

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

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	111
Organisation of the meeting	111
Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems	111
Catch Documentation Scheme for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. (CDS)	111
Non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy	111
Implementation of the CDS and trade data analysis	113
Vessel inspection	114
Vessel monitoring system (VMS) and vessel movement activity within the Convention Area	114
Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR	115
Transshipment	115
Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures	116
Conservation Measure 10-02	116
Conservation Measure 10-05	117
Conservation Measure 10-09	117
Conservation Measure 26-01	117
Conservation Measure 32-18	118
Southern Ocean Cooperation Platform	119
Vessel cap in the exploratory toothfish fisheries in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2	119
CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)	120
Report from Korea on vessel activities	120
Provisional Compliance Report	120
Conservation Measure 10-03	121
Conservation Measure 21-02	122
Conservation Measure 22-07	122
Conservation Measure 23-04	122
Conservation Measure 25-03	123
Conservation Measure 26-01	123
Conservation Measure 91-05	124
Late removal of fishing gear	125
Review of Conservation Measure 10-10	125
Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area	126
Pre-season vessel activity	127
IUU Vessel Lists	129
Fishery notifications	130
Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	130
Net monitoring cables	131
Process for managing quarantined data	131
Unidentified gear	131
Exploratory fishery research plans	131

Consideration of the Second Performance Review	132
Other business	132
Close of the meeting	133
Appendix I: CCAMLR Compliance Report	134
Appendix II: NCP-IUU Vessel List	147

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 21 to 25 October 2019.
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. A welcome was extended to the Kingdom of the Netherlands (Netherlands) as a new Member of CCAMLR. 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.

Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems

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

4. SCIC noted the requirement of Conservation Measure (CM) 10-05, Annex 10-05/B, for the designation of a minimum of six Members to serve on a Review Panel to review the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) Fund expenditure proposals and to make recommendations to the Commission on whether to fund special projects or special needs. Nominations from Australia, the European Union (EU), New Zealand, Korea, the Russian Federation (Russia), South Africa, the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK) were endorsed by SCIC.

Non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy

5. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/14, which outlined the Secretariat's review of the non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Strategy and the Secretariat's proposed NCP Engagement Strategy Action Plan for 2020–2022. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for its work and support and recommended that the review and update of the NCP Engagement Strategy be undertaken every two years in parallel with the analysis of the trade data (paragraph 14).
6. SCIC endorsed the proposed NCP Engagement Strategy (CCAMLR-38/14, Annex 1) and made the following recommendations:

- (i) to continue the use of CDS data and other global trade data holdings to identify NCPs

- (ii) for the Executive Secretary in their obligations under CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraph C1, to contact NCPs which have traded in a minimum total of 1 000 kg over the previous three years
- (iii) for the Executive Secretary to contact Flag States of vessels that have engaged in transshipment activities as identified through the CDS, transshipment notifications or reports of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) activity
- (iv) for further resources be made available to encourage Member States to actively participate in the NCP Engagement Strategy.

7. SCIC noted that the USA has engaged in bilateral discussions with Viet Nam in support of the NCP Engagement Strategy and will continue to do so in the future. SCIC also noted Australia's engagement in the Southeast Asian region in support of this and other relevant work.

8. SCIC considered the Secretariat's proposal for expenditure from the CDS Fund for the development of a proof of concept for an online interactive e-CDS training package and for the delivery of CDS workshops and training in 2020 (CCAMLR-38/15).

9. In its deliberations, the CDS Fund Review Panel, with participation from the Secretariat and the Chair of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF), Mr K. Timokhin (Russia), considered CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/B, particularly with respect to its role and the purpose of the Fund.

10. The CDS Fund Review Panel considered that:

- (i) both proposed projects (that is, the e-CDS interactive online training proof of concept proposal and two proposed CDS workshops in 2020) are consistent with the purpose of the CDS Fund (CM 10-01, Annex 10-05/B, paragraph 1 and CCAMLR-38/15)
- (ii) the proposed funding requested (\$A25 000 per workshop and \$A20 000 for the e-CDS proof of concept) was based on the cost of previous workshops and on experience gained during the CCAMLR website redevelopment. The Review Panel considered the cost and its basis as reasonable and therefore it should be referred to SCAF
- (iii) similar workshops run by the Secretariat have been successful in the past
- (iv) the e-CDS proof of concept should: (i) include options for including translation into all official languages, (ii) be appropriately targeted at CDS officers (including to assist new CDS officers, such as through improved manuals and online training modules) and (iii) engage current CDS users in the design of the material.

11. The CDS Fund Review Panel benefited from the engagement and further clarifications offered from the Secretariat in relation to the scope, timing, duration and participation in the workshops, and its ideas for the e-CDS and the providers that it had considered approaching. The Secretariat provided further information to the CDS Fund Review Panel and it requested that the Secretariat share the same with SCIC so that all Members would have this valuable information available.

12. The Secretariat reminded SCIC that there had been successful CDS workshops held in 2010, 2012 and 2017, and the Secretariat proposed to follow a similar model for workshops in 2020. The Secretariat provided direction to the background information reported on those workshops. The Secretariat confirmed that, as with previous workshops, the cost structure of proposed workshops was for essential logistical support such as venue hire, administrative support and material, and not scoped to cover participants' travel and subsistence.

13. With respect to the proof of concept for the development of an online interactive e-CDS training package, the Secretariat informed SCIC that in obtaining a proof of concept, that it was anticipated that the proof of concept stage would return a detailed proposal to SCIC and SCAF in 2020 for the development of the training package. Some Members asked whether the translation of a training package could be extended beyond the official languages of the Commission. The Secretariat advised the request could be made in the proposal for the proof of concept, and the costs of developing training materials in additional languages would be expected to be outlined in the full proposal.

Implementation of the CDS and trade data analysis

14. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/BG/09, BG/10 Rev. 2 and BG/11 reporting on the analysis of global toothfish trade data, implementation of the CDS and analysis of CDS data and the reconciliation of CDS data with monthly fine-scale catch and effort data. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for its work on the trade data analysis provided and recommended that this work be continued to be undertaken every two years.

15. SCIC noted that the discrepancy identified in the reconciliation between CDS and fine-scale catch and effort data for the Convention Area was less than 1% which is within the expected tolerance and supports the conclusion that Members were meeting their obligations.

16. SCIC noted that the CDS has been implemented by 16 Members, three Acceding States, one NCP cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS and one NCP with limited access to the CDS since the 2018 Commission meeting.

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

18. SCIC noted that no Specially Validated *Dissostichus* Catch Documents (SVDCDs) had been issued in 2019.

19. 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, noting that the main ordinance for implementing the CAMLR Convention was passed by the Legislative Council and legislative work has been undertaken for implementation of the relevant conservation measures which is expected to be completed in the next year. China also welcomed other Members providing information associated with the suspected IUU toothfish catch landed, traded or transhipped through Hong Kong SAR, noting that assistance would be provided by Hong Kong SAR in providing the necessary assistance and undertaking follow-up action under the existing domestic frameworks.

20. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/BG/52 detailing Ecuador's efforts to comply with the conservation measures. SCIC thanked Ecuador for its efforts and the submission of a comprehensive report.

Vessel inspection

21. SCIC reviewed the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection in 2018/19 in CCAMLR-38/BG/14 which noted that 152 port inspections and 17 at-sea inspections were undertaken, and SCIC endorsed the recommendation that an electronic version of the form in CM 10-03, Annex 10-03/A, be developed and made available to Contracting Parties.

22. SCIC welcomed Chile's submission (CCAMLR-38/BG/29) on inspections undertaken by Chile's vessel OPV-83 *Marinero Fuentealba* in the 2018/19 season. Chile informed SCIC that it carried out boarding and inspection activities in Subarea 48.1. During the patrol, two inspections of fishing vessels and one sighting of a logistical support vessel were recorded.

23. SCIC expressed its appreciation to Chile in conducting the inspections, noting the importance of these patrols for the implementation of conservation measures and the challenges involved in undertaking at-sea inspections.

Vessel monitoring system (VMS) and vessel movement activity within the Convention Area

24. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/BG/06 which reported on the outcomes of work carried out intersessionally on the Satellite Overwatch pilot project by France, with support from the Secretariat. The Satellite Overwatch pilot project involved the receipt and analysis of images with geographical positions from target surveillance areas within the Convention Area, for comparison with CCAMLR vessel monitoring system (VMS) data. It was proposed that potential IUU fishing activity is being undertaken in a number of subareas, however, continued work with satellite surveillance is necessary to formulate final conclusions.

25. SCIC thanked France and the Secretariat for their work to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of satellite surveillance as a mechanism to combat IUU fishing and supported the proposal to continue working intersessionally to develop this system of surveillance, with an update on the Satellite Overwatch project development to be reported back to SCIC next year.

26. The Secretariat presented CCAMLR-38/BG/28 which reported on its participation in the search and rescue (SAR) workshop hosted by the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) and Antarctica New Zealand, from 14 to 16 May 2019. The workshop presented an opportunity to raise awareness of CCAMLR's arrangements with maritime rescue coordination centres (MRCCs) for the release of VMS data for live search and rescue events.

27. SCIC noted the importance of engaging in work to support SAR and thanked the Secretariat for its participation in the workshop, as well as New Zealand for hosting.

Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR

28. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/BG/08 on the offal management group, which reported on offal management techniques currently used by CCAMLR vessels and found that incidents of non-compliance with CM 26-01, paragraph 6, on the prohibition of dumping or discharging of offal and discards south of 60°S were often the result of mechanical failure. The paper summarised international best practice of offal management, noting that it largely reflected the provisions in CMs 25-02 and 25-03, and that no specific action was recommended to improve the implementation of CM 26-01, paragraph 6. SCIC agreed that the offal management group should continue its work intersessionally using the e-group.

29. New Zealand presented CCAMLR-38/BG/34 reporting on toothfish offal found by observers in the stomachs of toothfish caught by the *San Aspiring* while operating in the Convention Area south of 60°S. It was noted that hooks and snoods were discovered attached to some of the offal and New Zealand highlighted that offal dumping is prohibited under CMs 25-02 and 26-01. New Zealand encouraged Members to use the information provided in the paper to undertake an investigation to determine the source of the offal.

30. SCIC thanked New Zealand for its presentation and considered the need for further discussion on whether the origin of the offal and hooks recovered could be determined. SCIC encouraged Member participation in the offal management e-group intersessionally in order to strengthen offal management practices in the Convention Area.

