



Operation of CCSBT MCS Measures

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS)	2
3. TRANSHIPMENT MONITORING PROGRAM.....	8
4. VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM (VMS).....	12
5. CCSBT IUU VESSEL LIST.....	12
6. RECORDS OF AUTHORISED VESSELS AND FARMS	12
ATTACHMENT A.....	14

1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides a summary of the operation of the main five CCSBT Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) measures from the Secretariat's perspective:

- 1) The Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS),
- 2) The Transshipment Monitoring Program,
- 3) The Vessel Monitoring System (VMS),
- 4) The CCSBT Illegal Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Vessel List Resolution, and
- 5) Records of Authorised Vessels and Farms.

For each measure, the Secretariat's roles/responsibilities with respect to that measure are outlined. Any issues that the Secretariat is aware of in the operation of the measure, and any recommendations for changes to that measure are also discussed. In addition, a summary of transshipment program data received by the Secretariat are provided at **Attachment A**.

This year, proposed revisions to these main CCSBT measures have been included in separate papers: CCSBT-CC/1510/09 (CDS Resolution) and CC/1510/11 (Authorised Vessel Resolution).

2. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS)

2.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

The Secretariat's roles/responsibilities are:

- receiving and processing¹ all CDS documents;
- checking the completeness and accuracy of these documents;
- conducting reconciliations between the different types of CDS forms and between copies of forms provided by exporters and importers;
- following-up with Members/Cooperating Non-members (CNMs) regarding discrepancies and missing information;
- managing validation details submitted by Members/CNMs;
- producing 6 monthly and annual CDS reports;
- maintaining and enhancing the CDS database;
- coordinating the purchase of centralised tags for use with the CDS;
- noting and considering any implementation issues encountered;
- regularly reviewing the effectiveness of the CDS Resolution as appropriate, and
- responding to ad hoc queries as required.

2.2 CDS OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The following are the main CDS operational issues that the Secretariat has observed since the Ninth meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC9). Many of these issues are the same as in previous years. The Secretariat continues to work with relevant Members/ CNMs to resolve these issues where possible/ practicable.

This year the Secretariat has been able to spend more time analysing both import and REEF (Re-export/Export after Landing of Domestic Product Form) data, including running some basic REEF reconciliations. These analyses have highlighted that there are issues regarding both the submission of REEFs by re-/exporters and the submission of importer copies of Catch Monitoring Forms (CMFs) and/or REEFs by importers.

2.2.1 Late Submission of CDS Documents

Time delays in receiving data submissions can make some CDS tasks difficult or impossible to carry out in a timely manner. For example, late (and non-) submissions may delay the commencement of reconciliation work and/or negatively impact on reconciliation results.

Late (and non) submission may also affect the completeness of information that can be provided to meetings, presented in the Secretariat's six-monthly or annual CDS reports, and used in estimates of catch against allocations.

Information on late submissions is provided below.

¹ Loading all electronic documents received (all Catch Tagging Forms from all Members and all Catch Monitoring Forms & Re-Export/Export after landing of Domestic Product forms from Australia) to the database, and data entry of all paper documents received (all other forms).

a. CMFs/ CTFs Submitted Late by Catchers

Indonesia

Indonesia's CMF documents for the first quarter of 2014, were submitted approximately three weeks later than the data submission guidelines, and CMFs for the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2014 were submitted approximately 2 weeks late. A batch of 10 CMFs that had been missing for 2014 were not submitted until June 2015.

South Africa

South Africa has submitted 29 CMFs for the second quarter of 2014, but all of these CMFs were submitted more than two months late. In addition, all of South Africa's tagging data for the 2nd quarter were submitted approximately three months late and for the 3rd quarter of 2014 approximately three weeks late.

b. CMFs/ REEFs Submitted Late by Importers

Japan submitted its import copies of CMFs/REEFs received to date on time. Most other less frequently importing Members (Australia, Korea and occasionally the EU, New Zealand, South Africa and Taiwan), either provided importer copies of CMF and/or REEF documents late, or sometimes did not provide these documents at all – refer to section 2.2.2 below.

