⁸ Based on the transhipment reports provided to the Secretariat.

⁹ At sea transhipments not permitted.

¹⁰ The figures are for vessels which were on the CCSBT authorised carrier vessel list in 2010 (regardless its authorised period).

¹¹ Based on each Member's Compliance Action Plan(2010) or National Report(2010)

¹² Based on each Member's Compliance Action Plan(2010) or National Report(2010)

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

(C) Markets (2010 calendar year) Quantities are net weights in tonnes¹⁴.

Importers	Exporters									
	Australia	EU	Indonesia	Japan	Korea	New Zealand	Philippines	South Africa	Taiwan	Total
Australia	-	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5
Canada	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2
China	3.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.3
France	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.9
Germany	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greece	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong	0.8	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.9
Indonesia	0.06	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0.06
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japan	6093	0	257.8		913.5	428.6	37	12.5	935.9	8678.3
Korea	7.4	0	44.6	0		0	0	0	0	52
Malaysia	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	0.5	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0.5
Philippines	0	0	1.3							1.3
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore	17.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.3
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1.6	1.6
Spain	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.03
Switzerland	0.97	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	1.07
Thailand	0.53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.53
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Arab Emirates	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.03
United Kingdom	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
United States	26.4	0	64.1	0	0	1.8	0	8.4	0	100.7
Total	6164.1	0	368.7	0	913.5	429.2	37	20.9	937.5	8870.9

¹⁴ Export quantities (t) calculated using information from CDS Catch Monitoring Forms (using the figures for overall estimated net weights).

(D) Monitoring (2009 or 2010 fishing year unless otherwise stated)

	Observer Coverage¹⁵			
	As a Percentage of Catch		As a Percentage of Effort (purse seine set or longline hook)	
	2009 fishing year	2010 fishing year	2009 fishing year	2010 fishing year
Australia	15.5% (purse seine)	12.4%(purse seine)	8.4% (purse seine), 17.2% (ETBF), 8.5%(WTBF)	20.2%(purse seine), 7.7%(ETBF), 2.5%(WTBF)
EU				
Indonesia ¹⁶	?	?	?	?
Japan	4.6%	7.2%	7.0%	6.5%
Korea	9.5%	12.7%	9.5%	12.7%
New Zealand ¹⁷	89% (charter) 10% (domestic)	84% (charter) 7% (domestic)	82% (charter) 8% (domestic)	80% (charter) 7% (domestic)
Philippines ¹⁸				
South Africa ¹⁹				
Taiwan	12.8%	8.4%	15.0%	12.0%

	Vessel Monitoring Systems(2009 fishing year)²⁰
Australia	Mandatory for all authorised SBT vessels. 70 vessels actually reported to a national VMS (2008-2009)
EU	VMS requirements under ICCAT apply (these vessels are considered most likely to also take SBT)
Indonesia	(i) foreign fisheries vessels and other fisheries vessels 100 GT above are compulsory to procure their own transmitter, (ii) fisheries vessel with 60 – 100 GT may borrow transmitter belongs to government (if any stock) and (iii) fisheries vessels below 60 GT will be provided by VMS off line procured by government.
Japan	Mandatory for all far seas fishing vessels. 103 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS.
Korea	Mandatory for all SBT fishing vessels. 11 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS.
New Zealand	Mandatory in large-scale vessels (>28m), as well as foreign charter vessels; New Zealand flagged and registered vessels operating outside of New Zealand vessels; vessels issued with a foreign license to fish in New Zealand waters; and other vessels as specified by the Chief Executive. 78 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS.
Philippines	The Philippine Fisheries Administration formally operationalized its VMS to track its flagged vessels operating in IOTC, ICCAT and WCPFC. The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources(BFAR) required commercial fishing vessel owners to submit vessel tracking agreements, authorizing BFAR to monitor and track their respective vessels.
South Africa	Mandatory for all vessels. All authorised vessels fishing in the South African fishery reported to a national VMS.
Taiwan	Mandatory for all SBT fishing vessels. 66 authorised vessels actually reported to a national VMS.

¹⁵ Based on National report or Compliance Action Plan of Members/CNMs.

¹⁶ Observer data not reported on basis of catch or effort. Indonesia's 2011 National Report notes 5 observers observed for 535 days in total in 2009, and 5 observers observed for 240 days in total in 2010.

¹⁷ Figures are for Calendar year.

¹⁸ Observer data not reported on basis of catch or effort. Philippines' 2010 National Report notes to date 80 observers were ready for deployment.

¹⁹ Observer data not reported on basis of catch or effort. South Africa's 2010 National Report notes 100% coverage was obtained for foreign fishing vessels and 16% for domestic vessels.

²⁰ Based on National Report or Compliance Action Plan of Members/CNMs.