31. The UK presented CCAMLR-38/BG/40 on electronic monitoring systems as a management tool to support research and compliance on CCAMLR vessels and suggested that SCIC consider electronic monitoring as a future requirement for CCAMLR vessels operating in the Convention Area.

32. SCIC thanked the UK for its paper and considered electronic monitoring as a promising tool to support research priorities and the monitoring and control of vessels. Many Members noted that some of their vessels had already implemented electronic monitoring systems with successful results, highlighting improved reporting capacity and additional options for the collection and validation of data.

33. SCIC agreed to establish an e-group for intersessional discussions and work related to electronic monitoring, to be chaired by the UK.

Transshipment

34. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-38/BG/15). SCIC noted that 212 transshipments had taken place during the review period and all transshipment notifications were provided in accordance with CM 10-09, paragraphs 2 and 3. SCIC endorsed the recommendation that Members remind vessels of the requirements to report transshipment activities as per CM 10-09, paragraph 4.

35. In relation to its proposal to amend CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-38/17), the EU reiterated the prohibition on transshipment within the South Orkney Islands southern shelf marine protected area (MPA) and the Ross Sea region MPA (CMs 91-03 and 91-05).

36. The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) presented its paper on improving the monitoring and control of transshipments in CCAMLR (CCAMLR-38/BG/46). ASOC emphasised the global need for improved oversight of transshipments. CCAMLR-38/BG/46 advocated that CCAMLR add regulations for transshipments, including preventing NCP carrier vessels from being authorised to tranship; developing a required standardised transshipment declaration form; requiring 100% VMS reporting and observer coverage for transshipments, and providing an annual report on transshipments to SCIC.

37. Many Members thanked ASOC for raising these concerns. SCIC expressed support for the improvement of monitoring and control of transshipment activities.

38. Regarding the reference by some Members to the recommendation related to transshipment in the Second Performance Review (PR2) report, China expressed the effort to regulate transshipment in the Convention Area and recalled that the Commission almost reached an agreement on a revision of CM 10-09 some years ago. China reiterated that transshipment should be regulated in an effective and legitimate way.

Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures

Conservation Measure 10-02

39. SCIC considered New Zealand's proposal to amend CM 10-02 (CCAMLR-38/29), obliging Contracting Parties to not license fishing vessels to operate in the Convention Area if they are listed in a final IUU vessel list of any regional fisheries body.

40. Many Members expressed their support for this proposal as it would enhance CCAMLRs' efforts to ensure that IUU fishing vessels were not able to operate in the Convention Area. These Members considered that the proposal was consistent with the existing obligation in CM 10-02, paragraph 2, that Contracting Parties not licence vessels to operate in the Convention Area unless they are satisfied the vessels are able to comply with the Convention and conservation measures in force. Japan generally supported the proposal but expressed its concern on the proposal relating to the revocation of the licence, which could undermine the right of respective Members as a Flag State to issue licences. China and Russia committed to supporting the effort of fighting IUU fishing in the Convention Area but expressed concern that the proposal might enable elements of cross-listing IUU-listed vessels.

41. The proponent, New Zealand, clarified that the intent in the proposal was a strengthening of the obligations of Contracting Parties as Flag States, not a proposal to cross-list IUU vessels. This clarification was welcomed by several Members.

42. Many Members thanked New Zealand for its work and encouraged development of the proposal. The proposal was still under discussion at the close of SCIC, with several Members still having concerns. SCIC agreed to refer the proposal to the Commission.

Conservation Measure 10-05

43. SCIC considered Korea's proposal to amend CM 10-05 (CCAMLR-38/27) in order to extend the scope of SVDCD provisions to allow a Contracting Party to issue an SVDCD for toothfish which could not be immediately seized or confiscated due to limitations in domestic legal frameworks.

44. While some Members supported the proposal, SCIC noted concerns expressed by some Members regarding that the proposed amendment may have unintended consequences which could allow IUU catch that should be seized or confiscated to enter international trade.

45. Noting the concerns of SCIC, Korea withdrew its proposal to amend CM 10-05. At the same time, however, Korea confirmed that this proposal was made as a complementary measure to the domestic legal framework, and that Korea could continue to fully implement the current CM 10-05. Korea assured SCIC that cases like the *Southern Ocean* would be prevented in the future due to pending amendments to its national laws and the newly introduced Ministerial Directive.

Conservation Measure 10-09

46. SCIC considered the proposal by New Zealand to modify CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-38/28) to include more specific details on the information provided in transshipment notifications and introduced a mechanism for confirming the details of completed transshipments. The proposal also contained provisions enabling all transshipment information to be made available on the secure section of the CCAMLR website to support inspection and catch verification. SCIC recognised that the proposal intended to improve transparency and support the CDS and CCAMLR's inspection regimes.

47. Some Members noted the need to prevent duplication of data wherever possible and would support electronic reporting where available. Many Members thanked New Zealand for its work. SCIC agreed to refer the proposal to the Commission with a view to its subsequent adoption.

48. SCIC considered the proposal by the EU (CCAMLR/38/17), which introduced referencing in CM 10-09 to the general prohibitions on transshipment contained in CMs 91-03 and 91-05. SCIC agreed that the prohibitions on transshipment in CMs 91-03 and 91-05 were clear, and some Members considered that the cross-referencing was unnecessary. Members in support of the proposal noted cross-referencing exists elsewhere within conservation measures and that the proposed amendment created a safeguard and would provide certainty. SCIC thanked the EU but was unable to reach consensus on the proposal. Some Members expressed their disappointment that the proposal could not be progressed.

Conservation Measure 26-01

49. SCIC considered the proposal by the EU to amend CM 26-01 to prohibit the dumping and discharge of plastics, oil and fuel products throughout the Convention Area (CCAMLR-38/18). The proposal emphasised that the prohibition on dumping and discharge would not apply where necessary for safety purposes, or when all reasonable precautions had been taken

to secure and prevent the loss of plastics from vessels. The EU noted that the current conservation measure only prohibits dumping and discharge south of 60°S latitude, and that the proposal was consistent with the MARPOL 73/78 Convention and its annexes.

50. Japan, whilst supporting the principle of preventing plastic pollution in the Convention Area, considered that the issue of marine pollution is under the auspices of MARPOL and that some of the proposed provisions are beyond the mandate of CCAMLR. This position was also supported by some Members who considered that more detail regarding the definition of plastic pollution was required.

51. Other Members disagreed and considered that it was within CCAMLR's mandate to enhance environmental protections in the Convention Area. Many Members supported the proposal noting that it strengthens current measures.

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

Conservation Measure 32-18

53. SCIC considered the proposal submitted by Argentina, Australia, the EU, Norway, Uruguay and USA to prohibit the finning of sharks caught in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-38/08 Rev. 1). The paper noted that whilst CM 32-18 prohibits direct fishing of shark species and encouraged the return to the sea of incidentally caught sharks alive where possible, it does not provide an enforceable prohibition on shark finning. The proposal highlighted that CCAMLR is lagging behind several regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) in addressing this issue. The proponents noted that a requirement to leave fins naturally attached would allow for better species identification of sharks and contribute to the conservation of sharks within the Convention Area.

54. Japan showed its strong opposition highlighting reasons it had previously provided to SCIC in not supporting the proposal: (i) that the practice of shark finning had never been observed in the Convention Area and (ii) that the total catch of sharks caught as by-catch was very small and mainly taken by a few Members in their exclusive economic zones (EEZs). Japan expressed disappointment that the word 'finning' was again used in a misleading manner in the proposal, as in the previous similar proposals, which is the practice of removing fins from a shark's body, with the retention of fins while the body is discarded (definition by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – the World Conservation Union (IUCN)). Japan explained that it should not be regarded as 'finning' to remove fins from a shark's body and retain both fins and body for food and other uses. Japan appealed to the proponents not to describe the two practices in a combined manner, affirming that Japan is strongly opposed to 'finning' which contradicts sustainable use.

55. China expressed concern with the continuous discussion of this issue and emphasised that discussion about such proposals should be based on the best available scientific advice. China recalled advice from the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-XXXVII, paragraph 5.3) regarding the necessity for better identification and data collection to quantify shark by-catch rates within the Convention Area and noted that this is consistent with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks.

56. Many Members expressed strong support for the proposal and highlighted that the proposed revisions to CM 32-18 had important ecosystem protection benefits, and the prevention of irrational use of Antarctic marine living resources.

57. No consensus was reached on the proposal and it was referred to the Commission.

Southern Ocean Cooperation Platform

58. SCIC considered the proposal by the EU to promote the creation of a Southern Ocean Cooperation Platform (SOCP) (CCAMLR-38/19). The proposal noted that since the creation of CCAMLR, three RFMOs have been created adjacent to the Convention Area, where species, in particular Patagonian toothfish (*Dissostichus eleginoides*), are harvested commercially. The EU considered that the formation of the SOCP would enhance coordination and collaboration between CCAMLR and adjacent RFMOs and promote the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources and ecosystems across management organisations.

59. Many Members recognised the importance of cooperation with adjacent RFMOs, noting that there were already a number of existing memorandums of understanding (MoUs) between CCAMLR and neighbouring RFMOs. Members expressed concern that the proposal created administrative, budgetary and resource burdens on the Secretariat, and in particular that this could impede the work of the Secretariat in supporting CCAMLR annual meetings, given the timing of the initial SOCP was proposed to fall during WG-FSA. Some Members also expressed concerns regarding differences in membership, procedures and objectives between CCAMLR and RFMOs. Australia expressed appreciation for the idea noting that it was interested in exploring ways to cooperate in the management of toothfish between CCAMLR and the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA). Australia considered that all Members have a responsibility, both legal and moral, to ensure that their actions outside the Convention Area do not undermine the Convention or CCAMLR conservation measures where there is a connection with CCAMLR. Australia noted that the maturity and success of CCAMLR in managing toothfish would be beneficial to RFMOs.

60. SCIC could not reach consensus about this EU proposal.

61. The UK recalled Resolution 10/XII which provides that:

‘Members should ensure that their flag vessels conduct harvesting of such stocks in areas adjacent to the Convention Area responsibly and with due respect for the conservation measures it has adopted under the Convention.’

Vessel cap in the exploratory toothfish fisheries in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2

62. SCIC considered New Zealand’s submission (CCAMLR-38/26) for a vessel cap of four vessels per Member in the exploratory toothfish fisheries in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2, highlighting that the status quo of unlimited capacity is not in line with the objective of the Convention.