A situation that often occurs with these less frequent importers is as follows. The Secretariat runs its importer reconciliations and determines that some or all expected importer copies of CMFs/REEFs have not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by a particular importing Member/CNM. The Secretariat then advises the importer about the missing CMFs/REEFs, and the importer tries to locate these documents by seeking information on the probable importing company via the Secretariat and the exporting Member. In the majority of these cases, the importing Member/CNM generally seems unaware of these SBT imports until advised by the Secretariat that the CDS documents are missing. Therefore, importer copies are often only submitted after prompting by the Secretariat.

This demonstrates that Members that import SBT on a less frequent basis need to improve their systems and processes to better detect SBT imports and subsequently submit importer copies of the associated CMFs/ REEFs. If known SBT imports are frequently not being initially detected by these Members, then it's possible that there are system flaws that will allow illegal SBT to be imported.

During 2014, this scenario occurred for:

- Australia (partial provision due to compliance investigation), Korea (partial provision), NZ (partial provision), and the EU (not yet provided) with regard to CMFs
- Korea (partial provision), New Zealand (partial provision) and Taiwan (now provided) with respect to REEFs.

During 2015 this scenario occurred for:

- Australia (now provided), Korea (partial provision) and South Africa (not yet provided) with regard to CMFs, and
- Korea (partial provision) and Taiwan (now provided) with respect to REEFs.

The Secretariat also assisted Japan with trying to locate 14 missing importer copies of CMFs exported to Japan by South Africa.

2.2.2 Non-Submission of CDS Documents

Many of the same issues outlined in section 2.2.1 above may also result as a consequence of non-submission of CDS documents.

a. Non-submission of CMFs/REEFs by Exporters/re-exporters

CMFs

During 2014 and the first quarter of 2015, the submission level of expected CMFs by exporters was high. In 2014, only two CMFs are missing for Australia (6.39t) and one CMF each is missing for Indonesia (0.31t), NZ (0.17t) and South Africa (0.47t). All CMFs so far expected for the first quarter of 2015 have been received.

REEFs

According to importer records, Indonesia issued at least 22 REEFs during 2014 and 9 during the first quarter of 2015, but none of these have been submitted to the Secretariat by Indonesia to date.

The Secretariat has recorded one REEF that was exported by Japan (0.56t) in 2014 that has not yet submitted to the Secretariat (by Japan).

b. Non-submission of CMFs/REEFs by Importers

The Secretariat detected a significant number of importer documents that have not been submitted to the Secretariat by the importer as expected. Note that it is possible that, in some cases, a shipment's actual export destination may change at shipping time, so that the expected importer may not always be the actual importer – so figures presented in this section should be considered cautiously.

There was a noticeably high percentage/number of import documents (especially for CMFs) not yet submitted by Korea. The Secretariat checked with exporting Members who confirmed that all the intended exports to Korea (that had missing importer copies) had actually been exported to Korea.

Korea advised the Secretariat that it has identified a problem with respect to provision of CDs documents by importers, and is currently working to resolve this issue for future submissions. In the meantime, Korea is trying to provide as many of the currently missing import documents as possible.

CMFs

During 2014, the following Members had not submitted importer copies of CMFs to the Secretariat as expected: Australia (2 missing - 0.45t)², Japan (35 missing - 206.18t), Korea (27missing - 2.52t), New Zealand (1 missing - 0.04t) and the EU (2 missing - 0.48t). During the first quarter of 2015, the following Members had not submitted expected importer copies of CMFs to the Secretariat: Japan (1 missing - 0.01t), Korea (6 missing - 0.37t) and South Africa (1 missing - 6.3t).

² Seized as evidence in a Compliance enquiry

REEFs

The Secretariat also detected a number of REEF importer documents that had not yet been submitted to the Secretariat by the expected importer. In 2014, there are 11 import REEFs missing from Korea (19.9t) and 1 from New Zealand (0.05t). In the first quarter of 2015, there are 7 import REEFs missing from Korea (9.2t).

2.2.3 Duplicate Form Numbers

Ensuring that CDS documents are issued with a unique form number is an important component of maintaining a robust CDS.

Indonesia issued a series of duplicate CMF numbers, especially during January and February 2015. In May 2015, an importer advised the Secretariat that 4 pairs of Indonesian CMFs with duplicate numbers were received by them, and that 29 pairs of Indonesian CMFs which had essentially duplicate numbers, except for being formatted slightly differently, were also received.

