

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Implementation and Compliance (SCIC)**

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	115
Organisation of the meeting	115
Implementation and compliance	115
Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and policies	115
Plastic pollution in the Southern Ocean	115
Catch Documentation Scheme for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. (CDS)	116
Trade data analysis	116
Implementation of the CDS	116
Non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy	117
Application for cooperative status as an NCP cooperating with CCAMLR	117
Cooperation with other organisations	118
System of Inspection	118
Vessel monitoring system (VMS)	119
Use of satellite surveillance in the Convention Area to detect IUU fishing	119
Proposals for new and revised conservation measures	120
Conservation Measures 10-02 and 10-09	120
Conservation Measure 10-06	121
Conservation Measure 10-07	121
Conservation Measure 22-07	122
Conservation Measure 31-02	123
CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)	123
CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)	124
Provisional Compliance Report	124
Conservation Measure 10-03	124
Conservation Measure 24-01	124
Conservation Measure 26-01	125
Conservation Measure 31-02	125
Conservation Measure 41-09	126
Conservation Measure 41-10	126
CCEP process	126
Late removal of fishing gear	126
Review of CM 10-10	127
Proposals to revise CM 10-10	127
IUU fishing in the Convention Area	129
Current level of IUU fishing	129
IUU vessel lists	129
Delisting procedure in Conservation Measures 10-06 and 10-07	131
Collection of fishing gear evidence	131
Fishery notifications	132

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	132
Discrepancies between C2 and CDS data	132
Scientific observers	132
Late gear removal	132
IUU fishing	133
Consideration of the 2017 Performance Review	133
Other business	133
Close of the meeting	134
Appendix I: Terms of reference for the Trade Data Analyst position	135
Appendix II: Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report	137
Appendix III: NCP-IUU Vessel List	149

Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC)

Opening of the meeting

1. The Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) was held in Hobart, Australia, from 22 to 26 October 2018.
2. The Chair of SCIC, Ms J. Kim (Republic of Korea) opened the meeting, welcomed Members and Observers, and thanked the Secretariat for its support. The Chair welcomed Ms B. Webb in her new role as Fishery Monitoring and Compliance (FMC) Manager and thanked her for her work in preparation for SCIC. The Chair also thanked Dr K. Reid for acting as interim FMC Manager. The Chair further expressed thanks to Members for their intersessional work to prepare for SCIC.

Organisation of the meeting

3. SCIC considered the SCIC Agenda as adopted by the Commission.

Implementation and compliance

Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and policies

Plastic pollution in the Southern Ocean

4. SCIC considered the paper from the UK regarding the reduction of plastic pollution in the Southern Ocean (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/15). The UK reported on industry-led efforts undertaken by UK-flagged fishing vessel operators to address the issue of marine plastic pollution and encouraged other Members to adopt similar measures to reduce the amount of microplastics and microfibrils released in the Convention Area. The UK reported that personal grooming and cleaning products containing microplastics had been prohibited on board vessels and external filters fitted to the waste water outlet of washing machines to reduce the number of microfibrils released during laundry cycles.
5. SCIC thanked the UK for its efforts and recognised the importance of addressing the issue of marine plastic pollution. Some Members, including the USA, EU and Australia, reported on similar initiatives they and/or their industries have undertaken to reduce marine plastic pollution in the Convention Area and more generally. The EU offered to work with the UK in developing a proposal for a conservation measure to reduce marine plastic pollution for consideration at the next annual meeting.
6. Many Members expressed their interest in reducing marine plastic pollution by vessels in the Convention Area. SCIC inquired as to the costs and operational processes required for the external laundry filters described. The UK reported that the cost of the external filter unit was under US\$150, with small ongoing costs of replacement filters. Noting there are a number

of different products on the market to deliver reductions in the release of microplastics and microfibres, the UK stated its interest in analysing results from different products.

7. SCIC noted a future proposal being put forward to address the issue of marine plastic pollution in the Convention Area.

Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS)

Trade data analysis

8. SCIC considered CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/03, BG/08 Rev. 1 and BG/14 Rev. 1 reporting on trends and supply chains in Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) data, global toothfish trade from the analysis of the FAO GLOBEFISH trade data, the analysis of the CDS data and reconciliation of CDS data with fine-scale catch and effort data. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for its work on the trade data analysis provided.

9. SCIC noted that 15% of imports are to Viet Nam and requested that the Trade Data Analyst terms of reference be amended to incorporate specific engagement with Viet Nam as part of non-Contracting Party (NCP) engagement. SCIC noted that customs authorities play an important role in the tracing of global fish trade and requested the Trade Data Analyst terms of reference include further engagement with customs authorities (Appendix I).

10. SCIC noted the overall close correlation between CDS and fine-scale catch and effort data and cautioned that the process of reconciling data did not inadvertently result in IUU fishing activity being missed. SCIC noted the difference in reconciliation of CDS and fine-scale catch and effort data for Subarea 48.2 and referred it to the Scientific Committee for further consideration.

Implementation of the CDS

11. SCIC reviewed the implementation of the CDS in 2017/18 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/09) and noted that 21 Member States and three Acceding States implemented the CDS, and two NCPs currently participate in the CDS with CCAMLR by monitoring the toothfish trade through limited access to the electronic web-based CDS (e-CDS).

12. SCIC noted the efforts to engage NCPs, including letters sent by the Secretariat in accordance with Conservation Measure (CM) 10-05, Annex 10-05/C and the NCP Engagement Strategy.

13. SCIC noted that no Specially Validated *Dissostichus* Catch Documents (SVDCDs) had been issued in 2018.

14. SCIC recalled that at CCAMLR-XXXVI, China advised that Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (Hong Kong SAR) was continuing work to support the implementation of the CDS and that Hong Kong SAR would continue to monitor the trade statistics of toothfish imported into, and re-exported through, Hong Kong SAR. China provided an update of this work, including the introduction and drafting of legislation on implementation of the CCAMLR CDS for establishment of a licensing system for trade in toothfish and continued monitoring of

the volume of toothfish imported into, and re-exported through, Hong Kong SAR. China also welcomed other Members to provide information associated with suspected illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) toothfish catch.

Non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy

15. SCIC considered CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/07, which outlined the Secretariat's efforts over 2018 and agreed to review the NCP Engagement Strategy in 2019 in conjunction with a review of the Policy to Enhance Cooperation between CCAMLR and NCPs. It was agreed that the Trade Data Analyst will focus on the NCPs that are critical to the toothfish trade and to work in cooperation with Members to approach these NCPs and establish closer cooperation with customs authorities.

16. SCIC supported the continuation of the Secretariat's NCP Engagement in 2019 and the ongoing review of the NCP Engagement Strategy.

17. SCIC noted that the Secretariat had proposed workshops in Central and South America and Indian Ocean Rim. Some Members reiterated the need to focus on the participation of priority NCPs from the region of Southeast Asia in the CDS and requested SCIC to consider the participation of Viet Nam specifically. SCIC noted the proven value of regional workshops conducted by the Secretariat in recent years.

18. SCIC encouraged Members to enhance their engagement with NCPs and report back their communications to the Secretariat. The EU highlighted the need for additional cooperation with regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) to promote the use of CCAMLR's CDS in other forums.

19. SCIC agreed to recommend to the Commission the 2019 workplan for the Trade Data Analyst.

Application for cooperative status as an NCP cooperating with CCAMLR

20. SCIC considered Ecuador's submission of an application for the Commission to consider granting it the status of an NCP cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS (CCAMLR-XXXVII/14).

21. SCIC recommended granting Ecuador the status of NCP cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS.

22. SCIC considered Singapore's submission of an application for the Commission to discuss granting it the status of an NCP cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS (CCAMLR-XXXVII/35). Singapore currently has limited access to the CDS under CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraph C4.

23. SCIC expressed its gratitude for the contributions that Singapore has made to the work of CCAMLR, including through the monitoring of trade in *Dissostichus* spp. However, some Members noted that the requirements of CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraphs C5 and C6 had

not been met. Following consultations with Singapore, these Members proposed to amend paragraph C4 of Annex 10-05/C to reflect that, for a market State like Singapore which prohibits the landing of *Dissostichus* spp. that have not been previously landed in the port of a Contracting Party or NCP cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS, limited access to the CDS would be appropriate as a permanent status.

24. SCIC agreed to amend CM 10-05 and Singapore withdrew its application for full unlimited access to the e-CDS on the basis that recognition as cooperating through limited access on an ongoing basis was supported under CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C as amended and adopted.

25. SCIC welcomed Singapore's ongoing engagement with CCAMLR and recognised its positive contribution within the Regional Plan of Action to Promote Responsible Fishing Practices Including Combating IUU Fishing in South East Asia (RPOA-IUU). SCIC noted that recognising NCPs which engage in the trade of *Dissostichus* spp. but which do not have landings is a key step forward.

Cooperation with other organisations

26. SCIC considered a proposal (CCAMLR-XXXVII/10) to extend CCAMLR's cooperation with three organisations bordering the Convention Area, including the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Organisation (SPRFMO), South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) and Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA). It was proposed that CCAMLR exchange summary information with these organisations regarding its toothfish tagging program and CDS and website links to IUU vessel lists. It was further proposed that CCAMLR renew Arrangements set to expire after CCAMLR-XXXVII with the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) and SPRFMO for a further three years.

27. SCIC supported the proposal to exchange CDS-related information with these organisations (SPRFMO, SIOFA and SEAFO), to include the links to IUU vessels lists of these organisations on the CCAMLR website and to renew Arrangements with CCSBT and SPRFMO for a further three years. Many Members reiterated the importance of CCAMLR's continued cooperation with other organisations.

System of Inspection

28. SCIC welcomed Chile's submission (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/18) on inspections undertaken by Chile's vessel OPV-83 *Marinero Fuentealba* in the 2017/18 season. Chile informed SCIC that it carried out boarding and inspection activities in Subarea 48.1. During the patrol, two inspections and four sightings were recorded.