63. Some Members expressed their support for capacity management in CCAMLR fisheries. Several Members highlighted that other capacity limiting measures should also be considered in conjunction with the proposed vessel cap to ensure a proposed scheme was based upon best available science, and that a proposal should ensure equitable future access to CCAMLR fisheries. SCIC encouraged Members to continue to consider approaches to capacity management in the intersessional period.

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)

Report from Korea on vessel activities

64. SCIC considered the follow-up report from Korea (CCAMLR-38/BG/36), requested by SCIC-2018 (CCAMLR-XXXVII, Annex 6, paragraphs 76 to 81). Building on the regular updates Korea provided between SCIC-2018 and SCIC-2019 (COMM CIRC 19/21 and COMM CIRC 19/74) on further actions taken against the *Hong Jin No. 701* and *Southern Ocean*, Korea reported the outcome of the pending prosecution as follows: the Prosecutor's Office made a decision to suspend the indictment on 26 December 2018 and the case was closed. Korea also reported the progress to strengthen its internal legal framework through amending the Distant Water Fisheries Development Act. Korea explained that the main element of the proposed amendment is to introduce an administrative sanctions mechanism to the Act to make the enforcement of sanctions more efficient and effective. Korea also explained the proposed amendment is progressing through the relevant sub-committees of the National Assembly and will be finally put forward to the Plenary of the National Assembly in due time. Korea will keep CCAMLR Members updated.

65. SCIC noted that, whilst it was disappointing that catch from the *Southern Ocean* had been allowed to enter international trade, Korea had taken swift action to ensure that would not occur in the future by issuing a new Ministerial Directive implementing CM 10-05.

66. SCIC congratulated Korea on its ongoing efforts to amend its legislation to enable it to more effectively address IUU fishing, including by authorising administrative sanctions to be applied in cases where criminal prosecution is inappropriate or unavailable. SCIC appreciated the detailed information provided by Korea during the intersessional period and looked forward to future updates.

67. SCIC recognised that no further action was required to address the cases involving the *Hong Jin No. 701* and *Southern Ocean*.

Provisional Compliance Report

68. In accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i), SCIC considered the 16 potential compliance incidents in the CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) Summary Report (CCAMLR-38/13 Rev. 2, Annex 1)

69. Following ad hoc consultation of Members, SCIC adopted, for further consideration by the Commission, its annual Provisional Compliance Report (Appendix I) in accordance with CM 10-10. In doing so, it noted that it did not reach consensus regarding the compliance status

(non-compliance Level 1 or 2) in two cases and, consequently, did not record a compliance status in the respective sections of the Provisional Compliance Report. SCIC agreed that this process should not set a precedent and that SCIC should work hard to avoid a repeat of this outcome in the future.

Conservation Measure 10-03

70. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by Chile regarding instances of port inspections not conducted within the 48-hour timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5, and instances where port inspection reports were not transmitted to the Secretariat within the timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 8. Chile noted that delays in conducting inspections were due to adverse weather conditions which prevented inspectors from accessing vessels. Chile advised inspection report form transmission delays were due to administrative issues, however, it noted that in those cases the inspections were conducted within the 48-hour timeframe.

71. SCIC noted that there were several Members which had compliance events included on the Draft CCEP Report with regard to CM 10-03, paragraph 5, and that Members responses frequently indicated delays were based on weather conditions precluding safe access by inspectors. Many Members considered that these instances should be treated consistently when considering a compliance status. SCIC noted that adverse weather conditions and other safety concerns constituted a valid reason for delays in conducting inspections.

72. Some Members observed that delays caused by accessibility and safety issues do not constitute non-compliance, and in some cases Members suggested a preliminary compliance status of minor non-compliant. Some Members noted that a status of 'No compliance status assigned' could be available in accordance with CM 10-10, Annex 10-10/B, although others considered that this may not be applicable in the case of a vessel in port.

73. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by South Africa regarding instances of port inspections not conducted within the 48-hour timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5, and instances where port inspection reports were not transmitted to the Secretariat within the timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 8. South Africa informed SCIC that delays in the conduct of inspections were due to the availability of inspectors over weekends and public holidays and transmission delays were due to technical and administrative issues. South Africa explained the steps being implemented to limit port access over weekends in vessel permit conditions and enhancements to its systems to allow for timely transmission of inspection reports.

74. Some Members noted that the late submission of reports due to administrative issues was common and considered that the compliance status for these issues should be aligned. SCIC revised the compliance status for the administrative issues outlined by South Africa to minor non-compliant (Level 1).

75. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by the UK regarding a port inspection not conducted within the 48-hour timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5. The UK noted that, as with other Members, weather conditions had prevented inspectors from safely accessing the vessel. The UK agreed that this case should be assessed consistently with other similar cases and supported a review of CM 10-03 to reflect this issue.

76. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 by Uruguay regarding instances of port inspections not conducted within the 48-hour timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5, and instances where port inspection reports were not transmitted to the Secretariat within the timeframe required by CM 10-03, paragraph 8. Uruguay noted that, as in cases involving other Members, weather conditions had not allowed safe vessel access on two occasions. The remaining inspection was not conducted within the 48-hour timeframe due to a public holiday on which inspectors were not permitted to work but was conducted on the first day following the holiday.

Conservation Measure 21-02

77. Ukraine noted that its responses to the CCEP were provided after the due date and hence were not reflected in the Summary report, however, the information was circulated to Members prior to the meeting. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 21-02 by Ukraine. The CCEP Summary report concerned a discrepancy between the gear specified in the notification, and the gear reported on board the vessel and Ukraine's response that the information provided in the vessel notification was incorrect, however, it had undertaken an investigation and provided details as to the correct gear specifications.

78. The USA noted with concern that the incident described could affect the sink rate of gear, and that the response now provided addressed that concern, however, the delayed timing of the response had hindered its ability to assess the incident. The USA, supported by the EU, noted that whilst information regarding compliance issues on Ukrainian vessels had been circulated in COMM CIRC 19/107, they considered it particularly important for Members to provide details on CCEP issues by the specified deadline, to ensure adequate time to consider issues raised in the CCEP.

Conservation Measure 22-07

79. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-07 by Ukraine. Ukraine noted that the vessel had correctly marked its gear at the 1 200 m intervals specified by the conservation measure, however, the vessel had not correctly marked all line segment midpoints, and where this had not occurred, the midpoint positions had been approximated by the vessel.

80. The USA noted that this issue may have impeded the work of observers on the vessel and questioned if corrective action had been undertaken. Ukraine clarified that instructions had been sent to the vessel to ensure correct gear marking would occur this season.

Conservation Measure 23-04

81. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 23-04 by Ukraine. Ukraine considered that the conservation measure had been wrongly interpreted by the vessel and commented that the recording of liced and damaged fish was unable to be undertaken using the current C2 form. Ukraine also noted the discussion that had taken place at WG-FSA-2019 regarding the development of a new C2 form which may address this issue.

82. SCIC considered that all catch is required to be reported in CCAMLR fisheries and accepted the clarification provided by the Secretariat that damaged and iced fish were able to be reported on the current vessel data form (WG-FSA-2019 report, paragraph 2.22).

Conservation Measure 25-03

83. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 25-03 by Norway. Norway provided a detailed explanation to SCIC on the net monitor cables used by its vessels, noting that the cables were necessary due to bandwidth and battery limitations with current wireless technologies, and that it is an operational requirement by vessels to closely monitor net positions when harvesting krill. Norway noted that whilst two of its vessels were cited in the report, a third vessel had been using this system for nine years and had never been recorded as having a compliance issue within CCAMLR.

84. SCIC noted the advice provided by the Scientific Committee Chair (Dr M. Belchier (UK)) on net monitoring cables (paragraph 129). Some Members noted that wording of the conservation measure was unambiguous, and that Norway had sought a derogation of this conservation measure to trial net monitor cables in 2016 (SC-CAMLR-XXXV, paragraphs 4.10 to 4.13), indicating it was aware of net monitoring cable requirements. Additionally, some Members noted the statement by Norway that one vessel had continuously used a net monitoring cable for nine years suggested that the preliminary compliance status suggested by Norway was inadequate, and that the fact that it had not been previously identified through the CCEP was not relevant.

85. Other Members considered that there was ambiguity in the definition of a net monitoring cable in CM 25-03, and that the rigging developed by Norway could be considered very different to net monitoring cables deployed in traditional trawl systems, therefore, the conservation measure needed to be updated to reflect this. Norway considered that the cable system provided a very low risk to seabirds due to its close alignment with the warp cable, and noted that by using alternative wireless systems, this may pose a greater risk to seabirds as the nets would need to be hauled and shot more frequently. To provide further information on the issue, including on the interactions with seabirds, SCIC later sought advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (paragraph 129).

86. SCIC could not reach consensus on whether the infringement was a Level 1 or Level 2 non-compliance.

Conservation Measure 26-01

87. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 26-01 by Ukraine for two issues regarding the discharge of sewerage south of 60°S latitude and offal not retained on board a vessel. Ukraine noted that in the case of the sewage discharge, the vessel was equipped with a sewage treatment plant rated to MARPOL specifications and provided a certificate of compliance regarding this. Ukraine also noted that in the case of the offal not retained on the vessel, this was due to a grating being removed whilst cleaning a blocked draining chute that had frozen.

88. Members reiterated the comment on the difficulty of assessing the information provided by Ukraine, as it was not submitted by the deadline for responses to the Draft CCEP report. Ukraine expressed that there had been administrative difficulties and that it understood the importance of providing a timely response. Some Members also noted that it would be difficult for a Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) observer to determine if discharge was treated sewage, and whether a treatment plant was operating correctly. Other Members considered that it would be useful to seek additional information regarding the observer report to clarify what exactly it noted.

89. South Africa provided a statement from the SISO report, noting that the report had been signed off by the Ukrainian observer also present on the vessel. Ukraine noted that there may have been some miscommunication between observers and crew which had resulted in this information being tabled in the report. Ukraine accepted the suggested status of ‘additional information required’ and undertook to provide a report to SCIC in 2020 to ensure that the discrepancy between the observer report and the Ukrainian statement is explained.

90. The USA noted the report on offal found in toothfish stomachs provided by New Zealand (CCAMLR-38/BG/34) and questioned whether the offal discovered may have come from this vessel. Many Members noted that it would be difficult to determine exactly where the offal had originated from and given that the observer report stated a high level of discharge for only a single day, it would be unlikely to be from this discharge incident. SCIC agreed to assign a minor non-compliant status (Level 1).