Indonesia appears to have partially resolved this problem post-issue and post-export by adding a postfix to one of each pair of duplicates (such as an 'A' or 'L' e.g. CMID15B0001 & 1A and CMID15B0056 & 56L) before submitting these documents to the Secretariat. The Secretariat notes that this situation appears to have occurred for at least all CMFs numbered from 1 – 59 (inclusive) for the 2015 calendar year.

2.2.4 Collaborative Arrangements with Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs)

CDS data indicate that there are significant exports of SBT to Non-Cooperating Non-Member (NCNM) States/Entities. For example, between 2010 and 2014 inclusive, the CDS indicates that 639.2t of SBT product was imported by the USA, and smaller amounts by China (124.4 t) and by Singapore (16.8t).

A major gap in the CDS is that whenever SBT is traded with a NCNM, no information is currently received back from these NCNMs to allow cross-checking and verification of the imports. This means that no independent verification of CDS exports to these States/entities can be conducted. The Secretariat has continued to promote cooperation with other NCNMs, especially Singapore and the USA during 2014/15, in order to further assist the CCSBT CDS reconciliation and verification processes, but has not yet managed to formalise relationships with any of these NCNMs to the extent that they have become OSECs³ to the CCSBT.

2.2.5 SBT Caught by Vessels not Authorised During the Month of Catch

As with previous years there were again some CMFs submitted that included vessels that caught SBT when they were not included on the CCSBT record of Authorised Vessels. In 2014 this occurred for two Australian CMFs (1 vessel), 5 Indonesian CMFs (4 vessels) and 6 South African CMFs (1 vessel). Both Australia and South Africa advised that that these non-authorisations were caused by administrative processing issues. Indonesia has not provided any advice regarding its unauthorised vessels. To date, the Secretariat has not detected any

³ The term OSECs refers to Other States/Fishing Entities Cooperating in the CDS

additional unauthorised vessels recorded on CMFs provided for the first quarter of 2015.

2.2.6 Validators not Authorised to Validate on Validation Date

During 2014, South Africa had one instance where a new validator had not yet been authorised at the time of validating a CMF.

2.2.7 Tagging Data Issues

Tagging data mismatch issues continue to be one of the biggest discrepancy issues identified during the Secretariat's reconciliation processes. While most Members have tried to reconcile their tagging data issues, South Africa has not yet done so for its 2014 data and received a relatively low score of 77.8% of CMFs that were submitted together with all their corresponding CTFs. The following are the main tagging issues identified by the Secretariat.

a. Tagging Data Mismatches

Many tagging data mismatches and/or missing sets of tagging data continued to be found during the reconciliation process for both 2014 and 2015 CDS data. As in previous years, mismatches generally occurred due to one of the following three situations:

- i) some tagging data which should have been submitted as part of the Excel spreadsheet quarterly submission of tagging data were missing, or
- ii) an incorrect or incomplete list of Catch Tagging Form (CTF) numbers was recorded on the CMF, or
- iii) the electronically submitted spreadsheets of catch tagging data contained errors such as referencing an incorrect CMF number, or
- iv) incorrect/ non-matching vessel information was sometimes provided as part of tagging submissions.

b. Duplicate Tag Numbers

Under the CDS Resolution, tag numbers issued by each Member/CNM must be unique. To assist Members with this task, uniquely pre-numbered tags are produced each year by a Japanese tag manufacturer and can be ordered through the Secretariat. All Members/CNMs except Australia, the EU and South Africa use these pre-numbered tags. The Philippines did not order any pre-numbered tags for 2015.

During 2014, duplicates tag numbers were submitted by Indonesia (32), New Zealand (246) and South Africa (10). South Africa's duplicates have since been corrected. As uniquely coded tags were purchased by Indonesia and New Zealand, it's likely that the duplicate tag numbers submitted to the Secretariat by these Members are a result of recording and/or data entry errors.

2.2.8 Secretariat Reconciliations of CDS Data: No Response Received

Neither Indonesia nor South Africa have provided a response to the Secretariat's 2014 reconciliation of its CDS data. However, Indonesia did provide a copy of most of the CMFs (except for one that is still missing) that were noted in the reconciliation as not yet having been submitted by them.

2.2.9 Copies of Cancelled CMFs Received Back from Importers

As in the previous two years, during 2014 the Secretariat received a number of importer copies of Australian export CMFs from Japan where these CMF numbers had already been cancelled by Australia.