29. SCIC thanked Chile for its efforts in conducting the inspections, noting the importance of these patrols and the challenges involved in undertaking at-sea inspections.

30. SCIC welcomed New Zealand's submission (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/34) on inspections undertaken by New Zealand's vessel HMNZS *Otago* in the 2017/18 season in the Ross Sea region. New Zealand informed SCIC that they undertake these activities to support

the Commission's objectives and that during the patrol six boarding and inspection activities were carried out. Two potential compliance breaches were identified by CCAMLR inspectors and were reported to the Flag States of Australia and Russia and to the Secretariat.

31. SCIC thanked New Zealand for its efforts in conducting these inspections, highlighting again the importance of patrols and at-sea inspections as key elements of the monitoring, control and surveillance efforts of CCAMLR in combating IUU fishing activities.

Vessel monitoring system (VMS)

Use of satellite surveillance in the Convention Area to detect IUU fishing

32. SCIC considered the proposal by France to contribute to the monitoring of fisheries in the Convention Area by offering its expertise in the assessment of satellite imagery to the Commission (CCAMLR-XXXVII/25). SCIC noted that the French proposal could provide an economically efficient and long-term assessment of IUU fishing in the Convention Area through the use of satellite images from the European Space Agency's Sentinel Satellites and the expertise of the French Monitoring and Control Centre (FMCC) monitoring centre. The duration of the project will be one year and the cost would be of €100 000. The EU supported the proposal and confirmed its substantial financial commitment to the project, which SCIC welcomed. SCIC noted that the implementation of this project does not entail additional financial obligations for the individual contribution of Members to the CCAMLR budget.

33. SCIC expressed its gratitude to France for its work in preparing the paper and its ongoing efforts to present innovative ways of detecting IUU fishing in the Convention Area.

34. Some Members reminded SCIC that in the case of delegating this kind of work to a third party, it is necessary to secure fairness, neutrality and transparency so that the most relevant institute could be nominated for conducting such an important practice with less expenditure.

35. SCIC recalled CCAMLR-XXXVI/08, which highlighted that quotes from private companies were four times higher than the cost of this proposal. France noted that the FMCC was already working with the proposed provider and would therefore be more cost effective.

36. Some Members raised concerns about the legal implications of the project and emphasised that the project should in no way prejudice any obligations of Flag States. SCIC noted that the obligations of Members was to report information on IUU fishing, which does not preclude data from being sourced privately. SCIC noted that the objective of the project was to acquire greater knowledge of IUU fishing activity in the Convention Area and that it was expected to provide deterrence to future IUU fishing activity as an additional benefit.

37. SCIC supported the proposal and expressed its appreciation for France's innovative work to provide the Commission with new ways to monitor IUU fishing activity. The project might be renewed next year if the Commission agrees. Some Members requested the proponent to provide other cost estimates for comparison if it is decided to continue further.

Proposals for new and revised conservation measures

Conservation Measures 10-02 and 10-09

38. The USA introduced its proposal to strengthen the monitoring and control of transshipments (CCAMLR-XXXVII/18). The USA noted that, because transshipment is an integral part of legal and illegal fishing operations, increased monitoring is necessary to support fishery management and prevent product of IUU fishing from entering the global market undetected.

39. The USA noted that the proposal would establish a record of NCP carrier vessels authorised to engage in transshipment inside the Convention Area. As a condition of inclusion in this record, the Flag State would have to agree to comply with the Convention and relevant conservation measures in force. Contracting Parties would have to license their carrier vessels under CM 10-02. Both Contracting Parties and NCP carrier vessels would be required to report positional data via the centralised VMS (C-VMS) and Contracting Party vessels would be prohibited from transshipping inside the Convention Area with any vessel not licensed under CM 10-02 or included in the Record of Carrier Vessels. The proposal also required any at-sea transshipment of marine living resources harvested in the Convention Area to occur in the Convention Area.

40. The USA noted that its proposal would progress a recommendation from the Second Performance Review (PR2) panel to facilitate product traceability by strengthening monitoring and control of transshipments.

41. Many Members supported the proposal by the USA, however, the USA revised its proposal in response to concerns raised by other Members, including by removing the requirement that Contracting Parties licence their carrier vessels under CM 10-02 and the limitation of at-sea transshipments outside the Convention Area.

42. Many Members expressed their concerns with the revised scope. Australia expressed its strong view that CCAMLR should have a robust transshipment regime which monitors transshipments of Antarctic marine living resources both within and outside the Convention Area; and emphasised that the establishment of a Record of Carrier Vessels is simply the first of many steps. Australia noted its willingness to progress the proposal in these revised terms in the spirit of compromise providing a review was undertaken no later than 2020.

43. Some Members expressed their comments with respect to the US proposal.

44. SCIC thanked the USA for its work on the proposal. SCIC noted that while the current proposal represented a positive step forward, it would be necessary to further review and enhance CCAMLR's approach to monitoring and control of transshipments in future years.

45. Noting the need for further dialogue among Members, SCIC agreed to refer the proposal to the Commission.

Conservation Measure 10-06

46. SCIC considered the EU's proposal to amend CM 10-06 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/26) to contain provisions for the cross-listing of Contracting Party (CP) IUU vessels from RFMOs to the CCAMLR IUU Vessel Lists.

47. It was proposed that the Secretariat communicate IUU vessel lists to relevant organisations expressing interest and nominated organisations for communication. The EU reiterated the importance of taking global action to combat IUU fishing by preventing IUU fishing vessels from transiting through the Convention Area after operating within the areas of competency of RFMOs.

48. SCIC concluded that it was unable to reach consensus on the matter of cross-listing CP-IUU Vessel Lists with RFMOs. Some Members expressed concern regarding the legal implications of automatic cross-listing of IUU vessel lists with RFMOs because, in their view and as presented, it implies exceeding the Commission's mandate as it would regulate activities that have taken place outside the Convention Area. Some Members expressed their disappointment that SCIC could not find consensus on this important step towards a global strategy to combat IUU fishing. Members noted the sophistication of IUU fishing vessel operators and the need to ensure these vessels are tracked as they move between ocean basins. Members recalled CCAMLR's reputation as a global leader in the fight against IUU fishing and noted their concern that the Commission was falling behind other organisations in this area.

Conservation Measure 10-07

49. SCIC considered the EU's proposal to amend CM 10-07 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/27) to list intersessionally vessels without nationality ('stateless vessels') and to allow the cross-listing of IUU vessels from other organisations on the NCP-IUU Vessel List. Many Members welcomed the proposal and reiterated their support for addressing this gap in CCAMLR's listing procedure. Some Members expressed concern regarding the legal implications of automatic cross-listing of IUU vessel lists with RFMOs because, in their view and as presented, it implies exceeding the Commission's mandate as it would regulate activities that have taken place outside the Convention Area. Russia noted that in previous years CCAMLR had a practise of listing stateless vessels, and introducing an intersessional procedure of the IUU listing denies SCIC the opportunity to carry out a thorough investigation of such cases.

50. A few Members sought clarification on the implications of the proposal for the freedom of navigation of vessels under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). These Members expressed concern that the original proposal of the EU automatically implied any vessel without a Flag in the CAMLR Convention Area would be assumed to have engaged in IUU fishing. SCIC agreed to refer the EU's proposal to the conservation measures drafting group without the cross-listing provisions and with a clarification that there would need to be some connection to fishing for a stateless vessel to be IUU vessel listed. Several Members noted that the proposal followed international best practice on stateless vessels. SCIC agreed that the question on an intersessional listing process must be considered at the Commission.

51. Some Members questioned the need for an intersessional listing process of stateless vessels, noting that these vessels fell under the existing procedure for listing vessels in

CM 10-07. Other Members emphasised the volume of IUU fishing activities in CCAMLR's Convention Area over the past five years, highlighting the need for urgent and comprehensive action. These Members highlighted the need to target stateless vessels specifically because in these cases there was no Flag State to take action. These Members also pointed out the need to take urgent action against stateless vessels rather than waiting for the following year's Commission meeting as is prescribed in the current procedure under CM 10-07.

52. SCIC agreed to refer the proposal to amend CM 10-07 to the Commission.

Conservation Measure 22-07

53. SCIC considered the paper presented by the USA (CCAMLR-XXXVII/19) on a spatial analysis that was undertaken to examine whether bottom longline fishing activities had taken place within relevant vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) and VME Risk Areas in the Convention Area. SCIC recognised that this exercise was a step toward reviewing the effectiveness of CCAMLR's comprehensive set of conservation measures to prevent significant adverse impacts of fishing on VMEs.

54. The USA reported finding several instances of longline fishing gear set inside VME Risk Areas between 2011 and 2017 and introduced a number of recommendations in response to these findings, including proposals for the Secretariat to routinely monitor fishing activity that may occur in VME Risk Areas so compliance issues can be considered through the CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) and to examine the feasibility of an automatic alert system through vessel VMS to warn vessel operators of their proximity to such areas. The USA also highlighted the need to review VME-related conservation measures more broadly, as well as reviewing the accuracy of fishing effort data reporting concerning start and end set coordinates.

55. SCIC supported the broad objective of the paper and thanked the USA for its efforts. SCIC noted the importance of protecting VMEs and VME Risk Areas in the Convention Area and ensuring the effective implementation of CCAMLR's related conservation measures.

56. Several Members responded to incidents identified by the paper. Australia, New Zealand and the UK confirmed that upon investigation, none of their fishing vessel activities had actually occurred within VME Risk Areas. SCIC highlighted the need to draw analyses from multiple sources of data and further examine instances of erroneous reporting.

57. Some Members noted the need to improve the procedure for the identification and designation of VME Risk Areas set out in CM 22-07 and considered that the current process for designating a VME Risk Area lacked transparency and feasibility. In future reviews of this conservation measure, Japan noted it would be desirable to include advanced consent from Members who are conducting fishing activities in the candidate VME Risk Areas and to notify fishers of the location of these Areas thus make them conscious of the VME Risk Areas.