Conservation Measure 91-05

91. SCIC considered the non-compliance of UK vessels of CM 91-05 of the prohibition of transshipments in the MPA. The UK noted a transshipment of spare parts had taken place between two of its vessels (belonging to the same company), and the Secretariat had been notified of this activity both prior to it taking place and after it took place in accordance with CM 10-09. However, as the transshipment had occurred within the Ross Sea region MPA, the activity was in breach of CM 91-05. The UK confirmed that the UK, as the Flag State, has issued a written warning to the company, that the company has revised its internal procedures in light of this and that the company, as a result of this breach, paid £10 000 into the CCAMLR MPA Special Fund. The UK proposed a provisional compliance rating of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

92. Some Members considered that the issue should have been identified as two separate compliance issues given that two vessels were involved and, in their view, the compliance status is assigned to the vessel and not to a compliance event. Other Members considered it appropriate to treat the matter as a single compliance event given that transshipment was an activity that required two vessels to complete, and the activity occurred between vessels belonging to the same company and of the same Flag State.

93. In light of the company revising its internal procedures after this non-compliance, China highlighted the obligation of Contracting Parties to provide a copy of CM 91-05 to all licensed vessels. The UK confirmed that it had complied with the obligation to provide full sets of conservation measures prior to this incident.

94. As the wording in CM 91-05 is unambiguous regarding a prohibition on transshipment, some Members noted that for consistency the issue should be categorised as non-compliant (Level 2). Additionally, as the conservation measure infringement had taken place within the MPA, some Members noted that any detrimental impacts from the activity may have significantly impacted a designated protected area.

95. Other Members considered that the UK had addressed the issue appropriately through responsible Flag State action to implement the conservation measure as well as by taking swift and decisive action against the vessels involved when the non-compliance occurred, and that the transshipment was of a small number of items other than Antarctic marine living resources. Additionally, as the vessels had correctly notified the Secretariat of the transshipment activity, both prior to and following the activity under the requirements of CM 10-09, it was a single occurrence of non-compliance by the vessels.

96. SCIC could not reach consensus on whether the non-compliance was a Level 1 or Level 2.

Late removal of fishing gear

97. SCIC considered investigations by the Australia, New Zealand, Spain, Ukraine and the UK into the late removal of fishing gear following a fishery closure notification (CCAMLR-38/BG/41; COMM CIRCs 19/05, 19/12, 19/73, 19/78 and 19/108). SCIC noted Members' responses which explained that several factors led to the delay in retrieving gear, including that ice conditions were such that lines were not able to be retrieved in a timely fashion, lines that were snagged on the sea floor required extended grappling for retrieval by vessels, and that large numbers of hooks deployed by some vessels at the time the closure notification was issued required considerable hauling time and effort. These factors resulted in lines remaining in the water after the closure of the fishery.

98. SCIC noted that 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 required.

Review of Conservation Measure 10-10

99. SCIC considered the recommendations provided by the Secretariat in CCAMLR-38/13 Rev. 2, noting that the recommendation on VMS analysis had been withdrawn. SCIC provided the following advice on the recommendations:

- (i) SCIC noted that CM 10-10 already applies to States Party to the Convention but not Members of the Commission (Acceding States), and they have the ability to respond to issues through the CCEP and at meetings. SCIC agreed that Acceding States will be considered in the CCEP for assessment for the 2019/20 season as a trial. SCIC also agreed to conduct a review of the trial and decide whether the CCEP for Acceding States should be continued or not.

- (ii) SCIC supported the recommendation to amending the evaluation period contained in CM 10-10, paragraph 1(i), to the period from 1 July to 30 June.
- (iii) SCIC supported the proposal by Uruguay and supported by many Members to amend to CM 10-03 to provide an exception to the requirement that vessels be inspected within 48 hours when the vessel cannot be safely accessed by inspectors.

100. Korea expressed its concern with the current requirement under CM 10-10 regarding the application of a compliance status agreed by consensus. Korea recognised that whilst having defined and tiered compliance statuses has merit, the consideration of the status often deviates Members from the true purpose of compliance evaluation, which is reviewing Contracting Parties' compliance and any subsequent actions that have been taken to ensure full compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures and advice. Korea noted that Members have been distracted from reviewing what happened, how it was addressed and what actions need to be taken, which they believe should be the main focus of this process. Therefore, Korea expressed its concern that Member discussion on compliance status focuses on prolonged arguments over whether a certain non-compliance should be Level 1 or 2, while sacrificing valuable time and energy that should be invested in more important discussions on actions to improve compliance, and discussions on amendments of conservation measures to better meet the objectives of the Convention.

101. Several Members thanked Korea and shared its concerns that the current process loses sight of the bigger objective, which is to improve compliance and to promote the effective implementation of the Convention and its conservation measures. These Members noted the importance of focusing on follow-up actions rather than focusing simply on compliance statuses. New Zealand noted that the lack of defined mechanisms and reference documents makes assessing a compliance status difficult and inconsistent between years.

102. Other Members also noted that the use of a defined status is the result of the SCIC discussion on compliance, and not the aim of the discussion itself, and the removal of a status listing would result in every event being automatically considered in a negative fashion. Furthermore, the lack of a compliance status would provide no indication of the seriousness of the compliance event.

103. SCIC reiterated that consensus decision-making is a fundamental element of the CCAMLR Rules of Procedure. SCIC agreed that there are broad interests in reviewing the mechanisms of compliance evaluation, and how the application of a compliance status is determined but could not reach consensus on any particular recommendations to the Commission for amending CM 10-10 and, therefore, recommended work be undertaken intersessionally by interested Members.

Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area

Current level of IUU fishing

104. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-38/12 Rev. 1 on IUU fishing activity and trends in 2018/19 and advised that the paper had also been discussed by WG-FSA (WG-FSA-2019 report, paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2). SCIC noted that no vessels on the NCP-IUU Vessel List had been sighted within the Convention Area during this period. SCIC noted that the number of IUU vessel sightings in the Convention Area had shown a steady decline over time with the last reported sighting in 2016.

105. SCIC considered CCAMLR-38/BG/17 Rev. 1 which reported on intersessional work conducted with Members by the Secretariat to develop draft technical guidelines to assist vessels which encounter unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area. SCIC noted the recommendation in the report to consider further continued development of the technical guidelines through the unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area e-group as Member engagement in the process had been minimal.

106. SCIC considered observations on IUU fishing in the French EEZ (CCAMLR-38/BG/38) in 2018/19. SCIC noted that satellite surveillance systems were supplemented this year with global positioning system (GPS) tags deployed on albatrosses. These tags can detect radar emissions from vessels. No IUU fishing activities were reported and no suspicious radar activities were detected, however, licensed fishing vessels undertook three recoveries of unidentified fishing gear in the waters surrounding the Kerguelen Islands and one recovery of unidentified fishing gear in the waters surrounding the Crozet Islands. SCIC thanked France for its continued efforts to combat IUU fishing in the Convention Area.

107. Australia expressed its sincere gratitude to France for its continued cooperative effort in the undertaking of joint monitoring and surveillance activities across the Kerguelen Plateau.

108. SCIC noted the interim report submitted by INTERPOL (CCAMLR-38/BG/05) in accordance with the funding agreement between CCAMLR and INTERPOL. The INTERPOL report provided information on coordination and exchange of information on vessels of interest to CCAMLR:

- (i) the *Nika*, which is owned by the same company as the NCP-IUU-listed vessel *STS-50* (formerly *Andrey Dolgov*)
- (ii) the NCP-IUU-listed vessel *Hai Lung*, which is noted as being now named *Jinzhang*, and Bolivian-flagged fishing vessel *Cape Flower*, which landed approximately 100 tonnes of toothfish in the port of Manta, Ecuador, in mid-April 2016.

109. SCIC welcomed INTERPOL's report and expressed appreciation for its work in coordinating efforts to apprehend the *Nika*, and the multinational efforts in partnership with INTERPOL in combating IUU fishing activities worldwide. SCIC supported further cooperation between CCAMLR and INTERPOL, particularly for investigations into the *STS-50* and *Nika*. It was noted that invitations to assist in the investigations of these vessels had been issued by INTERPOL to Members. The USA encouraged such Members to engage with INTERPOL in order to advance these investigations in meeting CCAMLR obligations for control of Members' nationals and vessels.

Pre-season vessel activity

110. SCIC considered reports from Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Spain, Ukraine and the UK (CCAMLR-38/BG/21 and BG/49) on pre-season vessel activity in Subarea 88.1, as requested by SCIC-2018 (SCIC-2018 report, paragraph 113). Reports from Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Ukraine and the UK were noted by SCIC.

111. Russia queried the report on the unknown gear retrieved by the Korean vessel *Sunstar* to clarify whether the gear had baited hooks when hauled, if the gear showed any signs of degradation and whether any further gear analysis had been performed. Korea responded that the gear report was received directly from the fishing master at the time of the event. Korea further added that the *Sunstar* master had noted that the gear was in good order and the master could find the gear because of the buoy light. New Zealand noted it had requested high-resolution photos from the *Sunstar* and these showed that there was still bait attached to hooks.

112. The USA requested whether any analysis had been done on the radio buoy to determine if it was a continuously transmitting model or transmission on demand type. Korea responded that the retrieved gear had been disposed of at a port reception facility without a technical analysis of the gear. The USA recommended that in future any unidentified gear recovered should be retained, as they can be analysed in detail potentially in cooperation with INTERPOL.

113. Russia presented its report on the pre-season vessel activity of the *Palmer* and *Mys Velikan*, noting its investigation found no evidence that either of the Russian vessels had set the unidentified gear retrieved by the *Sunstar*. The EU requested Russia clarify the comment in its report which noted that the gear retrieved by the *Sunstar* was considered to be a year old. Russia stated that the SISO observer deployed on the *Sunstar* had assessed the gear that was retrieved as being old due to the scuffed and torn mainline, lack of paint on the buoy and absence of bait on hooks. Some Members noted that Russia had only provided VMS information for one vessel of a subset of the days that other Members had considered and only with respect to daily position information derived through VMS. Russia confirmed that it had analysed in full the entire information when preparing its report.

114. SCIC deliberated on the information in the report presented by Russia. New Zealand presented several photos from a pre-departure port inspection conducted under New Zealand domestic legislation: (i) high-resolution images of hooks and snoods taken by the crew of the *Sunstar* and (ii) images taken during an inspection under the System of Inspection. Some Members noted differences between these images and the photo of the *Palmer's* gear provided in the Russian report, as well as the similarities between these images and the photos of the unidentified gear retrieved by the *Sunstar*. Members made several requests for VMS, observer reports and data, and catch data analysis that may be available to better inform SCIC as to the activities of the *Palmer* at the time the unidentified fishing gear was encountered. A short presentation of VMS data to SCIC was agreed to by those Members with vessels in close proximity to the recovered gear for the period 18 to 30 November 2017, with the exception of Russia.