This situation can happen in cases where a CMF for export is filled out by Australia, then a replacement CMF (with a new) number is issued which includes amended data, and the original Australian CMF is cancelled and then either i) or ii) below occurs:

i) The replacement Australian CMF (with a new number) is not sent to the importer, and therefore, the Secretariat receives only the original CMF number (not the replacement CMF) back from the importer, or

ii) The replacement CMF (with the new number) is sent to the importer, but the Secretariat still receives only the original CMF (number) and not the amended CMF (with the new number) back from the importer.

It is generally not possible for the Secretariat to determine which of the two scenarios i) or ii) has occurred. However, either scenario would result in the Secretariat receiving an export and import copy of essentially the same CMF (usually with some differences) with two different CMF numbers.

In order for the compliance checking process to function appropriately, the Secretariat requests that if an exporter cancels a CMF and replaces it with a newly issued CMF (with a different number), then this replacement CMF must be sent to the importer. In addition, the exporter should provide clear advice to the importer and the Secretariat regarding:

- The original CMF number that was cancelled, and
- The new CMF number that was issued as its replacement.

The importer should then ensure that the replacement CMF number, including its associated import information, is the one submitted to the Secretariat.

Alternatively, the importer could return both the original (cancelled) and replacement CMFs to the Secretariat, and clearly mark which one is the original (cancelled), and which one is the replacement.

2.2.10 Fish Weight/Number Differ Between Exporter and Importer Copies of a CMF

There still appears to be a relatively small problem where CDS documentation is sometimes being amended after the original CMF has been exported with the SBT but before the CMFs are submitted to the Secretariat. This sometimes results in the importer submitting a copy of a CMF which has different weights and/or numbers of SBT on it than the exporter's copy.

In 2014 Indonesia submitted 3 export CMFs (out of 704) where the number of fish differed on the exporter and importer copies and 4 export CMFs (out of 704) where the weights differed between exporter and importer copies. New Zealand submitted 8 out of 136 export CMFs where the number and weight differed, and Taiwan submitted 1 out of 80 export CMFs where the number and weight differed.

In the first quarter of 2015, there is 1 New Zealand export CMF (out of a total of 16) where the weight differs between the exporter and importer copies of the CMF.

2.2.11 Multiple Preceding Document Numbers Associated with a Single REEF

During 2014, the Secretariat noted that, since the CDS commenced in 2010, multiple CMFs have been associated with a single REEF. In these cases, it is not possible to accurately conduct REEF discrepancy analyses that check for over-utilisation of CMFs in subsequent exports/re-exports.

This pattern continues to be seen for 2014 CDS documents issued by both Korea (36.4% of 11 REEFs) and Japan (39.1% of 174 REEFs) recording multiple preceding document numbers on a single REEF. Japan has also recorded multiple preceding document numbers on 21.2% of its REEF export forms so far received for 2015.

To date, no compromise solution has been found to facilitate a way for over-utilisation analyses to be carried out. The Secretariat proposed setting up a Member-accessible database to allow tag numbers to be matched to specific CMFs, but this was not supported by all Members. The Secretariat has provided an analysis of REEF utilisation in paper CCSBT-CC/1510/08 and also explores if this issue can be resolved as part of its CDS Review (paper CCSBT-CC/1510/09).

3. TRANSHIPMENT MONITORING PROGRAM

3.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

Revisions to the Transshipment Resolution

Effective from 1 January 2015, CCSBT21 agreed a modified Transshipment Resolution that included a requirement to maintain a CCSBT Record of Carrier Vessels (excluding container vessels) authorised to receive transshipments involving SBT from fishing vessels either at sea or in port. Previously, the Resolution had required that only Carrier Vessels (CV) receiving transshipments at sea involving SBT needed to be placed on this Authorised Record.

In addition, a requirement was added to provide Lloyds/ IMO Number (if available) as part of Members'/CNMs' CCSBT authorised CV submissions. The provision of IMO numbers has been improving since it became a requirement. In March 2015, 98.7% of all CCSBT authorised CVs were greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had only been provided for 48.0% of these. In September 2015, 100% of all CCSBT CV authorisations were for CVs greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had been provided for 91.3% of these CVs.

During 2015, the Secretariat also updated its transshipment Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) with ICCAT and the IOTC to take into account both CCSBT's and the relevant RFMO's revised Transshipment Resolutions (refer to paper CCSBT-CC/1510/06).