58. SCIC thanked the USA for its paper, noting the effort involved in undertaking the analysis. SCIC acknowledged Member responses to the paper and noted SCIC's commitment to look at how CCAMLR might strengthen its monitoring of VME Risk Areas and review its VME-related conservation measures.

Conservation Measure 31-02

59. SCIC considered Korea's proposal to amend CM 31-02 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/33) concerning fishery closure notifications in the Convention Area. The amendment proposed that vessels acknowledge receipt of fishery closure notifications to the Secretariat and relevant Flag State that the Secretariat notify the Flag State if it does not receive acknowledgement. Korea noted that other Members had made similar suggestions to modify the communication of fishery closure notifications using supplementary approaches including issuing closure notifications via COMM CIRC. Japan noted the fundamental problem associated with the ongoing communication system (i.e. email) and proposed to consider a new communication system in order to ensure every notification is properly and safely delivered to fishing vessels replacing the current system in the future. SCIC thanked Korea for proposing a process to ensure fishing vessels receive fishery closure notifications.

60. New Zealand queried the Secretariat as to what extra workload would be placed on them if the proposal was accepted. The Secretariat responded that due to time differences it would be problematic.

61. Members agreed that the communication of fishery closure notifications should be also sent by COMM CIRC and email as per previous practice.

CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

62. SCIC considered the US proposal to improve scientific observer safety (CCAMLR-XXXVII/20) by adding a provision to paragraph B of the text of the CCAMLR System of Scientific Observation (SISO) to require scientific observers to be equipped with independent two-way satellite communication devices and personal lifesaving beacons.

63. Many Members noted that the proposed safety equipment would provide a scientific observer with a means of communication independent from vessel-based communication equipment and pointed out that the use of the proposed safety equipment was mandated in other international organisations and RFMOs, as well as by some Members for their observers deployed in CCAMLR fisheries. Russia suggested modifying the prescriptiveness of the description of safety equipment in the proposal. In addition, some Members noted the competency of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in vessel safety matters. SCIC noted the importance of creating additional conditions for increasing observer safety.

64. Japan noted that necessary costs associated with this requirement should be met by the designating Members.

65. SCIC thanked the USA for its efforts and agreed to amend the text of SISO to require scientific observers to be equipped with an independent, satellite-based communication device, noting that it would be the responsibility of the designating Member to provide this equipment.

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)

Provisional Compliance Report

66. Australia presented CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/39 which outlined Australia's view on the key principles underpinning the CCEP. Australia expressed its commitment to building a positive compliance culture within CCAMLR and emphasised that any compliance discussion should be a positive process. Australia noted the many benefits that the CCEP provides, including its role in maintaining CCAMLR's integrity. Australia expressed its confidence that the CCEP enriches the work of the Commission. Australia emphasised that the CCEP should focus on Flag State and Port State performance, consider all relevant factors that need to be taken into account in determining a compliance rating and, most importantly, focussing on follow up actions where that is needed to resolve a compliance issue.

67. China highlighted that evaluation of compliance status should also take into account the status of fish stocks and the risk under which the fishery is subject to IUU fishing. The UK noted that each compliance incident needed to be assessed on its relevant circumstances.

68. In accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i), SCIC considered the 10 potential compliance incidents in the CCEP Summary Report (CCAMLR-XXXVII/13 Rev. 1).

Conservation Measure 10-03

69. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by the UK regarding two port inspection reports not provided to the Secretariat within the timeframe required. The UK noted that this had occurred due to the absence of available staff in the relevant port, and that since then the resourcing issue had been addressed. The UK advised that port inspections had been conducted within the CM 10-03 timeframe, had not identified any non-compliance by the vessels inspected and the catch landed by the vessels was documented in accordance with CM 10-05. The suggested compliance status category was accepted, noting the importance of on-time submission of reports.

70. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by Chile in respect of the port inspection of the *Puerto Toro* which was not transmitted to the Secretariat. Chile noted the vessel was not inspected due to logistical and meteorological difficulties which precluded access to the vessel. However, Chilean authorities were able to inspect the catch at its storage premises and Chile confirmed that it had taken measures to minimise the occurrence of a similar situation in the future and provided confirmation in writing of the circumstances and actions to SCIC.

Conservation Measure 24-01

71. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 24-01 by Chile in respect of the *Cabo de Hornos* not embarking a scientific observer in accordance with the SISO. Chile recognised that there was a misinterpretation of CM 24-01 and reported that it had designed protocols to ensure that future research activities are conducted in accordance with all CCAMLR conservation measures and requirements.

72. Some Members noted that the absence of a scientific observer is not a minor issue and the participation of scientific observers is integral to CCAMLR's objective of robust data collection. Chile acknowledged these views and clarified their compliance status with additional text in the CCEP report (Appendix II).

Conservation Measure 26-01

73. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 26-01 by the Australian-flagged vessel *Antarctic Discovery*. Australia explained that a single plastic bait band (of more than 2 300 boxes) had been detected on board by a New Zealand patrol. Australia confirmed that these bands are prohibited through its domestic licencing regime and it had undertaken an investigation of the incident and issued an official caution when the vessel was found to be in breach of its licencing conditions. Australia noted that its response was appropriate and proportionate to the incident, given that the vessel operator did not have a history of non-compliance and that no further action was required.

74. Some Members noted that only in this particular case a suggested preliminary compliance status concerning the incident was not provided in accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 1(iv). Other Members considered that under CM 10-10, paragraph 1(iii), provision of a preliminary compliance status is voluntary. SCIC noted there were different interpretations of the responsibility of Members to include a suggested compliance status in their response to the Draft CCAMLR Compliance Report. CM 10-10 was further discussed in paragraphs 90 to 101.

75. SCIC considered the compliance with CM 26-01 by the Russian-flagged vessel *Mys Velikan*. SCIC agreed that the compliance incident in the Draft Report was the result of a misinterpretation in the inspection process and that the *Mys Velikan* was compliant.

Conservation Measure 31-02

76. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 31-02 by the Korean-flagged vessels *Hong Jin No. 701* and *Southern Ocean*, which had both set lines within 24 hours of a notified closure.

77. Korea explained that the breach of CM 31-02 was due to a technical issue with the email system which resulted in both vessels not receiving the closure notice. Both vessels were unaware of this breach until the Flag State brought this to their attention. During this time, both vessels had continued to fish and provide daily catch and effort data.

78. SCIC acknowledged the response taken by Korea in referring the cases to the national Police and Prosecutor's Office and that the *Southern Ocean* matter is presently pending prosecution. If convicted, the *Southern Ocean* will be subject to a monetary penalty far higher than the value of the illegally caught fish, or imprisonment of those responsible.

79. SCIC thanked Korea for its in-depth presentation of the cases and the strong actions it had taken under its domestic law to address the compliance incidents relating to its vessels.

80. SCIC acknowledged some Members' concerns that despite the action taken in response to the vessels' infringements, the case against the *Southern Ocean* is still pending. These

Members also noted that, despite that its domestic law provides for severe criminal penalties, there seemed to be significant gaps with respect to administrative and other civil tools to address violations, including mechanisms to deprive violators of the economic benefit of their infringements.

81. SCIC requested Korea report back on the progress and outcome of the pending prosecution and efforts to review and strengthen its internal legal framework in terms of administrative actions to ensure that it can impose sanctions of sufficient severity to serve as an effective deterrent to IUU fishing in all cases.

Conservation Measure 41-09

82. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 41-09 by the New Zealand-flagged vessel *Janas* which was reported to breach the by-catch move-on rules specified in paragraph 6. New Zealand described its investigation which concluded that a reporting error of incorrect start-haul latitudes determined that the vessel had in fact complied with all requirements. SCIC thanked New Zealand for its detailed investigation and agreed that the vessel was compliant on this matter.

Conservation Measure 41-10

83. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 41-10 regarding the Uruguayan-flagged vessel *Badaro* which continued to fish after exceeding the by-catch limits. Uruguay explained that this issue would be considered regarding future applications by the vessel to undertake fishing in the Convention Area and advised that the vessel would not be participating in fisheries in the 2018/19 season.

CCEP process

84. SCIC noted the Secretariat's review of the history of CCEP implementation and reporting (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/05). The Secretariat emphasised that CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/05 is intended to clarify and document the process the Secretariat uses in developing its reports under CM 10-10.

85. SCIC endorsed the proposal of the Secretariat to develop and document its standard operating procedures with the intention that SCIC should thereafter annually review and, as necessary, modify the approaches taken for the CCEP.

Late removal of fishing gear

86. SCIC considered investigations by the UK and New Zealand into the late removal of fishing gear following a fishery closure notification (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/16 and BG/33 respectively).

87. SCIC noted Members' responses which explained that several factors led to the delay in retrieving gear, including the need to protect the Antarctic marine environment as the ice cover was such that lines were not able to be retrieved in a timely fashion as well as the unexpected timing of the closure notice. This resulted in lines remaining in the water after the closure of the fishery.

88. The investigations conducted by the relevant Members found that their flagged vessels followed all requirements laid out in CM 31-02, including that no lines were set in the 24 hours leading up to the closure of the fishery and that all notification requirements were fulfilled. In all cases, the findings of the investigations concluded that no breach of CM 31-02 occurred and, therefore, no further action was needed.

89. Several Members expressed concern that notwithstanding paragraphs 4 and 5 of CM 31-02, the obligations of paragraph 1 still stand. These incidents are repeated by the same vessels and are not isolated and potentially undermine fisheries management and that these incidents challenge CCAMLR's precautionary approach and requirement to conserve Antarctic marine living resources. However, when questioned on this point, the Secretariat confirmed that a late extraction of lines is considered when forecasting fisheries closures and is a normal occurrence which is managed effectively.