115. Russia noted that the System of Inspection report from New Zealand did not contain the photographs presented to SCIC and clarified that the reports received from both New Zealand and the Secretariat as required under the terms of the System of Inspection were identical, and that the pre-season inspection conducted by New Zealand was not a CCAMLR requirement. New Zealand noted that all photographic material from the inspection undertaken in accordance with the System of Inspection had been provided to the Secretariat within the required timeframe, however, as the quantity of material was considerable, it was provided separate to the System of Inspection report. The Secretariat confirmed that these materials were received from New Zealand in good order but noted that it could not confirm that they had been forwarded to Russia as required. These materials were provided to Russia during the meeting more than a year and a half later and some Members agreed that from here Russia should have adequate opportunity to review the information that it had just received. Some Members

recalled that the purpose of this exercise was to determine the origin of the unidentified gear so that further action could be taken. New Zealand noted that it had shared one low-resolution printed copy photo with the Russian Delegation one week before the Commission meeting.

116. In response to this, Russia noted that in contradiction to paragraph VIII of the Text of the System of Inspection, the photographic and video materials in question were not provided to the Flag State of the inspected vessel in time indicated therein (it is stipulated that there are 15 days for forwarding such information from the inspector to the Designating Member, 15 days from a Designating Member to the Secretariat and 7 days from the Secretariat to the Flag State).

117. Russia further stated that this fact in context of the re-emergence of such materials only at this stage should be considered as a breach of the requirements of the System of Inspection. In response many Members noted that New Zealand had acted consistently with the System of Inspection.

118. Nevertheless, Russia agreed to undertake further evaluation of relevant photographic materials and videos presented by New Zealand during SCIC in connection with the previous review of longline vessel activity in the area at the time the *Sunstar* retrieved gear in Subarea 88.1 prior to the start of the 2017/18 season (CCAMLR-XXXVII, Annex 6, paragraph 114) and will be ready to provide outcomes of such a review prior to the next SCIC meeting.

119. Many Members commended Russia on its willingness to conduct a further investigation into the pre-season vessel activity by the *Palmer*. These Members requested that such a report be provided to the Commission within 45 days by COMM CIRC and include an analysis of the following elements:

- (i) detailed VMS data for the time period 18 to 30 November 2017 as held by the Secretariat
- (ii) information from the SISO observer cruise report for the *Sunstar* and from the domestic observer on the *Palmer*, including any photographs of the fishing gear taken on board the vessels
- (iii) SISO observer data as submitted to the CCAMLR Secretariat from the *Palmer* and the *Sunstar*, including any photographs of the fishing gear taken onboard the vessels
- (iv) daily catch and effort reports, monthly fine-scale catch and efforts reports (C2) and CDS data from the *Palmer* for relevant periods in 2017/18 which have been submitted by to the Secretariat
- (v) relevant imagery from inspection of the *Palmer* conducted by any Member under the System of Inspection.

IUU Vessel Lists

120. SCIC considered the 2019/20 Provisional NCP-IUU Vessel List and the Provisional Contracting Party-IUU Vessel List for 2019. The Secretariat noted that there had been no

additions to the NCP-IUU Vessel List and recommended that the Commission consider the information on the current vessel details of the NCP-IUU-listed *Hai Lung* and update the vessel details on the NCP-IUU Vessel List to reflect the current known name of the vessel as *Jinzhang* as proposed in CCAMLR-38/12 Rev. 1, Annex 1.

121. Australia informed SCIC that, contrary to the information provided, it had undertaken informal engagement with Iran in 2011 regarding the NCP-IUU-listed vessel *Koosha 4*.

122. The EU also noted updated information submitted to the Secretariat on the vessel *Sea Urchin* (COMM CIRC 19/109).

123. SCIC noted the correspondence with Angola regarding the NCP-IUU-listed *Northern Warrior* (CCAMLR-38/BG/60 Rev. 1). The EU highlighted with concern the inappropriate tone of the letter from Angola, also noting that the content touched upon matters not directly related to CM 10-07 and that there was a clear lack of understanding of the procedure of the Commission. Spain joined what the EU had stated.

124. The NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2019/20, which notes the change of name of the *Hai Lung* to the *Jinzhang* and reflects the unknown Flag status of the *Sea Urchin* as The Gambia/Stateless, as agreed by SCIC, is provided in Appendix II for adoption by the Commission.

Fishery notifications

125. SCIC considered fishery notifications received for exploratory fisheries for toothfish and established fisheries for krill for 2019/20 (CCAMLR-38/BG/07 Rev. 1). The Secretariat had received all fishery notifications on time for the upcoming 2019/20 season with no withdrawal of fishery notifications prior to the meeting.

126. SCIC considered the implementation of procedures to monitor and forecast closures in CCAMLR fisheries in the 2018/19 season (CCAMLR-38/BG/12). SCIC noted that the key challenges for the application of the procedures were associated with a number of vessels reporting an intention to fish but subsequently did not set gear, a reduction in number of hooks deployed during season progression, meteorological conditions, poor fishing conditions and effort distribution. SCIC noted that despite these challenges, the new arrangement to manage all areas outside the Ross Sea region MPA under a single catch limit (CM 41-09, paragraph 2i) worked well, delivering 98% of the catch limit.

127. Russia recalled COMM CIRC 18/114, highlighting the need to clarify the operational management of the Ross Sea region toothfish fishery.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

128. SCIC considered advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee in respect of risk of bird strikes posed by net monitoring cables used on Norwegian krill vessels with continuous trawl fishing systems, the process for managing quarantined data, how unidentified gear would impact on CCAMLR fisheries assessments and how historical performance of vessels is used when assessing exploratory fishery research plans.

Net monitoring cables

129. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that net monitoring cables are not clearly defined in conservation measures, however, in conventional trawl systems, monitoring cables do present a considerable risk of bird strikes due to their aerial extent, small profile and the distance from the vessel to the air/sea cable interface. Additionally, the Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that different approaches to the rigging and deploying of net monitoring cables may reduce the risk posed to birds and provide substantial amount of scientific information, including more accurate and real-time catch data both temporally and spatially as well as location of by-catch, although further research and data is required before any conclusions can be made.

Process for managing quarantined data

130. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that quarantined data exists within CCAMLR data holdings and is confined to toothfish data collected over the last 10 years. The Chair of the Scientific Committee clarified that data are classified as quarantined when research and analysis have shown clear discrepancies that require further investigation. Data are still available for use by Members, however, they are flagged and should be treated with caution before drawing conclusions. He noted that there is an established process of data investigation, whereby the contributing Member should present information to the Scientific Committee's working groups, who consider whether the data discrepancies have been addressed. However, some data remain in a quarantined state. The Chair of the Scientific Committee confirmed that no quarantine data have been used when developing stock assessment advice.

131. The Chair of the Scientific Committee was asked if the Scientific Committee was aware that a vessel whose data had been quarantined had not recorded non-retained, damaged and/or liced toothfish. The Scientific Committee Chair advised that he was not aware of this but would take the matter back to the Scientific Committee for further consideration.

Unidentified gear

132. With particular reference to the 2017/18 season, the Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that the impacts of unidentified gear may have significant impacts on fisheries assessments, dependent on the quantity of unidentified gear and associated catch.

Exploratory fishery research plans

133. The Chair of the Scientific Committee clarified that the process for assessing exploratory fishery research plans proposed by Members followed a comprehensive checklist developed over several years by WG-SAM and WG-FSA. This assessment includes both on- and off-water activities. A number of metrics are used in the assessment, including tag-detection and tag-survival rates, which are calculated using a process developed by New Zealand and endorsed by the Scientific Committee. He noted that rates vary between vessels and that, although the discussions on this issue were still ongoing in the Scientific Committee, during

WG-SAM-2019 concerns were expressed that the vessel *Palmer* exhibited particularly low tag-detection and survival rates, despite deploying a high number of tags, suggesting a high mortality of tagged fish post-release.

134. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted a number of possible explanations as to why a vessel may have a low tag-detection rate. These included poor tagging practices and poor tag survivorship leading to high mortality of tagged fish.

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

Consideration of the Second Performance Review

136. SCIC considered the progress report of the Second Performance Review (PR2) (CCAMLR-38/11) which provided a summary of actions taken since CCAMLR-XXXVII. SCIC, along with the Commission and Scientific Committee, was encouraged to identify any additional actions.

137. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for compiling the progress report and agreed that no changes were necessary for Recommendations 10, 11, 16, 17 and 18. SCIC noted that Recommendation 9 had been considered, and that the status of Recommendation 12 shall note the consideration by SCIC of CCAMLR-38/28. SCIC additionally requested a status change for Recommendation 14 to 'ongoing'. In relation to Recommendation 13(iv), the EU noted with concern that there has been no progress on the recommendation from PR2 to adopt a procedure to cross-list IUU vessels and recalled to that effect the EU proposal submitted at CCAMLR-XXXVII. New Zealand supported the EU intervention and noted that it had submitted a proposal for amendments to CM 10-02 which is not about cross-listing but rather relates to Contracting Parties not being able to licence IUU-listed vessels.

Other business

138. SCIC noted that increasing numbers of participants are attending SCIC and the Commission, and that the CCAMLR Headquarters building is at capacity to host the SCIC and Scientific Committee meetings simultaneously in the same building. The Secretariat presented some options under consideration, including:

- (i) making no change – the current situation is acceptable
- (ii) limiting attendance by Observer delegations to two per delegation and providing overflow seating in the library with audio-visual connection to SCIC. Noting that this would limit the ability to utilise the library as a meeting room while SCIC was in session
- (iii) limiting the attendance of Observer delegations to the Commission meeting (e.g. to 10), or other solutions involving the whole Commission meeting and its meeting timing (recognising that such a decision would have to be taken by the Commission, not SCIC)

- (iv) moving the SCIC meeting to an alternative venue in Hobart, but within a 10-minute walk of the CCAMLR Headquarters building, retaining all current facilities (including interpreting, Secretariat support for proceedings and report adoption)
- (v) other possibilities.

139. SCIC considered that the current facilities were acceptable with the present level of attendance, although may become unworkable if numbers increased. Many Members noted that for smaller delegations holding the meetings on the same premises was essential to enable attendance at the Scientific Committee, SCIC and SCAF and, therefore, SCIC was reluctant to have its meeting held on external premises. SCIC did not support a limit on delegation size. The EU invited larger delegations to reflect on the size of their delegations.