Request to Approach WCPFC Regarding Development of a Transshipment MOU

At CC9, Japan requested that the Secretariat approach the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) to ascertain the possibility of implementing a transshipment

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the CCSBT and the WCPFC for at-sea transshipments involving SBT within the WCPFC Convention Area.

WCPFC's existing transshipment Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) is CMM 2009-06.

Paragraph 34 of WCPFC's CMM 2009-06 states:

“34. There shall be no transshipment on the high seas except where a CCM has determined, in accordance with the guidelines described in paragraph 37 below, that it is impracticable for certain vessels that it is responsible for to operate without being able to tranship on the high seas, and has advised the Commission of such.”

Paragraph 35. a. v) provides that:

“35. Where transshipment does occur on the high seas:

a. the CCMs responsible for reporting against both the offloading and receiving vessels shall, as appropriate:

.....

v. Submit to the Commission a plan detailing what steps it is taking to encourage transshipment to occur in port in the future.”

Paragraph 37 provides interim guidelines for, “the determination of circumstances where it is impracticable for certain vessels to tranship in port or in waters under national jurisdiction”, which include demonstrating that significant economic hardship and substantial changes to historical modes of operation will occur unless High Seas (HS) transshipments can be made.

WCPFC confirmed that its Regional Observer Program (ROP) observers have both a compliance and scientific monitoring function, and can be placed on either offloading (*e.g.* fishing) vessels or receiving (*e.g.* Carrier Vessels). WCPFC itself is not responsible for the placement of these observers, nor for contracting out their placement. Instead, observers are sourced from national and subregional Member and observer programs. For transshipment monitoring at sea, it is the responsibility of both the offloading vessel State/Fishing Entity and receiving vessel Flag State/Fishing Entity/agent to ensure that at least one WCPFC ROP observer is placed on board either the offloading or receiving vessel as appropriate.

WCPFC also confirmed that there is currently no single standardised Transshipment Declaration form utilised by transshipping vessels (but the minimum required fields to be reported are provided in Annex 1 of CMM 2009-06), and that there is no binding requirement that these Transshipment Declarations must be signed by the vessel master. There are also differences in the timeframes for the submission of observer reports – currently 120 days from the end of the trip for WCPFC, but 20 days from the end of the period of observation for CCSBT.

CCSBT could consider implementing a transshipment MoU with WCPFC in cases where shared Members have fully complied with WCPFC's CMM 2009-06, particularly paragraphs 34, 35 and 37.

Given the differences between WCPFC's Transshipment CMM 2009-06 and CCSBT's Transshipment Resolution, any agreed MOU would require a number of changes to be made to CCSBT's existing Transshipment Resolution to allow WCPFC's transshipment arrangements to be used for monitoring at-sea transshipments involving SBT in the WCPFC Convention Area. Options such as cross-endorsing WCPFC ROP observers who have

undertaken CCSBT-specific training with respect to both CCSBT observation and reporting requirements, along with development of the necessary training materials, could be considered.

Record of Authorised Carrier Vessels

The Secretariat maintains a Record of Authorised CVs, and upon receipt of new or amended information, it updates both its internal database and the CCSBT web site.

Transshipment Documents

In addition to the Record of Authorised CVs, for all at-sea transshipments involving SBT, the Secretariat receives and maintains the following documents:

- transshipment declarations;
- observer deployment requests, and
- observer reports.

In-port transshipments are not required to be observed, therefore only transshipment declarations need to be submitted for in-port transshipments. All of these documents are a key part of the effective operation of the transshipment program, and it is important that they are submitted as required.

Transshipment documents are received from either the IOTC or ICCAT Secretariats, or may also be submitted directly to the CCSBT Secretariat. The Secretariat then stores and maintains them on its internal database and filing systems.

3.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The Secretariat observed one of the same main issues with operation of the Transshipment Resolution as has occurred in previous years – difficulty of identifying SBT during multi-species transshipments. The Secretariat has also identified a new issue - transshipment observers are reporting that some fish that are not declared/recorded as SBT do in fact appear to be SBT.