Review of CM 10-10

Proposals to revise CM 10-10

90. SCIC considered the EU's proposal to amend CM 10-10 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/28) to enhance the effectiveness of the Commission's procedure for evaluating and addressing compliance issues. Recalling the challenges Members faced reaching consensus on specific issues during the previous year's CCEP discussions, the EU noted that it had been tasked by the Commission to undertake intersessional consultations in partnership with China to revise the text of CM 10-10. The EU reported it was unable to provide a consensus view on the text proposed due to the diverging positions expressed by the consulting Members.

91. SCIC thanked the EU for its intersessional work on improving the text of CM 10-10. The USA noted that, while the EU's proposed changes would clarify that SCIC can adopt the Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report by consensus, even in cases where Members had not reached consensus on specific issues, the current measure already allows this. Several Members expressed concern with the EU's proposal, reiterating that consensus was central to CCAMLR's approach to decision-making. SCIC considered that it was in the interest of Members to reach consensus on matters relating to compliance and that the purpose of CM 10-10 was to ensure an effective, fair and transparent CCEP.

92. China referred Members to the revisions it proposed to CM 10-10 in Annex II of COMM CIRC 18/56. China considered that it had proposed an alternative amendment to CM 10-10 to include the CCAMLR System of Inspection and the entirety of the SISO in the CCEP. Recalling Article XXI of the Convention, China noted that the inclusion of these two independent instruments was important to improving the effectiveness of the CCEP.

93. China indicated that CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/05 makes it clear that when the Secretariat prepares the Draft CCAMLR Compliance Report, reference has always and firstly been made to the System of Inspection. China further indicated, in this sense, inclusion of the System of Inspection would not entail practice challenges, but reflects the practice of CCAMLR.

94. Some Members expressed concern with China's submission since it was presented as a COMM CIRC and was not submitted as a working paper. Those Members also noted that the Commission had devoted a substantial amount of time to determining which components of SISO were appropriate to include in the CCEP (namely Part D). SCIC noted that SISO utilises a single source of data, and some Members argued that it can be inappropriate to rely on single data points for determining compliance issues. The remaining sections of SISO and the System of Inspection are used to inform the CCEP preparation process.

95. Australia urged Members to consider the problem they were solving in efforts to improve CM 10-10. Bearing in mind the need for Members to commit to the application of CM 10-10 in a constructive manner, Australia suggested that it was more important to address issues concerning SCIC's approach to the CCEP than the text of CM 10-10 itself. Australia welcomed future efforts to innovate and improve CM 10-10, but underscored the need to fix SCIC's approach to the CCEP.

96. Chile encouraged Members to think deeply about how they wished to direct the CCEP, noting that it was a fundamental tool for the work of SCIC. Chile invited Members to reflect on how to improve the CCEP process and text of CM 10-10, and noted that SCIC does not always reach consensus on every issue and that this reality would need to be reflected in the CCEP.

97. The EU suggested that SCIC could explore the idea of a semi-automatic classification system for compliance issues that could be linked to the CCEP assessment process. The EU proposed that the classification system would be based on different levels of non-compliance categories for different types of infringements. The EU noted that this system would reverse the CCEP assessment process so that SCIC could discuss why certain infringements should not fall under certain non-compliance categories.

98. SCIC was unable to reach consensus on the proposal by the EU.

99. Some Members noted that they interpreted CM 10-10, paragraph 1(iv), as creating an obligation for the reporting Member to provide a suggested compliance status to SCIC. Other Members confirmed that when read in combination with paragraph 1(iii), they did not interpret paragraph 1(iv) of CM 10-10 as creating an obligation to provide a suggested compliance status in returning its response to the Draft Compliance Report.

100. Some Members recalled issues raised during discussions of the CCEP regarding discrepancies that were found in different translations of Members' reporting obligations under CM 10-10, paragraph 1(iii).

101. SCIC noted that the reporting Member was in the best position to suggest a compliance status given the Member would be in full possession of the facts and mitigating or aggravating circumstances; and that this could provide important context in SCIC's deliberations. SCIC agreed that the meaning of paragraphs 1(iii) and (iv) of CM 10-10 should be that the suggestion of a self-assessed compliance status by a reporting Member is mandatory in the 'Additional Information' provided in Draft Compliance Reports.

IUU fishing in the Convention Area

102. SCIC considered observations on IUU fishing in the French exclusive economic zone (EEZ) (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/30) in 2017/18. SCIC noted that surveillance systems were maintained throughout the period and no IUU fishing activities were reported, however, licensed fishing vessels found non-compliant fishing gear in the area on three occasions. SCIC noted that two of the observations of non-compliant fishing gear indicated a long period of exposure under water, although one incident indicated a short period of exposure under water. SCIC thanked France for its continued efforts to combat IUU fishing in the CAMLR Convention Area.

103. SCIC considered the interim report submitted by INTERPOL (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/42 Rev. 1) in accordance with clause 7.1 of the Funding Agreement between CCAMLR and INTERPOL. INTERPOL reported holding an investigative meeting in July 2018 to improve CCAMLR's awareness of IUU fishing. The report provided an update on progress of the ongoing case file on criminal network operations concerning the *STS-50* and information which was received on the Bolivian-flagged fishing vessel *Cape Flower*, which landed approximately 100 tonnes of toothfish in the port of Manta, Ecuador, in mid-April 2016.

104. SCIC welcomed INTERPOL's report and expressed appreciation for INTERPOL's work in coordinating efforts to apprehend the *STS-50* and the multinational efforts in partnership with INTERPOL in combating IUU fishing activities. SCIC supported further cooperation between CCAMLR and INTERPOL.

Current level of IUU fishing

105. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-XXXVII/12 and advised that the paper had also been discussed by WG-FSA. WG-FSA had requested further information clarifying the trends that had occurred within the Convention Area and further information developed by the Secretariat was provided to Members. SCIC noted that whilst the information indicated a reduction in IUU activity over time, the information could not account for changing patterns in surveillance effort.

IUU vessel lists

106. SCIC considered the IUU fishing activity and trends in 2017/18, including IUU vessel lists (CCAMLR-XXXVII/12).

107. Spain reported on the progress of the investigation of the *Northern Warrior* for undertaking repair work that exceeded the authorised work for emergency reasons. The investigation has been resolved and the offenders received a sanction of €60 001 for having committed a very serious infringement.

108. SCIC noted the ongoing case of the apprehended IUU vessel, *STS-50*, and noted the multinational effort involved. It was reported that the two masters and some members of the crew of the vessel were of Russian nationality. One of the masters and the crew were in Indonesian custody awaiting judicial proceedings. Members encouraged Russia to undertake further investigations to locate and prosecute the other master in accordance with obligations under CM 10-08.

109. SCIC noted the report on the progress of the investigation of the *Andrey Dolgov* by China. The seized toothfish cargo was sold at auction. China advised that the proceeds of the sale from the seized toothfish cargo (after the settlement of relevant costs incurred) which amounts to around A\$330 000, would be contributed to CCAMLR with a view to conserve marine living resources.

110. Korea reported on the progress of the retrieval of unidentified fishing gear in Subarea 88.1. SCIC thanked Korea for the information as well as its efforts in retrieving the fishing gear.

111. SCIC noted there was no formal procedure for the retrieval and handling of suspected IUU fishing gear, and that consideration be given to practices and procedures for handling gear in the future to ensure the gear can be fully investigated. SCIC noted that the unidentified fishing gear likely belonged to a licenced vessel, which raised serious concerns.

112. SCIC proposed that further investigation by Members was required to locate the identity of the vessel of the unidentified fishing gear found in small-scale research unit (SSRU) 881C. Members with longline fishing gear from licenced vessels in SSRU 881C around the date of the gear retrieval were asked to report back to SCIC.

113. SCIC requests that the Members (Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Spain, UK and Ukraine) who had longline vessels in the area at the time the *Sunstar* retrieved gear in Subarea 88.1 prior to the start of the 2017/18 fishing season, undertake a review into those vessels to assess whether they could have set that gear (see COMM CIRC 17/100).

114. SCIC requests that the below elements are included in the review and reported back to SCIC as a background document (translated into the official Commission languages by the Secretariat) at least 45 days prior to the annual Commission meeting in 2019. That report shall analyse, at a minimum, the VMS data, on-board plotting systems, the systems that relate to C2 data, engineer logbook, observer logbook, details of fishing gear used and all other related information.

115. It was requested that the Flag States focus on the time period of 18–30 November 2017 and on the location of the gear retrieved in the vicinity of 64°57.041'S / 179°27.730'W (SSRU 881C) as reported in the COMM CIRC.

116. SCIC considered the inclusion of the Korean-flagged vessel, the *Southern Ocean*, on the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List. SCIC noted that Korea had undertaken an investigation into the situation involving the *Southern Ocean* as discussed in the CCEP and that the case against the vessel had been forwarded for prosecution. Korea stated that it has now withdrawn the fishery notification of the *Southern Ocean* from Subarea 88.1 for the 2018/19 season to demonstrate its determination and commitment to compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures.

117. Korea requested that the *Southern Ocean* be removed from the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List based on compliance with paragraph 14 of CM 10-06. Korea considered it had taken effective action in response to the activities of the *Southern Ocean*. SCIC noted that judicial proceedings were still underway and had not reached a conclusion. Several Members expressed gratitude to Korea for undertaking actions against the *Southern Ocean* to the full extent under its national legislation.

118. SCIC agreed on the removal of the *Southern Ocean* from the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List in accordance with paragraph 14(iv) of CM 10-06. Korea thanked SCIC for recognising its efforts.

119. SCIC considered information provided by Angola for the possible removal of the *Northern Warrior* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List. SCIC considered the submission made by the Angolan Observer representative. SCIC noted concerns about the submitted information, which contains clear evidence that there are still links between the current and previous owners of the vessel, including quotes for vessels repairs addressed to the previous owner after the transfer of ownership. SCIC noted that the Angolan Observer representative failed to address these concerns in a satisfactory manner and, therefore, concluded that the vessel should remain on the NCP-IUU Vessel List.