140. The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) presented CCAMLR-38/BG/47 which detailed an update on 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, by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The update highlighted the initiatives undertaken for the implementation of the IMO Polar Code. ASOC called on CCAMLR to contribute in furthering the cooperation between the IMO and the Antarctic Treaty System on fishing vessel safety, ship-sourced marine plastics and the collection and analysis of marine mammal data to ensure improved vessel safety and better inform voyage planning in the Antarctic area. ASOC also requested that CCAMLR note the Arctic Council's Arctic Shipping Best Practice Information Forum and agree to collaborate meaningfully in the exchange of best practice.

141. SCIC thanked ASOC for its update and noted CCAMLR's longstanding and continued support of high standards of safety for fishing vessels in the Convention Area. Several Members expressed their support for the development of the Polar Code and noted that CCAMLR also has a responsibility to address vessel safety in line with existing conservation measures and resolutions and as noted in the last performance review.

142. SCIC recommended a proposal by the USA that the existing SISO e-group could be used to gather resources relating to the health and safety of scientific observers, with a view towards identifying resources to recommend for posting in the section of the CCAMLR website entitled 'Information for Technical Coordinators and Scientific Observers'. Any resulting recommendations would be submitted for future consideration of SCIC and the Scientific Committee.

Close of the meeting

143. SCIC thanked Ms Kim for her efforts in guiding SCIC over the last three years.

144. SCIC noted that Ms Kim will continue her current term as Chair of SCIC alongside Ms M. Engelke-Ros (USA) as Vice-Chair. Members offered their best wishes for their upcoming term.

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Report 2018/19

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response																		
Conservation Measure 10-03																							
Chile		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>In the CCEP reporting period Chile submitted 33 port inspection reports. Monitoring of port inspection reports received by the Secretariat indicates the following inspection(s) that occurred more than 48 hours after the reported port entry of the vessel:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Arrival date</th> <th>Inspection date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Port</th> <th>Inspection delay (hours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27-Mar-19</td> <td>30-Mar-19</td> <td><i>Marigolds</i></td> <td>UKR</td> <td>Punta Arenas</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28-Mar-19</td> <td>01-Apr-19</td> <td><i>Volk Arktiki</i></td> <td>RUS</td> <td>Punta Arenas</td> <td>96</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (hours)	27-Mar-19	30-Mar-19	<i>Marigolds</i>	UKR	Punta Arenas	72	28-Mar-19	01-Apr-19	<i>Volk Arktiki</i>	RUS	Punta Arenas	96	<p>The inspections delay was due to security issues of inspectors, associated with a punctual weather conditions in Punta Arenas during the last days of March 2019 (winds upper 50 knots).</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.
Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (hours)																		
27-Mar-19	30-Mar-19	<i>Marigolds</i>	UKR	Punta Arenas	72																		
28-Mar-19	01-Apr-19	<i>Volk Arktiki</i>	RUS	Punta Arenas	96																		
Chile		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 1, requires Contracting Parties to undertake inspection of all vessels carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. which enter their ports. Exceptions to this conservation measure apply to certain areas, vessels and fishing practices described in the footnotes of the conservation measure and the CCAMLR regulatory documents.</p> <p>In the reporting period, Chile had 811 documented landings, including 781 landings from vessels which inspection reports are not required to be submitted to the Secretariat.</p> <p>Secretariat analysis has identified the following landing(s) from the Catch Documentation Scheme for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. (CDS) for which a corresponding port inspection report does not appear to have been received by the Secretariat.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DCD landing date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Landing Port</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>21-Jan-19</td> <td><i>Kostar</i></td> <td>KOR</td> <td>Punta Arenas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23-Feb-19</td> <td><i>Koreiz</i></td> <td>UKR</td> <td>Punta Arenas</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DCD landing date	Vessel name	Flag	Landing Port	21-Jan-19	<i>Kostar</i>	KOR	Punta Arenas	23-Feb-19	<i>Koreiz</i>	UKR	Punta Arenas	<p>Due to an activities control error, the inspection reports were not sent to CCAMLR, however, both were done on time. The pending reports were sent on 3 September 2019.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.						
DCD landing date	Vessel name	Flag	Landing Port																				
21-Jan-19	<i>Kostar</i>	KOR	Punta Arenas																				
23-Feb-19	<i>Koreiz</i>	UKR	Punta Arenas																				

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response												
Conservation Measure 10-03 (cont.)																	
Chile		<p>Administrative – CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The Secretariat received 33 inspections reports from Chile.</p> <p>Three reports received were more than 35 days after the inspection date.</p> <p>The latest a report received was 40 days after inspection.</p>	<p>Internal controls will be improved to minimise the risks of incurring these breaches.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.												
South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 1, requires Contracting Parties to undertake inspection of all vessels carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. which enter their ports. Exceptions to this conservation measure apply to certain areas, vessels and fishing practices described in the footnotes of the conservation measure and the CCAMLR regulatory documents.</p> <p>In the reporting period, South Africa had 18 documented landings.</p> <p>Secretariat analysis has identified the following landing(s) from the CDS for which a corresponding port inspection report does not appear to have been received by the Secretariat.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="454 903 1093 1015"> <thead> <tr> <th>DCD landing date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Landing Port</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>08-Mar-19</td> <td><i>Hong Jin No. 707</i></td> <td>KOR</td> <td>Cape Town</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28-Mar-19</td> <td><i>Tronio</i></td> <td>ESP</td> <td>Cape Town</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DCD landing date	Vessel name	Flag	Landing Port	08-Mar-19	<i>Hong Jin No. 707</i>	KOR	Cape Town	28-Mar-19	<i>Tronio</i>	ESP	Cape Town	<p>3.1 The Republic of South Africa acknowledges the concerns that arose in the CCEP regarding non-compliance to Conservation Measure 10-03.</p> <p>3.2 The matter was investigated and the Republic of South Africa wishes to advise that:</p> <p>3.2.1 The vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i> was inspected outside the 48-hr reporting period after port entry.</p> <p>3.2.2 The Fishery Control Officers (FCOs) are responsible for inspections and monitoring of both domestic and foreign fishing vessels.</p> <p>3.2.3 In the twenty-two (22) domestic fishing sectors there are 2 900 right holders and 1 788 fishing vessels.</p> <p>3.2.4 South Africa does not have a dedicated section that deals only with foreign fishing vessels.</p> <p>3.2.5 The FCO capacity has drastically reduced from eighteen (18) to nine (9), and vacancies have not been filled. It is essential that two (2) officials should be present upon inspection and monitoring of these vessels, as a safety measure.</p> <p>3.2.6 In addition to CCAMLR, the FCOs are also responsible for monitoring and inspecting other RFMOs such as CCSBT, IOTC, SEAFO.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraphs 73 and 74.
DCD landing date	Vessel name	Flag	Landing Port														
08-Mar-19	<i>Hong Jin No. 707</i>	KOR	Cape Town														
28-Mar-19	<i>Tronio</i>	ESP	Cape Town														

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 10-03 (cont.)					
South Africa (cont.)			<p>3.2.7 The lack of effective information technology resources has created a challenge in communication amongst the officials.</p> <p>4.1 The Republic of South Africa would like to affirm its commitment in respect of complying with all the applicable conservation measures.</p> <p>4.2 In light thereof, the following corrective measures will be taken:</p> <p>4.2.1 Disciplinary action against those officials responsible for late inspections.</p> <p>4.2.2 Aim to establish a dedicated unit for monitoring and inspections of foreign fishing vessels.</p> <p>4.2.3 Request capacity building from CCAMLR on conservation measures.</p> <p>4.2.4 Amending the permit conditions whereby foreign fishing vessels do not enter port after 16h00 Friday.</p> <p>The inspection report in respect of the <i>Hong Jin No. 707</i> conducted on 07 Mar 2019 was transmitted to the Secretariat on 6 Sep 2019.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
South Africa		<p>Administrative – CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The Secretariat received 11 port inspection reports from South Africa.</p> <p>One report was received 37 days after inspection.</p>	<p>As Above</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>See paragraphs 73 and 74.</p>

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response																														
Conservation Measure 10-03 (cont.)																																			
South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>In the CCEP reporting period South Africa submitted 11 port inspection reports. Monitoring of port inspection reports received by the Secretariat indicates the following inspection(s) that occurred more than 48 hours after the reported port entry of the vessel:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Arrival date</th> <th>Inspection date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Port</th> <th>Inspection delay (Hours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25-Aug-18</td> <td>05-Sep-18</td> <td><i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i></td> <td>JPN</td> <td>Cape Town</td> <td>264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>09-Dec-18</td> <td>19-Dec-18</td> <td><i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i></td> <td>JPN</td> <td>Cape Town</td> <td>240</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29-Mar-19</td> <td>02-Apr-19</td> <td><i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i></td> <td>JPN</td> <td>Cape Town</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18-Jun-19</td> <td>10-Jul-19</td> <td><i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i></td> <td>JPN</td> <td>Cape Town</td> <td>528</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)	25-Aug-18	05-Sep-18	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	264	09-Dec-18	19-Dec-18	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	240	29-Mar-19	02-Apr-19	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	96	18-Jun-19	10-Jul-19	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	528	<p>As Above</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>See paragraphs 73 and 74.</p>
Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)																														
25-Aug-18	05-Sep-18	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	264																														
09-Dec-18	19-Dec-18	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	240																														
29-Mar-19	02-Apr-19	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	96																														
18-Jun-19	10-Jul-19	<i>Shinsei Maru No. 3</i>	JPN	Cape Town	528																														
United Kingdom		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 1, requires that Contracting Parties shall undertake inspections of all fishing vessels carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. which enter their ports. Exceptions to this conservation measure apply to certain areas, vessels and fishing practices described in the footnotes of the conservation measure and the CCAMLR regulatory documents.</p> <p>In the CCEP reporting period the UK submitted 26 port inspection reports in accordance with the above conservation measure framework. Monitoring of port inspection reports received by the Secretariat indicates the following inspection(s) that occurred more than 48 hours after the reported port entry of the vessel:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Arrival date</th> <th>Inspection date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Port</th> <th>Inspection delay (Hours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>09-Aug-18</td> <td>12-Aug-18</td> <td><i>Antarctic Bay</i></td> <td>CHL</td> <td>UK OT</td> <td>72</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)	09-Aug-18	12-Aug-18	<i>Antarctic Bay</i>	CHL	UK OT	72	<p>The UK investigated this potential infringement.</p> <p>The <i>Antarctic Bay</i> pre-notified its intention to enter port on 9 August, in line with CM 10-03, Annex A. The vessel entered the outer harbour limits on 9 August at 19:00 and remained in the outer limits, at anchor, due to bad weather.</p> <p>The vessel entered the port facilities at 23:30 on 11 August once it was safe to do so. The CCAMLR inspection took place the following day at 09:15 on 12 August.</p> <p>The UK recognises that information within CM 10-03, Annex A, should have been updated once it was apparent that bad weather would impact the vessel's ability to enter port and come alongside safely, however, the inspection was carried out in full compliance with the conservation measure.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>See paragraph 75.</p>																		
Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)																														
09-Aug-18	12-Aug-18	<i>Antarctic Bay</i>	CHL	UK OT	72																														