- a. Observers are often unable to separate species during transshipments. This is usually due to the fish being transhipped in frozen ‘strings’ containing a mix of species and also due to the speed of these transfers. These two factors often result in the observer report recording ‘Mixed Tuna Species’. Where observers can separate SBT, they most commonly use one of two methods to identify SBT and estimate weights. Both of these methods rely on information provided by the fishing vessel:
 - Identify SBT by the presence of CCSBT tags that have been inserted by the fishing vessel;
 - Where SBT can be visibly identified in a transfer (often using the above method), observers commonly use an average weight, multiplied by the estimated number, to calculate a total weight. The average weight is generally calculated using weights and numbers of fish provided by the fishing vessel.

The 5th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC5) requested that, in order to assist observers with identification, SBT be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species where possible.

- b. This year the Secretariat has noticed an increase in the frequency of observer reports where observers believe they have identified SBT which has been recorded as other species. Photographs of these fish have often been taken, but it appears almost impossible to positively identify an SBT with absolute certainty based on photographic evidence alone.

3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretariat recommends that:

- The Compliance Committee should discuss whether it wishes to further investigate implementing a Transshipment MoU with WCPFC in cases where shared Members have fully complied with WCPFC's CMM 2009-06, and whether it is acceptable to alter any of the CCSBT's transshipment requirements to allow such at-sea transshipments of SBT to occur in the WCPFC Convention Area;
- Members take note of CC5's request that where possible, SBT should be transhipped separate to other tuna-like species, in order to assist observers with identification, and
- Members decide whether the Secretariat should discuss with the Observer Consortium the feasibility and associated costs of providing observers with kits to obtain tissue samples for later genetic analysis.

3.4 SUMMARY OF TRANSHIPMENT DATA RECEIVED

A summary of transshipment data provided to the Secretariat on transshipment declarations and/or observer reports for 2014 and the first half of 2015 (aggregated by flag and product type) is provided at **Attachment A** (Tables 1 - 4).

Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide information for all transshipment declarations and observer reports received. Table 4 provides information about in-port transshipments that took place during the first half of 2015 where this information has been submitted to the Secretariat.

In many cases Tables 1 and 2 apparently show large discrepancies between transshipment declaration weights of SBT versus observer reported weights. The reason for these discrepancies is because, to date, many observer reports have often not included the weight of SBT transhipped for each individual vessel (it has been requested they do so), but only the overall weight of all SBT over a series of transshipments. In such situations the Secretariat cannot accurately estimate the weight of SBT transhipped per vessel. This area of uncertainty is still being addressed.

The following summarises the information received by the Secretariat:

- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT were to be transhipped were received for 82.9% of all known SBT transshipments at sea during 2014.
- Observer deployment requests specifying that SBT were to be transhipped have so far been received for 100% of all known SBT transshipments at sea during the first half of 2015.
- The Secretariat received 82 transshipment declarations for transshipments at sea totalling 1,613t during 2014, and has so far received 23 transshipment declarations totalling 382.2t for the first half of 2015.
- The Secretariat has already received 3 transshipment declarations for transshipments that occurred in port during the first half of 2015. It is not yet possible for the Secretariat to check whether more are expected because CMFs for the 2nd quarter of 2015 are not due to be submitted until 30 September 2015.

- Observer reports have been received for 100% of all known 2014 transshipments. Of the observer reports received, 35.4% contained observer estimates of the weights of SBT transhipped, while the remaining 64.6% did not provide specific information on SBT weights, which is an improvement since last year.
- Table 3 of **Attachment A** provides a summary of transshipment weights according to transshipment declarations, observer reports, and CDS information. To enable valid comparisons to be made, this table presents data for only those transshipments for which the Secretariat has received both transshipment declarations and observer reports, and has also been able to match these transshipments with CDS documents. When summed, the weights of transhipped SBT reported on transshipment declarations versus CDS documents differed from each other by only 0.01%.

4. VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM (VMS)

4.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

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

5. CCSBT IUU VESSEL LIST

5.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

In June 2015 (in Circular #2015/036) the Secretariat sent a reminder to Members and CNMs to provide information about vessels presumed to be carrying out SBT IUU fishing activities during the current and/or previous year, accompanied by the suitably documented supporting evidence. No information was submitted to the Secretariat. In addition, the Extended Commission has not yet directed the Compliance Committee to consider cross-listing IUU vessel lists with other tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (tRFMOs) and relevant organisations. Therefore, there are currently no vessels to consider listing on the CCSBT IUU Vessel List.