120. SCIC noted that Chile had revoked its request to delist *Pescacsine I* (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/38).

121. Therefore, the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2018/19 is unchanged as agreed by SCIC and is provided in Appendix III for adoption by the Commission.

Delisting procedure in Conservation Measures 10-06 and 10-07

122. SCIC considered the time frame within which Members and NCPs were able to request delisting of a vessel from the CP-IUU and NCP-IUU Vessel Lists and noted that the request to delist a vessel was a serious matter, requiring Members to undertake in-depth investigations into all information relevant to the listing. SCIC considered 45 days for the submission of information requesting delisting of a vessel from both IUU vessel lists would be appropriate. SCIC noted that this time frame would ensure there was adequate time for Members to review intelligence information related to the listing and to translate information provided in accordance with CMs 10-06 and 10-07 into the four working languages of the Commission.

123. SCIC noted the 45-day time frame reflected the current practice that CCAMLR applies to working papers. The Secretariat highlighted the cost of translating information provided in accordance with CMs 10-06 and 10-07 and requested that Members take this into account when considering revisions to the Commission's delisting procedure.

124. SCIC agreed to conduct intersessional work on revising CCAMLR's delisting procedure contained within CMs 10-06 and 10-07.

Collection of fishing gear evidence

125. SCIC considered a letter from INTERPOL (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/47) briefing SCIC on the deployment of an investigative support team which worked with the Mauritius Police Force to collect information from gillnets retrieved by the NGO vessel *Sam Simon*. It was noted that the banned gillnets were strongly suspected to have been deployed by the vessel *Thunder*, which sank in the waters of Sao Tome and Principe on 6 April 2015.

126. SCIC thanked INTERPOL for its efforts, specifically regarding the investigative support it provides to Port States in taking action against IUU vessels.

Fishery notifications

127. SCIC considered fishery notifications received for exploratory fisheries for toothfish and established fisheries for krill for 2018/19 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/06). The Secretariat had received all fishery notifications on time for the upcoming 2018/19 season with no withdrawal of fishery notifications prior to the meeting.

128. SCIC noted that during the meeting, Korea withdrew fishery notifications for the vessel *Southern Ocean* in Subarea 88.1 and the vessel *Hong Jin No. 701* in Subarea 88.2.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

129. SCIC considered advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee, Dr M. Belchier (UK), in respect of discrepancies between CDS and C2 data, scientific observer safety, late gear removal impacts and IUU fishing data.

130. SCIC thanked the Chair of the Scientific Committee for his time.

Discrepancies between C2 and CDS data

131. SCIC sought further clarification from the Scientific Committee Chair regarding discrepancies presented in CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/14 Rev. 1 between C2 and CDS data.

132. The Chair of the Scientific Committee explained that the green weight supplied by C2 vessel data should be similar to the estimate of green weight provided by the CDS. It noted that vessels use conversion factors to calculate green weight from product weight.

133. The Chair of the Scientific Committee highlighted the importance of clarifying where discrepancies are occurring and agreed that the Scientific Committee could undertake further analysis of associated data once those vessels with discrepancies had been identified by the Secretariat.

Scientific observers

134. The Chair of the Scientific Committee highlighted the high value of data recorded by scientific observers. He noted the importance of observer safety but stated that commenting on the observer safety measures proposed in CCAMLR-XXXVII/20 was outside of the remit of the Scientific Committee.

Late gear removal

135. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted the importance of accurate data on fisheries catch in relation to gear removed after fishery closure.

IUU fishing

136. SCIC asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee for any deliberations regarding the WG-FSA analysis of IUU data from Division 58.4.1, as noted in the report of SCIC-17 (CCAMLR-XXXVI, Annex 6). The Chair of the Scientific Committee explained that this analysis was discussed during WG-FSA-18 (SC-CAMLR-XXXVII, Annex 9, paragraphs 4.93 to 4.97).

137. The Chair of the Scientific Committee further noted that WG-FSA-18 had confirmed that catch rates from IUU and authorised vessels are comparable. SCIC welcomed the Scientific Committee's proposal to develop a work plan to estimate catch from IUU fishing.

138. SCIC asked for clarification on what advice was sought from SCIC on paragraph 2.3 of the WG-FSA-18 report, regarding pre-season fishing. The Chair of the Scientific Committee expressed the need for accurate information on fisheries catch and noted that whether catch data from pre-season fishing was retained is unclear.

Consideration of the 2017 Performance Review

139. SCIC considered the progress report of the PR2 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/11) which provides a summary of actions taken since CCAMLR-XXXVI. SCIC, along with the Commission, Scientific Committee and SCAF, were encouraged to identify additional actions.

140. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for compiling the progress report. SCIC requested that the Secretariat include 'Considerations, discussion and decisions' in the heading of the third column of the tables in the progress report. SCIC agreed that action on Recommendations 9 to 14, 16 and 18 were ongoing.

141. SCIC requested the Secretariat to compile actions taken by SCIC and include them in the relevant tables of the progress report. SCIC agreed to continue its regular review of the progress of the implementation of PR2 recommendations that are relevant to SCIC. The Secretariat was asked to include a disclaimer paragraph with respect to PR2 report on the website and make the progress report available on CCAMLR's website in accordance with the format of the online publication of the First Performance Review Report and Responses.

Other business

142. ASOC presented its paper on the progress at the IMO of the Polar Code Phase 2 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/35). ASOC provided a summary of the development of safety measures for non-SOLAS vessels (vessels not covered under the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea Convention), including fishing vessels, and current discussions on the implementation of marine mammal avoidance measures under the Polar Code. ASOC noted that more than 50% of the vessels operating in the Southern Ocean are not covered under the safety provisions of the Polar Code. ASOC suggested CCAMLR Members support the development of measures by the IMO to ensure the best improvements to safety of fishing vessels operating in the Southern Ocean and to ratify the Cape Town Agreement which would allow for the future development of mandatory measures.

143. SCIC welcomed ASOC's update on the progress of discussions at the IMO and noted CCAMLR's longstanding support of high standards of safety for fishing vessels in the Convention Area.

144. SCIC considered the paper presented by ASOC on upgrading CCAMLR provisions on at-sea transhipments in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/37). The paper considered that PR2 identified a 'significant gap' in relation to transhipments within CCAMLR's compliance regime. ASOC welcomed the proposal submitted by the USA on strengthening CCAMLR's monitoring and control of transhipments (CCAMLR-XXXVII/18). ASOC considered that CCAMLR had fallen behind other international organisations in relation to its ability to monitor transhipments. ASOC referred to findings by the FAO Global Study on Transhipments which reported seven out of 10 existing RFMOs that require reefers to either be equipped with VMS or to have observers on board. ASOC recommended that CCAMLR take action on this issue to maintain its reputation as a leader among RFMOs in efforts to combat IUU fishing activities.

145. SCIC thanked ASOC for the information it provided and noted the willingness of Members to work together on progressing this issue further to improve the effectiveness of CCAMLR's monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) regime.

Close of the meeting

146. SCIC thanked Ms Kim for her efforts in guiding SCIC over the last two years.

147. SCIC noted that Ms Kim will continue to serve for another term as SCIC Chair and that SCIC elected a new Vice-Chair, Ms M. Engelke-Ros (USA). Members offered their best wishes for their upcoming term.

Terms of reference for the Trade Data Analyst position

1. Refine and implement an annual process to reconcile trade data with Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) data. This will include consideration of the management of trade data in line with CCAMLR's data management systems redevelopment work.
2. Implement a process to evaluate the effectiveness of the CDS utilising, in part, the reconciliation of trade data and CDS data.
3. Support the implementation and possible expansion of the non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy, including the 2019 review with a special focus on non-Contracting Parties that accounted for more than 10% of the global trade in *Dissostichus* spp. in 2017 (CCAMLR-XXXVII/BG/03).
4. Provide reports of discrepancies identified between CDS data and trade data to the relevant Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties and to support their follow up on these issues as required.
5. Apply strategies to promote the consistent application of harmonised system (HS) codes, including through targeted cooperation and capacity building, to improve the analysis of trade data, including through cooperation with customs authorities.
6. To progress in the analysis of the supply chains for *Dissostichus* spp., notably in relation to the trade of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) products.
7. Manage the collaborative arrangement with GLOBEFISH.
8. Provide an annual report on trade data analysis to CCAMLR-XXXVIII.