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response																								
Conservation Measure 10-03 (cont.)																													
Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>In the CCEP reporting period Uruguay submitted 29 port inspection reports in accordance with the above conservation measure framework. Monitoring of port inspection reports received by the Secretariat indicates the following inspection(s) that occurred more than 48 hours after the reported port entry of the vessel:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Arrival date</th> <th>Inspection date</th> <th>Vessel name</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Port</th> <th>Inspection delay (Hours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24-Sep-18</td> <td>03-Oct-18</td> <td><i>Badaro</i></td> <td>URY</td> <td>Montevideo</td> <td>216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21-Dec-18</td> <td>26-Dec-18</td> <td><i>Torres Del Paine</i></td> <td>URY</td> <td>Montevideo</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-Feb-19</td> <td>19-Feb-19</td> <td><i>Proa Pioneer</i></td> <td>URY</td> <td>Montevideo</td> <td>168</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)	24-Sep-18	03-Oct-18	<i>Badaro</i>	URY	Montevideo	216	21-Dec-18	26-Dec-18	<i>Torres Del Paine</i>	URY	Montevideo	120	12-Feb-19	19-Feb-19	<i>Proa Pioneer</i>	URY	Montevideo	168	<p><i>Badaro</i></p> <p>Due to adverse weather conditions (storm warning), the vessel entered a port zone. At this point in time, the vessel had no mooring (its mooring was not accessible or operational). The <i>Badaro</i> was inspected on 03/10/18, since in the previous days the vessel had been ‘in transit in a port zone’ waiting to be allocated an appropriate physical location for the inspection. In situations such as this, where a vessel is ‘in transit in a port zone’, the national legislation does not provide for vessels to be boarded for inspection.</p> <p><i>Torres Del Paine</i></p> <p>As a result of port operations and vessel accessibility, the inspection took place on 26/12/18, the first working day following the Christmas holiday.</p> <p><i>Proa Pioneer</i></p> <p>As a result of adverse weather conditions in the area, the vessel had to enter the port zone in Montevideo early. Consequently, the inspection was delayed. In addition to this, as the vessel was not in an operational area, unloading was not feasible. In situations such as this, where a vessel is ‘in transit in a port zone’, the national legislation does not provide for vessels to be boarded for inspection.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.
Arrival date	Inspection date	Vessel name	Flag	Port	Inspection delay (Hours)																								
24-Sep-18	03-Oct-18	<i>Badaro</i>	URY	Montevideo	216																								
21-Dec-18	26-Dec-18	<i>Torres Del Paine</i>	URY	Montevideo	120																								
12-Feb-19	19-Feb-19	<i>Proa Pioneer</i>	URY	Montevideo	168																								

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response																		
Conservation Measure 21-02																							
Ukraine	<i>Koreiz</i>	<p>CM 21-02 paragraph 13 (i) states that Members whose vessels participate in exploratory fisheries shall only use the types of fishing gear specified in the Fishery Operation Plan for the vessel.</p> <p>The Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) report for the cruise dates of 28 October 2018 to 24 February 2019 in Subarea 88.2 states that the vessel gear specifications were different from the CCAMLR vessel notification, as seen in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gear type</th> <th>Vessel's notification details</th> <th>On board details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Longline weights</td> <td>Concrete</td> <td>Stone</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minimum mass of weights</td> <td>9 kg</td> <td>6.3 kg (from 30 sampled stones)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weight spacing</td> <td>34 m</td> <td>40 m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hook spacing</td> <td>1.5 m</td> <td>1.6 m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hook snood length</td> <td>0.7 m</td> <td>0.8 m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gear type	Vessel's notification details	On board details	Longline weights	Concrete	Stone	Minimum mass of weights	9 kg	6.3 kg (from 30 sampled stones)	Weight spacing	34 m	40 m	Hook spacing	1.5 m	1.6 m	Hook snood length	0.7 m	0.8 m	<p>In accordance with the vessel's procedures, the crew checked the weight of the concrete weights and revealed discrepancies. To minimise the consequences of using the weights of a lesser weight the crew and the observers followed the protocol B of the CM 24-02 and measured the sink-rate by the bottle-test every 24 hours (item B2 (i)).</p> <p>Specific instructions to the crew and the national observer introduced.</p> <p>Specific documentary procedure on verification of the fishing gear parameters prior leaving the port to the Vessel's Procedures Manual introduced.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.
Gear type	Vessel's notification details	On board details																					
Longline weights	Concrete	Stone																					
Minimum mass of weights	9 kg	6.3 kg (from 30 sampled stones)																					
Weight spacing	34 m	40 m																					
Hook spacing	1.5 m	1.6 m																					
Hook snood length	0.7 m	0.8 m																					
Conservation Measure 22-07																							
Ukraine	<i>Calipso</i>	<p>CM 22-07, paragraph 3, states Members shall require their vessels to clearly mark fishing lines into line segments and collect segment-specific data on the number of VME indicator units.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 26 November 2018 to 19 February 2019, in small-scale research units (SSRUs) 882A (RSR North), 881I, 881K, 881J, 881H (RSR South) and research blocks 88.2_4 (SSRUs 882D and 882E) states 'Mid-point positions (every 5 baskets) of VME segments were not marked by the vessel. Only start and end positions (every 10 baskets) were available. The observers therefore had to estimate VME segment mid-points and depths. In some cases, this was further complicated by some VME segment start and end positions not being marked at all'.</p>	<p>Every longline on the vessel <i>Calipso</i> is marked from the beginning to the end on 'line segments' (sections) with lengths 1 200 m it is corresponding to the requirements CM 22-07 p.2 (iv). Each 'line segment' is equivalent to 10 baskets. In order to avoid confusion of the 'line segments' during the setting and hauling of the line, additional marking through every 5 baskets (to determine the midpoint) were not done. During the hauling of the longline the watch officers made marks (control points) of the beginning and the end of each 'line segment' on the plotter. Thus, the midpoint and depth were defined as the centre between the two control points. There were rare cases when by some technical reasons the watch officers did not put marks, in this case, an approximate assessment was made for determination of the midpoint and the depth of the necessary 'line segment' on the plotter.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.																		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 23-04					
Ukraine	<i>Simeiz</i>	<p>CM 23-04, paragraph 3, requires that monthly fine scale catch and effort reporting be the total target catch, reported by species.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 3 March 2019 to 22 April 2019 states in Subarea 48.2 states ‘...non-retained damaged and/or liced toothfish were not recorded by the vessel, resulting in the observer’s sampling and recording more fish than what was reported by the vessel’.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, in the existing C2 and daily Catch and Effort reporting forms, there is no column for entering data on damaged fish, which is stored on board only until leaving the CCAMLR area. In existing practice, the fish was partially retained on board (2nd grade product, gonads, collars, etc., where possible) and were counted as obtained catch. Ukraine took to account the existing misestimating in particular area where percent of highly damaged fish were highest in all observed seasons. Ukraine analyse the experience of other CCAMLR Members, and such fish will be taken into account in an updated C2 form in the corresponding column, and will be a part of obtained catch with a conversion factor ‘1’. This form was proposed in WG-FSA-18/29 and currently being developed by the Secretariat and is under discussion.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraphs 81 and 82.
Conservation Measure 25-03					
Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 25-03, paragraph 1, prohibits the use of net monitoring cables.</p> <p>A derogation was granted by the Commission in 2016 (CCAMLR-XXXV, paragraphs 5.67 and 5.68) and again in 2017 (CCAMLR-XXXVI, paragraph 5.7) to trial the use of net monitoring cables.</p> <p>The Scientific Committee noted the derogation in CM 25-03 had lapsed and expired (SC-CAMLR-XXXVII, paragraph 3.14 and Annex 9, paragraph 6.62) for the 2018/19 fishing season.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 4 March 2019 to 9 May 2019 in Subareas 48.2 to 48.3, Figure 3 displays use of a net monitoring cable and is captioned as ‘Port beam derrick with trawl warp and net monitoring cable running parallel’.</p>	<p>According to CM 25-03, paragraph 1, the use of net monitoring cables is prohibited. This prohibition was introduced to reduce the incidental mortality of, or injury to, seabirds and marine mammals during trawl fishing.</p> <p>The Norwegian krill fishing vessels have become increasingly dependent on having access to sensor data from the trawl during fishing. The trawl sonar continuously informs about the trawl geometry and depth, and the skipper will always be well informed about the trawl performance. Cameras inform about influx organisms, like krill size, salps etc.</p>		See paragraphs 83 to 86.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 25-03 (cont.)					
Norway (cont.)	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>		<p>As more sensors have been introduced and producing an increased amount of data, transfer of this information via a wireless connection has become a solution not conducive to continuous trawling method.</p> <p>The Norwegian vessel <i>Antarctic Sea</i> has operated a net monitoring cable running closely along the towing wire since the vessel was introduced to the krill fishery without any noted compliance issue from the CCAMLR observers. The observer reports do not show any serious bird strike.</p> <p>Net monitoring is beneficial to the industry and also to CCAMLR science, and this has been recognised by the Scientific Committee previously. The need for cabled connections has also been discussed, and in 2016 a one-year derogation on the prohibition of the use of a net monitoring cable was granted to facilitate trials with such cables on the vessel <i>Saga Sea</i>. This derogation was subsequently extended by one year. The derogation granted by the Commission in 2016 allowed trials with a traditional net monitoring cable. Trials were effectively carried out in 2017/18 but proved unsuccessful due to operational difficulties.</p> <p>For the 2018/19 fishing season the vessel owner standardised the rigging onboard all vessels to become identical to the rigging on board the <i>Antarctic Sea</i>. This also included the operation of the net monitoring cable as described in WG-EMM-17/47. The vessels use a cable connection to the net sensors. This cable runs along the single trawl warp and is aligned with that warp. There are therefore two parallel cables (net cable and warp) leading from the vessel to the trawl, and these run in parallel and so close to each other that they appear more or less as one unit.</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 25-03 (cont.)					
Norway (cont.)	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>		<p>It is emphasised that this rigging is very different from that used on classical double-warp trawlers where the cable normally runs freely between the warps as a third cable.</p> <p>The Norwegian vessels have made efforts to maintain and develop practices that facilitate a cabled communication while meeting the main objective of CM 25-03 in terms of reducing bird strikes. The cables are rigged in a manner that minimises the risk of bird strikes. The vessels have assumed that this practice has been acceptable.</p> <p>The general net cable prohibition included in CM 25-03 remains however a potential challenge to the vessels as long as the net monitoring cable prohibition does not define or describe more specifically what is meant by 'net monitoring cables'. In the strictest interpretation, any use of cabled connection may be considered a violation, regardless of the actual risk of bird interactions. Some observers rightly report that net monitoring cables were used by Norwegian vessels and this may thus be regarded as a potential violation of CM 25-03.</p> <p>Further Action:</p> <p>Based on the recognised need and utility of net monitoring devices and the continued technical requirement for cabled communication, Norway has suggested that the Scientific Committee considers amending Article 1 of CM 25-03 so that uses of net monitoring cables that do not violate the objectives of reducing incidental mortality of, or injury to, seabirds become permitted.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 25-03 (cont.)					
Norway	<i>Saga Sea</i>	<p>CM 25-03, paragraph 1, prohibits the use of net monitoring cables. A derogation was granted by the Commission in 2016 (CCAMLR-XXXV, paragraphs 5.67 and 5.68) and again in 2017 (CCAMLR-XXXVI, paragraph 5.7) to trial the use of net monitoring cables.</p> <p>The Scientific Committee noted the derogation in CM 25-03 had now lapsed and expired (SC-CAMLR-XXXVII, paragraph 3.14 and Annex 9, paragraph 6.62) for the 2018/19 fishing season.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 22 November 2018 to 23 January 2019 in Subarea 48.2, contains images depicting the use of a net monitoring cable during fishing operations and states ‘As the <i>Saga Sea</i> was trialling the use of a third wire, providing a direct link from a net mounted echo sounder to the processing unit on board, there was a streamer line in place as a protection measure for birds’.</p>	<p>According to CM 25-03, paragraph 1, the use of net monitoring cables is prohibited. This prohibition was introduced to reduce the incidental mortality of, or injury to, seabirds and marine mammals during trawl fishing.</p> <p>The Norwegian krill fishing vessels have become increasingly dependent on having access to sensor data from the trawl during fishing. The trawl sonar continuously informs about the trawl geometry and depth, and the skipper will always be well informed about the trawl performance. Camera inform about influx organisms, like krill size, salps etc. As more sensors have been introduced and producing an increased amount of data, transfer of this information via a wireless connection has become a solution not conducive to continuous trawling method.</p> <p>The Norwegian vessel <i>Antarctic Sea</i> has operated a net monitoring cable running closely along the towing wire since the vessel was introduced to the krill fishery without any noted compliance issue from the CCAMLR observers. The observer reports do not show any serious bird strike.</p> <p>Net monitoring is beneficial to the industry and also to CCAMLR science, and this has been recognised by the Scientific Committee previously. The need for cabled connections has also been discussed, and in 2016 a one-year derogation on the prohibition of the use of a net monitoring cable was granted to facilitate trials with such cables on the vessel <i>Saga Sea</i>. This derogation was subsequently extended by one year. The derogation granted by the Commission in 2016 allowed trials with a traditional net monitoring cable.</p>		See paragraphs 83 to 86.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 25-03 (cont.)					
Norway (cont.)	<i>Saga Sea</i>		<p data-bbox="1120 293 1615 341">Trials were effectively carried out in 2017/18 but proved unsuccessful due to operational difficulties.</p> <p data-bbox="1120 365 1615 995">For the 2018/19 fishing season the vessel owner standardised the rigging onboard all vessels to become identical to the rigging on board the <i>Antarctic Sea</i>. This also included the operation of the net monitoring cable as described in WG-EMM-17/47. The vessels use a cable connection to the net sensors. This cable runs along the single trawl warp and is aligned with that warp. There are therefore two parallel cables (net cable and warp) leading from the vessel to the trawl, and these run in parallel and so close to each other that they appear more or less as one unit. It is emphasised that this rigging is very different from that used on classical double-warp trawlers where the cable normally runs freely between the warps as a third cable. The Norwegian vessels have made efforts to maintain and develop practices that facilitate a cabled communication while meeting the main objective of CM 25-03 in terms of reducing bird strikes. The cables are rigged in a manner that minimises the risk of bird strikes. The vessels have assumed that this practice has been acceptable.</p> <p data-bbox="1120 1019 1615 1315">The general net cable prohibition included in CM 25-03 remains however a potential challenge to the vessels as long as the net monitoring cable prohibition does not define or describe more specifically what is meant by ‘net monitoring cables’. In the strictest interpretation, any use of cabled connection may be considered a violation, regardless of the actual risk of bird interactions. Some observers rightly report that net monitoring cables were used by Norwegian vessels and this may thus be regarded as a potential violation of CM 25-03.</p>		