5.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES/ RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no operational issues or recommendations.

6. RECORDS OF AUTHORISED VESSELS AND FARMS

6.1 SECRETARIAT ROLE

Revisions to the Authorised Vessel Resolution

In October 2014, CCSBT21 adopted an amendment to the CCSBT's 'Resolution on amendment of the Resolution on "Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU) and Establishment of a CCSBT Record of Vessels over 24 meters Authorized to Fish for Southern Bluefin Tuna', that requires the Lloyds/ IMO Number (if available) to be provided as part of Members'/CNMs CCSBT authorised vessels submissions. The Secretariat also updated the authorised vessel submission templates accordingly.

Provision of IMO numbers by Members/CNMs has been improving since it became a requirement. In March 2015, 56.8% of all CCSBT authorised fishing vessels were greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had only been provided for 11.5% of these vessels. In September 2015, 63.6% of all CCSBT authorised fishing vessels were greater than or equal to 100GT/GRT in size, and IMO numbers had been provided for 33.7% of these vessels.

This year, a further revision to the Authorised Vessel Resolution with respect to IMO Number has been proposed by the EU, along with some additional revisions proposed by the Secretariat. These revisions are discussed in paper CCSBT-CC/1510/11.

Authorised Farm and Vessel Records

The Secretariat receives authorised farm and vessel updates approximately twice a week, with vessel updates containing up to one hundred vessels. Upon receipt of this information, the Secretariat updates its authorised vessels/farms database as well as the CCSBT web site. Updated information is also shared with the joint tuna RFMOs' Consolidated List of Authorised Vessels (CLAV). Automated updates to the CLAV from all tRFMOs have now been programmed to occur daily.

6.2 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The following item continues to be the main issue with the operation of the Authorised Vessel/farm Resolutions:

- There are still a small number of cases where vessels caught SBT and were not authorised at the time. Refer to section 2.2.5 and paper CCSBT-CC/1510/04 for further details.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretariat requests that:

- Members submit vessel authorisation renewals prior to current authorisations expiring;
- Members provide retrospective updates where appropriate if non-authorisations were a result of administrative issues, and
- Members consider the various revisions proposed to the Authorised Vessel Resolution by the EU and by the Secretariat in paper CCSBT-CC/1510/11.

Attachment A

Table 1: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the 2014 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	48	1,181,590	GG	48	630,278
Korea	2	68,017	GG	2	11,930
Taiwan	32	363,509	GG	32	3,662
TOTAL	82	1,613,116		82	645,870

Table 2: Summary of Transhipments at sea during the first half of the 2015 Calendar Year

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From Observer Reports	
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT
Japan	6	208,990	GG	6	174,455
Taiwan	17	173,217	GG	2	2,736
TOTAL	23	382,207		8	177,191

Table 3: Summary of Transhipments at sea versus CDS Forms versus Observer Reports for the 2014 Calendar Year⁴

Fishing Vessel Flag	Comment	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) from Transhipment Declaration	Total Net Weight (kg) from CDS	Total Net Weight (kg) from Observer Report
Japan	All data provided	24	665,118	664,984	630,278
Korea	All data provided	1	8,026	8,467	11,930
Taiwan	All data provided	4	3,719	3,719	3,662
Japan	Observer report provided, no SBT weight specified	24	516,472	516,156	Weight not provided
Taiwan	Observer report provided, no SBT weight specified	28	359,790	352,739	Weight not provided
Korea	Observer report provided, no SBT weight specified	1	59,991	61,369	Weight not provided
TOTAL		82	1,613,116	1,607,434	

⁴ This report is limited to transhipments where observer reports have been provided, and where the Secretariat has been able to match CDS information

Attachment A

Table 4: Summary of Transhipments that occurred in port during the first half of the 2015 Calendar Year⁵

Fishing Vessel Flag	From Transhipment Declarations			From CDS		
	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type	Number of Transhipments	Total Net Weight (kg) of SBT	Product Type
Korea	3	278,839	GG	Not due to be submitted to the Secretariat until 30/09/15		

⁵ Transhipments conducted in port are not part of the CCSBT Transhipment Regional Observer Program, and therefore no observer deployment requests nor observer reports are required to be submitted for these transhipments. Only Transhipment Declarations are required to be submitted.