Budget to support the Trade Data Analyst position

1. Salary A\$140 000
(1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) at GS Pay Grade 5, PayPoint 17)

2. GLOBEFISH (A\$14 000)
(Yearly access to GLOBEFISH trade data and expert advice services)

Total **A\$154 000**

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Report 2017/18

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 10-03					
Chile	<i>Puerto Toro</i>	<p>This vessel was reported through the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) to have landed <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. caught in Subarea 48.2 in Punta Arenas on 22 February 2018. No inspection report was received by the Secretariat in respect of this landing as required by paragraph 8.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested the port inspection on 5 June 2018.</p>	<p>That the inspection at disembarking was not possible due to problems in reaching the disembarking location. The cargo, however, was inspected afterwards at the storage premises.</p> <p>It should be noted that from October 2017 to August 2018, the ships that operated in the CCAMLR Area and that disembarked in Chile, 11 were inspected at the disembarking location and only one at the storage premises.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the aforementioned, measures to minimise the occurrence of similar situations have been adopted.</p> <p>Further Action: Adoption of measures to minimise the occurrence of similar events.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.
United Kingdom	<i>Argos Froyanes</i>	<p>This vessel was reported through the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) to have landed <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i> caught in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 in a port of a UK OT on 6 February 2018. No inspection report was received by the Secretariat in respect of this landing as required by paragraph 8.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested the port inspection on 5 June 2018.</p>	<p>The UK investigated this potential infringement. The inspection had been undertaken within 48 hours of port entry but submission of this report to the CCAMLR Secretariat was delayed due to staff shortages and administrative oversight. This report was subsequently sent to the Secretariat on 20 August 2018. The UK apologises for this oversight and minor non-compliance with CM 10-03. The current procedures for the submission of inspection reports to the Secretariat have been reviewed and modified to ensure compliance with the deadlines established in CM 10-03.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required. SCIC agreed on the importance of the Contracting Parties to provide to the Secretariat relevant inspection reports in time compliant with CM 10-03.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 10-03 (cont.)					
United Kingdom	<i>Argos Georgia</i>	<p>This vessel was reported through the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) to have landed <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i> caught in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 in a port of a UK OT on 8 February 2018. No inspection report was received by the Secretariat in respect of this landing as required by paragraph 8.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested the port inspection on 5 June 2018.</p>	<p>The UK investigated this potential infringement. The inspection had been undertaken within 48 hours of port entry but submission of this report to the CCAMLR Secretariat was delayed due to staff shortages and administrative oversight. This report was subsequently sent to the Secretariat on 20 August 2018. The UK apologises for this oversight and minor non-compliance with CM 10-03. The current procedures for the submission of inspection reports to the Secretariat have been reviewed and modified to ensure compliance with the deadlines established in CM 10-03.</p> <p>Further Action: None Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	<p>No further action required.</p> <p>SCIC agreed on the importance of the Contracting Parties to provide to the Secretariat relevant inspection reports in time compliant with CM 10-03.</p>
Conservation Measure 24-01					
Chile	<i>Cabo de Hornos</i>	<p>No observer was appointed in accordance with the Scheme of International Scientific Observation onboard the vessel throughout all fishing activities within the fishing period of the Chilean survey in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2. The vessel was authorised to fish from 6 January to 15 March 2018.</p> <p>Paragraph 3(c) requires each fishing vessel conducting fishing for research purposes to have at least two scientific observers, one of whom shall be an observer appointed in accordance with the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation, onboard throughout all fishing activities within the fishing period.</p>	<p>The absence of an international observer appointed in accordance with the SISO scheme onboard the vessel during the activities carried out in the mentioned period was due to a misinterpretation of the Conservation Measurement 24-01. The problem arises as a misinterpretation of the catch limit specified by the commission, of 50 tonnes for <i>C. gunnari</i> instead of ‘finfish’, hence producing confusion about the requirements.</p>	Non-compliant (Level 2)	<p>SCIC took note of the explanations presented by Chile. Members concluded Chile had incurred a mistaken interpretation of CM 24-01, on the extent of the obligation to carry observers on board of this specific scientific survey fishery by the <i>Cabo de Hornos</i>. SCIC recognised that Chile acted in good faith and that there were several international scientists on board the vessel. However, SCIC agreed that it would not be appropriate to set the precedent that the lack of observers on board under CCAMLR SISO should be categorised as a minor infringement. SCIC decided no additional measures were needed.</p>