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 25-03 (cont.)					
Norway (cont.)	<i>Saga Sea</i>		<p>Further Action:</p> <p>Based on the recognised need and utility of net monitoring devices and the continued technical requirement for cabled communication, Norway has suggested that the Scientific Committee considers amending Article 1 of CM 25-03 so that uses of net monitoring cables that do not violate the objectives of reducing incidental mortality of, or injury to, seabirds become permitted.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
Conservation Measure 26-01					
Ukraine	<i>Calipso</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 6, prohibits the dumping or discharging of offal and discards.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 28 October 2018 to 24 February 2019 states, ‘On 03/01/2019 the International Observer noticed a high occurrence of offal (cut off fins from toothfish processing) in the stomachs of sampled <i>D. mawsoni</i>. Upon inspection of the offal chute, it was found that the grating designed to retain all smaller pieces of offal from the offal chute was not in place, and the smaller pieces of offal (mostly consisting of stomach contents, bloody membranes and fins) from the chute were being discharged directly into the ocean, on the port-side of the vessel. After the observer notified the vessel Officers, the grating was subsequently welded into place permanently and the discharge of offal into the ocean ceased’.</p>	<p>The company’s office was informed on this incident immediately. The grating, which was removed time to time by the crew for the purpose of cleaning from ice, was welded permanently, preventing the further removal.</p> <p>Specific instructions to the crew introduced.</p> <p>Written record ‘Do not remove’ on the grating was immediately painted.</p> <p>Similar instructions immediately sent to the other vessels of the company.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required.
Ukraine	<i>Koreiz</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 5(v), prohibits the dumping or discharging of sewage within 12 n miles of land or ice shelves, or while the ship is travelling at a speed of less than 4 knots.</p> <p>The SISO report for the cruise dates of 28 October 2018 to 24 February 2019 in Subarea 88.2 states ‘Sewage, directly from the lavatories onboard, was observed to be discharged directly into the sea throughout the duration of the cruise.</p>	<p>The international observer notified that the vessel was not equipped with the appropriate storage facilities to comply with CM 26-01, and his conclusion was, that sewage was discarded inside the CCAMLR area on a daily basis. But he didn't take into account that the vessel <i>Koreiz</i> is equipped with the sewage treatment plant EVAC ORCA III</p>	Additional information required	See paragraphs 87 to 89.

(continued)

Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC response
Conservation Measure 26-01 (cont.)					
Ukraine (cont.)	<i>Koreiz</i>	This was in contravention of CM 26-01 (2015). The observer notified the vessel officers about the contravention but unfortunately the vessel was not equipped with the appropriate storage facilities to comply with CM 26-01. Therefore, sewage was discarded inside the CCAMLR area on a daily basis’.	(a copy of the valid International Sewage Pollution Prevention Certificate is attached). No untreated sewage, including the one flowing directly from the lavatories, from the vessel can be discharged overboard. The treatment rate of the plant complies with the standards of resolution MEPC.159(55). Preliminary Status: Compliant		
Conservation Measure 91-05					
United Kingdom		<p>Vessels: <i>Argos Georgia</i> (UK) and <i>Nordic Prince</i> (UK)</p> <p>CM 91-05 requires that notwithstanding CM 10-09, no fishing vessel may engage in transshipment activities within the MPA, except in cases where vessels are involved in an emergency relating to safety of human life at sea or engaged in a search and rescue operation. Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels (CM 95-01, paragraph 11, footnote 1).</p> <p>At 2042 and 2134 (UTC) on 11 December 2018 the Secretariat received emails from the Masters of the <i>Argos Georgia</i> and the <i>Nordic Prince</i> respectively notifying a proposed transshipment of: ‘- 1 drum of 20 lts magazine liquid – 1 box engine spare parts’ to take place at ‘12th Dec. 2018, at approx. 02:00 hrs UTC, in Pos. 75°18’ S – 175°04’ W’.</p> <p>At 0255 and 0306 (UTC) on 12 December 2018 the Secretariat received email notifications from both vessels that transshipment had been completed at ‘at 02:48 hrs. UTC. December 12th 2018. In Position 75°19.0 S 175°07.1 W. without any incident’.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted the proposed activity had been advised in accordance with timeframes in CM 10-09 and entered the transshipment information on the CCAMLR website List of Transshipments on 12 December 2018. Secretariat analysis subsequently conducted on the location of transshipment activity within the Convention Area identified this transshipment took place in the Special Research Zone of the Ross Sea region MPA (as described in Annex 91-05/A).</p>	<p>This was a routine transshipment of spares/consumables (not including any Antarctic marine living resources) carried out between two fishing vessels operated by the British company Argos Froyanes Ltd.</p> <p>The transshipment was conducted in accordance with the requirements of CM 10-09, including notifying the CCAMLR Secretariat in advance. The transshipment had, however, been conducted in the Special Research Zone of the Ross Sea region MPA and so was not in line with paragraph 11 of CM 91-05.</p> <p>The company has amended its internal documentation and training to ensure within their transshipment procedures areas of the Convention Area within which transshipment is prohibited is made clear. The UK confirmed that as the Flag State it had issued a written warning to the company, and the company paid £10k to the CCAMLR MPA Fund.</p> <p>The UK has proposed an amendment to CM 10-09 to include explicit reference to the areas in which transshipments are prohibited, contained within CMs 91-03 and 91-05.</p> <p>Further Action: None Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		See paragraphs 91 to 96

Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2019/20

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>Jinzhang</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>	The Gambia/ Stateless	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
STS-50	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