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 24-01 (cont.)					
Chile (cont.)	<i>Cabo de Hornos</i> (cont.)		<p>Although we acknowledged the involuntary mistake, it is also worth mentioning that the research cruise had onboard several international researchers including Dr Christopher D. Jones (Antarctic Ecosystem Research Division, NOAA, USA); Dr Alex Dornburg (North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences, USA); Elyse Parker (Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, USA) and Roberto Sarralde (Spanish Institute of Oceanography). The results of the survey have been submitted and discussed during the recent WG-SAM meeting, and further documents will be presented at WG-FSA to provide relevant information collected by the research cruise. A national observer was also onboard.</p> <p>Further Action: Design protocols to ensure that research activities are in accordance with all Conservation measures and that all requirements are fulfilled.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
Conservation Measure 26-01					
Australia	<i>Antarctic Discovery</i>	<p>This vessel was inspected by New Zealand on 04 December 2017 in Subarea 88.2.</p> <p>The CCAMLR-SI/E1536 Report of Inspection, 7.3 Inspector’s Statement notes ‘...<i>Inspection of bait boxes found only one plastic strap around a box of 25 ton (sic) of squid. Plastic strap will be removed, cut and placed in incinerator...</i>’</p> <p>The results of the inspection were also reported by the observer.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 prohibits the use of plastic packaging bands to secure bait boxes.</p>	<p>Australia implements its CCAMLR obligations (including CM 26-01) via legislative instrument, licence conditions and management arrangements. Licence conditions require vessel operators to comply with CCAMLR Conservation Measures. Penalties can apply for a breach of licence conditions.</p> <p>New Zealand authorities shared the results of an at-sea inspection of an Australian flagged vessel soon after the inspection was conducted. The inspection report noted the presence of one plastic strap from one 25 tonne box of squid bait (although we note this should read 25 kg).</p> <p>The vessel was carrying 2 325 bait boxes. The plastic strap was removed and immediately destroyed.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	SCIC noted that, in responding to its Draft CCAMLR Compliance Report, Australia had not suggested a preliminary compliance status for this infringement. Some Members were of the view that subparagraph 1(iv) of CM 10-10 requires Contracting Parties to suggest a preliminary compliance status.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 26-01 (cont.)					
Australia	<i>Antarctic Discovery</i> (cont.)		Upon receipt of information from New Zealand, Australia undertook an investigation of the incident. The investigation found that a breach of licence conditions had occurred and an official caution was issued to the operator. The operator was also reminded of their obligations. The vessel did not have a history of non-compliance. The incident was an isolated event and the risk was promptly managed (that is the plastic band was removed and destroyed).		Other Members considered that the subparagraph was not clear in this regard; these Members noted that the ambiguity was increased by the fact that, in the English version of CM 10-10, subparagraph 1(iii) makes provision of a suggested preliminary compliance status voluntary. SCIC also noted that subparagraph 1(iii) had been inconsistently translated into CCAMLR's other official languages. SCIC considered that the efficiency of its implementation of the CCEP is enhanced by the provision of suggested preliminary compliance statuses by Contracting Parties and agreed to amend CM 10-10 paragraph 1(iii) to make such provision obligatory, to address the ambiguity of the application of the provision.
Russian Federation	<i>Mys Velikan</i>	This vessel was inspected by New Zealand on 03 December 2017. CCAMLR-SI/E1480 Report of Inspection, 7.3 Inspector's Statement notes ' <i>...Both Port and Starboard scuppers only had 20mm mesh grating evidence of small offal discharge. Spoke to chief mate regarding offense and rectification. Agreement that scuppers will be sealed with smaller mesh before next set of gear...</i> '	Russia has conducted comprehensive and detailed investigation based on the findings of the <i>Mys Velikan</i> inspection that took place on 3 December 2017. According to the results of the investigation, the size of openings in the screens installed on board the <i>Mys Velikan</i> is 20 mm, as it is prescribed in CM 26-01 (2015) 'General environmental protection during fishing'.	Compliant	No action required.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 26-01 (cont.)					
Russian Federation	<i>Mys Velikan</i> (cont.)	<p>The Report of Inspection did not note any observation of active discharge or dumping of offal.</p> <p>CM 26-01, paragraph 6 prohibits the dumping or discharging of offal and discards.</p>	<p>In paragraph 5(iii) of CM 26-01 (2015) ‘General environmental protection during fishing’, it is specified that vessels fishing south of 60°S are prohibited from dumping or discharging food wastes not capable of passing through a screen with openings no greater than 25 mm.</p> <p>Both during the inspection, and the study of additional materials, there was no evidence found of dumping or discharging any waste from the <i>Mys Velikan</i> into the sea while fishing south of 60°S.</p> <p>Nevertheless, because it is mentioned in the inspection act that some small residues which fall under the definition of ‘offal’ were discovered on a screen, the issue of compliance with CM 26-01 (2015) ‘General environmental protection during fishing’ by Russia was included and considered at the ad-hoc workshop that took place in August 2018 in Kaliningrad (Russian Federation), in order to instruct vessel owners.</p> <p>In particular, special attention at the workshop was paid to the process of separate collection, handling and storing different kinds of food wastes, offal and discards, as it is outlined in CM 26-01 (2015) ‘General environmental protection during fishing’.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p> <p>Further action: Not required</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 31-02					
Korea, Republic of	<i>Hong Jin No. 701</i>	<p>A fishery closure notification for the area north of 70°S in Subarea 88.1, SSRUs A and B in Subarea 88.2 outside the Ross Sea region MPA was issued on 02 December 2017 (2359 UTC).</p> <p>The vessel set lines within 24 hours of the closure notification (COMM CIRC 17/105).</p> <p>Paragraph 2 requires that upon receipt of a fishery closure notification no longlines may be set within 24 hours of the notified closure date and time.</p>	<p>Korea provided the information on the <i>Hong Jin No. 701</i>'s setting lines within 24 hours of the closure notification, the measures taken to the vessel immediately and additional detailed information on the incident through 2 circulars (COMM CIRCs 17/105, 18/08).</p> <p>After that, the police investigated the case and concluded that the incident of the <i>Hong Jin No. 701</i> was unintentional, and the case was terminated without charge. This is because the violation of the Distant Water Fisheries Development Act of Korea results in criminal charges, and the intention to violate was critical for the Police's determination on referring the case to the Prosecution Office. Considering that, the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries did not take additional administrative actions other than the measures that have already taken, which Korea believes to be deterrent enough to prevent any such violation from happening again. Also, Korean Fisheries Monitoring Center, which conducts 24/7 monitoring, control and surveillance on Korean vessels was included in Korea's contact points for fishery notification right after the incident to ensure that Korean authorities can always reach Korean vessels even on holidays and non-working days.</p> <p>Korea will update on this matter if further details are available before SCIC. As a belt-and-suspenders approach, MOF has submitted a proposal to amend CM 31-02 to introduce a 'reception alarm' system, whereby vessels are required to immediately acknowledge the receipt of fishery closure notifications and the Secretariat alerts the flag state if such acknowledgment of receipt is not provided within a certain time frame to be agreed by the Commission.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action is required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Seriously, Frequently or Persistently non-compliant (Level 3)	SCIC requested that Republic of Korea report back on the progress and outcome of efforts to review and strengthen its internal legal framework in terms of administrative action.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 31-02 (cont.)					
Korea, Republic of	<i>Southern Ocean</i>	<p>A fishery closure notification for the area north of 70°S in Subarea 88.1, SSRUs A and B in Subarea 88.2 outside the Ross Sea region MPA was issued on 02 December 2017 (2359 UTC).</p> <p>The vessel set lines within 24 hours of the closure notification (COMM CIRC 17/105).</p> <p>Paragraph 2 requires that upon receipt of a fishery closure notification no longlines may be set within 24 hours of the notified closure date and time.</p>	<p>Korea provided the information on <i>Southern Ocean</i>'s setting lines within 24 hours of the closure notification, the measures taken to the vessel immediately and additional detailed information on the incident through 2 circulars (COMM CIRCs 17/105, 18/08).</p> <p>After that, the police investigated the case and referred the case to the Prosecution Office, recommending those involved in the incident be charged for the violation of the Distant Water Fisheries Development Act. Based on the results of the police investigation, the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries took an administrative action, which is 60-day suspension of business, in addition to the measures that have already taken, which Korea believes to be deterrent enough to prevent any such violation from happening again. Also, Korean Fisheries Monitoring Center, which conducts 24/7 monitoring, control and surveillance on Korean vessels was included in Korea's contact points for fishery notification right after the incident to ensure that Korean authorities can always reach Korean vessels even on holidays and non-working days.</p> <p>As this case is still on-going, Korea will update on this matter as further details are available before SCIC. As a belt-and-suspenders approach, MOF has submitted a proposal to amend CM 31-02 to introduce a 'reception alarm' system, whereby vessels are required to immediately acknowledge the receipt of fishery closure notifications and the Secretariat alerts the flag state if such acknowledgment of receipt is not provided within a certain time frame to be agreed by the Commission.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action is required. Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Seriously, Frequently or Persistently non-compliant (Level 3)	SCIC requested that Korea report back on the progress and outcome of the pending prosecution and efforts to review and strengthen its internal legal framework in terms of administrative action.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 41-09					
New Zealand	<i>Janas</i>	<p>Following the request from the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-XXXVI, paragraph 3.146) the Secretariat has undertaken a review of the implementation of the by-catch move-on rules specified in CM 33-03, paragraph 5 and CM 41-09, paragraph 6.</p> <p>CM 41-09, paragraph 6 provides that if the by-catch of any one species is equal to, or greater than, 1 tonne in any one haul or set, then the fishing vessel shall move to another location at least 5 n miles distant. The fishing vessel shall not return to any point within 5 n miles of the location where the by-catch exceeded 1 tonne for a period of at least five days.</p> <p>On 26/12/2017 fishing in SSRU 881H the <i>Janas</i> caught 1 155.2 kg of Macrourids (species code GRV) on haul number 11; hauling was completed at 1950 UTC. The <i>Janas</i> then commenced setting haul number 14 at 23.48 UTC on 26 December 2017 at a distance of 4.6 n miles from the path followed by the vessel on haul number 11.</p>	<p>Ministry for Primary Industries – CM 41-09 Investigation Report</p> <p>New Zealand as a Contracting Party to the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) is responsible for addressing instances of non-compliance with conservation measures that are in force. CM 10-10 (2017) CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure provides for the CCAMLR Secretariat to compile a Draft CCAMLR Compliance Report for each Contracting Party.</p> <p>Background In accordance with CM 10-10 paragraph 1 the Secretariat released the New Zealand CCAMLR Draft Compliance Report on 9 August 2018. Based on the request from the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-XXXVI, paragraph 3.146) the Secretariat has undertaken a review of the implementation of the by-catch move-on rules specified in CM 33-03, paragraph 5 and CM 41-09, paragraph 6.</p> <p>The Secretariat identified a potential breach by a New Zealand flagged fishing vessel <i>Janas</i> of CM 33-03 Limitation of by-catch in new and exploratory fisheries in the 2017/18 season and CM 41-09 Limits on the exploratory fishery for <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i> in Statistical Subarea 88.1 in the 2017/18 season.</p> <p>CM 41-09, paragraph 6 provides that if the by-catch of any one species is equal to, or greater than, 1 tonne in any one haul or set, then the fishing vessel shall move to another location at least 5nm distant. The fishing vessel shall not return to any point within 5nm of the location where the by-catch exceeded 1 tonne for a period of at least 5 days.</p> <p>New Zealand has determined that CM 33-03, paragraph 5 was not relevant to this alleged breach and concluded that only CM 41-09, paragraph 6 was applicable and would be assessed against.</p>	Compliant	No action required.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 41-09 (cont.)					
New Zealand	<i>Janas</i> (cont.)		<p>Situation</p> <p>In 26 December 2017 while fishing in SSRU 881H the New Zealand flagged fishing vessel <i>Janas</i> (ZMTW) caught 1155.2 kg of Macrourids (species code GRV) on haul number 11; hauling was completed at 1950 UTC. The <i>Janas</i> is then alleged to have commenced setting haul number 14 at 2348 UTC on 26 December 2017 at a distance of 4.6nm from the path followed by the <i>Janas</i> on haul number 11.</p> <p>Investigation</p> <p>New Zealand conducted an investigation to verify the information supplied by the Secretariat in assessing if the vessel had breached the provision in CM 41-09 paragraph 6.</p> <p>The New Zealand investigation consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis of the C2 data submitted by the <i>Janas</i> to the Secretariat, • Interview of the New Zealand Observer on board the vessel during the Ross Sea season (at the time the alleged compliance breach occurred), • Analysis of the Scientific Observer Logbook (also called the e-longline log book) submitted by the CCAMLR International Observer and New Zealand Observer to the Secretariat, • Analysis of the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) tracks of the <i>Janas</i> in relation to the C2 data. The vessel reports its CCAMLR VMS to the Secretariat and New Zealand's Ministry for Primary Industries (flag state) simultaneously, • Questioning the vessel owner/operator, • Analysis of the vessel plotter data, and • Obtaining a statement from the Vessel Master of the <i>Janas</i>. <p>Data</p> <p>1. Scientific Observer Logbook Observer data collected for Line 11 and Line 14 (source: Scientific Observers Logbook for the <i>Janas</i> 2017/18 Ross Sea trip)</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 41-09 (cont.)					
New Zealand	<i>Janas</i> (cont.)		<p>Description: The Scientific Observer Logbook. The observers reported the latitude and longitude coordinates for Line 11 and Line 14 during: setting start, setting end, hauling start and hauling end.</p> <p>2. Vessel Plotter Vessel plotter data collected for Line 11 and Line 14 sets (source: the <i>Janas</i> vessel plotter) Line 11: Start set coordinates -72°42.9, 176 17.3. End set coordinates -72°41.6, 176 33.2 Line 14: Start set coordinates -72°47.5, 176°48.8. End set coordinates -72°47.2, 176°36.3</p> <p>Description: The positions were extracted from the vessel's plotter. The data includes the positions for vessel start and end positions. A range circle drawn around Line 11 shows that point it intersects with Line 13 (as the nearest fishing line) is 5.09 nautical miles. Line 14 is further away from Line 11 than Line 13. Based on analysis of the vessel plotter coordinates – the <i>Janas</i> is compliant with CM 41-09, paragraph 6.</p> <p>3. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data (Source: Ministry for Primary Industries) The VMS position was analysed against CCAMLR Scientific Observer data collected for Line 11, Line 13 and Line 14.</p> <p>Description: Vessel Monitoring System data was cross referenced against the CCAMLR Scientific Observer data. The analysis of the two data sets (VMS and CCAMLR Scientific Observer data) allows us to validate the data. The distance from Line 11 to Line 13 is 5.06 nautical miles. Line 14 was set at a distance further away from Line 11 than Line 13. Based on the analysis of the VMS data the <i>Janas</i> is compliant with CM 41-09, paragraph 6.</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 41-09 (cont.)					
New Zealand	<i>Janas</i> (cont.)		<p>4. VMS position analysis with amended C2 data Description: The C2 data submitted by the <i>Janas</i> reported the incorrect coordinates for Line 14. Subsequently, the C2 data was amended to reflect the correct coordinates for Line 14 (coordinates which were verified by the CCAMLR Scientific Observer data). Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data was cross referenced against amended C2 data based on the CCAMLR Scientific data provided for Line 11, Line 13 and Line 14. The distance between Line 11 and Line 14 at the closest point is in excess of 5.67nm. Based on the analysis of the VMS and amended C2 data the <i>Janas</i> is compliant with CM 41-09, paragraph 6.</p> <p>Findings The results of the investigation concluded that the <i>Janas</i>: I. complied with all requirements under CM 41-09, paragraph 6; II. had submitted its C2 data with incorrect latitude for the start haul position of Line 14; III. that the Line 14 start of haul position that was submitted on the C2 data of -72°42.5S, should have been recorded as - 72°47.5S; IV. that the actual position -72°47.5S is consistent with latitude and longitude positions reported by the VMS, the vessel plotter and the CCAMLR Scientific Observer Logbook; and V. that the updated positions for Line 14 when plotted against the positions of Line 11, confirms the <i>Janas</i> moved outside of and did not return to within 5 nautical miles of any point, of the location of Line 11, for a period of at least 5 days.</p> <p>As a result of the investigation and subsequent findings, the C2 data was resubmitted and an informal warning was issued to the owner and Master of the <i>Janas</i>. This informal warning was to ensure that positional information is recorded accurately in the C2 data and submitted to the Secretariat.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant Further action: No further action is required Additional Documentation: Attachment A</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 41-10					
Uruguay	<i>Badaro</i>	<p>Following the request of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-XXXVI, paragraph 3.146) the Secretariat has undertaken a review of the implementation of the by-catch rules in CM 33-03, paragraph 6, and CM 41-10, paragraph 5.</p> <p>CM 33-03 paragraph 6 provides : If the catch of <i>Macrourus</i> spp. taken by a single vessel in any two 10-day periods (see footnote 8) in any SSRU, group of SSRUs or research block for which a specific catch limit (including a zero catch limit) is in place exceeds 1 500 kg in each 10-day period and exceeds 16% of the catch of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. by that vessel in that SSRU, group of SSRUs or research block for which a specific catch limit (including a zero catch limit) is in place in those periods, the vessel shall cease fishing in that SSRU, group of SSRUs or research block for which a specific catch limit (including a zero catch limit) is in place for the remainder of the season.</p> <p>Data from the first two 10-day periods the <i>Badaro</i> had a catch of <i>Macrourus</i> spp. exceeding 1 500 kg and exceeding 16% of the catch of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. The vessel continued to fish in the research block after the second trigger event, where it should have ceased fishing in that research block for the remainder of the season.</p>	<p>Uruguay considers that there was a case of non-compliance with CM 33-03 (paragraph 6) and CM 41-10 (paragraph 5) involving <i>Badaro</i>. This case of non-compliance has been noted in the shipping company’s records, and relevant procedures are being undertaken by the appropriate body. This case will be a major consideration to be taken into account in the assessment of future applications by the vessel to take part in fisheries in the Convention Area. <i>Badaro</i> will not take part in the exploratory fishery in the 2018/19 season.</p> <p>Further Action: This case of non-compliance will be a major consideration to be taken into account in the assessment of future applications by the vessel to take part in fisheries in the Convention Area.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.

Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2018/19

Vessel name	Flag	IMO Number	Call sign	Nature and date of activity(ies)	Year listed	Ownership history
<i>Amorinn</i>		7036345	5VAN9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.5.1 (11 Oct 2003) • Sighted 58.4.2 (23 Jan 2004) 	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infitco Ltd (Ocean Star Maritime Co.) • Seric Business S.A.
<i>Antony</i>		7236634	PQMG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting IUU-listed vessels 	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlanti Pez • Urgora S de RL • World Oceans Fishing SL
<i>Asian Warrior</i>	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	7322897	J8B5336	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.5.2 (31 Jan 2004) • Sighted 58.5.1 (10 May 2006) • Sighted 58.4.1 (21 Jan 2010) • Sighted 58.4.1 (13 Feb 2011) • Towing <i>Baiyangdian 57</i> (01 Apr 2012) • Sighted 58.6 (01 Jul 2012) • Sighted 58.4.2 (28 Jan 2013) • Sighted 57 (10 Mar 2013) • Fishing 58.5.1 (13 May 2013) • Sighted 57 (07 Sep 2013) • Sighted 58.4.1 (30 Mar 2014) • Sighted 57 (14 Apr 2014) • Sighted 57 (14 Dec 2014) • Hauling 5841H (07 Jan 2015) • Sighted 58.4.1 (11 Jan 2015) • Sighting 57 (26 Feb 2015) 	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navalmar S.A. • Meteora Development Inc • Vidal Armadores S.A. • Rajan Corporation • Rep Line Ventures S.A. • Stanley Management Inc • High Mountain Overseas S.A.

(continued)

Vessel name	Flag	IMO Number	Call sign	Nature and date of activity(ies)	Year listed	Ownership history
<i>Atlantic Wind</i>		9042001	5IM813	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undocumented landing Malaysia (01 Aug 2004) • Fishing 58.4.3a (22 Feb 2005) • Fishing 58.4.3a (28 Apr 2005) • Fishing 58.4.3b (16 Dec 2005) • Fishing 58.4.3b (01 Jul 2009) • Fishing 58.4.2 (27 Jan 2010) • Fishing 58.4.3b (04 Apr 2010) • Fishing 58.4.1 (13 Feb 2011) • Sighted 57 (16 May 2012) • Sighted 57 (20 Oct 2012) • Sighted 57 (28 May 2013) • Sighted 57 (01 Jul 2013) • Sighted 57 (13 May 2014) • Sighted 57 (14 Dec 2014) • Fishing 5841H (12 Jan 2015) 	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viarsa Fishing Company/Navalmar S.A. • Global Intercontinental Services • Rajan Corporation • Redlines Ventures S.A. • High Mountain Overseas S.A.
<i>Baroon</i>	Tanzania, United Republic of	9037537	5IM376	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing 58.4.1 (19 Mar 2007) • Sighted 88.1 (15 Jan 2008) • Sighted 57 (19 Dec 2010) • Sighted 57 (05 Oct 2012) • Sighted 57 (24 Mar 2013) • Sighted 57 (03 Sep 2013) • Sighted 57 (19 Nov 2013) • Sighted 57 (14 Feb 2014) 	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punta Brava Fishing S.A. • Vero Shipping Corporation
<i>Challenge</i>		6622642	HO5381	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.4.3b (14 Feb 2006) • Sighted 58.4.3b (22 May 2006) • Sighted 58.4.3b (10 Dec 2006) • Sighted 58.4.3b (08 Feb 2008) 	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prion Ltd • Vidal Armadores S.A. • Mar de Neptuno S.A. • Advantage Company S.A. • Argibay Perez J.A.
<i>Good Hope</i>	Nigeria	7020126	5NMU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resupplying IUU vessels 51 (09 Feb 2007) 	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharks Investments AVV • Port Plus Ltd

(continued)

Vessel name	Flag	IMO Number	Call sign	Nature and date of activity(ies)	Year listed	Ownership history
<i>Hai Lung</i>		6607666	PQBT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing 58.4.3b (23 May 2006) • Fishing 58.4.2 (18 Feb 2007) • Fishing 58.4.3b (24 Mar 2007) • Fishing 58.4.3b (12 Jan 2008) • Fishing 58.4.3b (09 Jan 2009) • Fishing 58.4.3b (20 Jan 2009) 	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arniston Fish Processors Pty Ltd • Nalanza S.A. • Vidal Armadores S.A. • Argibay Perez J.A. • Belfast Global S.A. • Eterna Ship Management
<i>Heavy Sea</i>		7322926	3ENF8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.5.1 (03 Feb 2004) • Fishing 57 (29 Jul 2005) 	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C & S Fisheries S.A. • Muner S.A. • Meteroros Shipping • Meteora Shipping Inc. • Barroso Fish S.A.
<i>Koosha 4</i>	Iran, Islamic Republic of	7905443	9BQK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.4.1 (20 Jan 2011) • Sighted 58.4.1 (15 Feb 2011) 	2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pars Paya Seyd Industrial Fish
<i>Limpopo</i>		7388267		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing 58.5.2 (21 Sep 2003) • Sighted 58.5.1 (03 Dec 2003) • Fishing 58.4.3b (23 Feb 2005) • Fishing 58.4.3b (14 Dec 2005) • Sighted 58.4.3b (25 Jan 2007) 	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grupo Oya Perez (Kang Brothers) • Lena Enterprises Ltd • Alos Company Ghana Ltd
<i>Northern Warrior</i>	Angola	8808903	PJSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting IUU-listed vessels 	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIP • Areapesca SA • Snoek Wholesalers • Southern Trading Group • South Atlantic Fishing NV • World Ocean Fishing SL • Orkiz Agro-Pecuaria, Pescas, Transportes E Comercio Geral, Ltda

(continued)

Vessel name	Flag	IMO Number	Call sign	Nature and date of activity(ies)	Year listed	Ownership history
<i>Perlon</i>		5062479	5NTV21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sighted 58.5.1 (03 Dec 2002) • Sighted 58.5.1 (04 Jun 2003) • Sighted 58.4.2 (22 Jan 2004) • Sighted 58.4.3b (11 Dec 2005) • Fishing 58.4.1 (26 Jan 2006) • Sighted 58.4.3b (07 Dec 2006) • Sighted 58.4.1 (30 Dec 2006) • Sighted 58.4.1 (16 Dec 2008) • Gear sighted (10 Feb 2009) • Fishing 58.5.1 (08 Jun 2010) • Sighted 51 (10 Feb 2012) • Sighted 57 (20 Jul 2014) • Sighted, boarded 57 (22 Apr 2015) 	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vakin S.A. • Jose Lorenzo SL • Americagalaica S.A.
<i>Pescacisne 1, Pescacisne 2</i>		9319856	9LU2119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting activities of IUU vessels 51 (16 May 2008) • Sighted 58.4.3b (22 Apr 2009) • Sighted 57 (07 Dec 2009) • Fishing 58.4.1 (07 Apr 2010) • Sighted 58.4.1 (29 Jan 2012) • Sighted 58.4.1 (30 Jan 2012) • Sighted 58.4.1 (31 Jan 2012) • Sighted 57 (24 Apr 2012) • Fishing 58.6 (03 Jul 2012) • Sighted 57 (28 May 2013) • Sighted 57 (04 Jul 2013) • Sighted 58.4.1 (20 Jan 2014) • Sighted 57 (13 May 2014) • Sighting 57 (08 Dec 2014) • Hauling 5841H (06 Jan 2015) 	2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mabenal S.A. • Vidal Armadores S.A. • Omunkete Fishing Pty Ltd • Gongola Fishing JV (Pty) Ltd • Eastern Holdings
<i>Sea Urchin</i>	Gambia	7424891		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing 58.4.4b (10 Nov 2006) 	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cecibell Securities • Farway Shipping

(continued)

Vessel name	Flag	IMO Number	Call sign	Nature and date of activity(ies)	Year listed	Ownership history
<i>STS-50</i>	Togo	8514772	5VDR2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landing IUU catch (25 May 2016) • Sighted 57 (06 Apr 2017) 	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maruha Corporation • Taiyo Namibia • Taiyo Susan • Sun Tai International Fishing Corp • STD Fisheries Co. Ltd • Red Star Co. Ltd • Poseidon Co. Ltd • Marine Fisheries Corp. Co. Ltd