

**REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON OBSERVATION AND INSPECTION (SCOI)**

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON OBSERVATION AND INSPECTION (SCOI)

1.1 The meeting of the Standing Committee on Observation and Inspection (SCOI) was held from 24 to 26 October under the chairmanship of Dr W. Figaj (Poland). All Members were represented at the meeting.

1.2 This year the Provisional and Annotated Provisional Agendas of SCOI were distributed to Members as an attachment to the Provisional Agendas of the Commission. The Provisional Agenda of SCOI took account of all sub-items of Commission Agenda Item 7, 'Observation and Inspection'. No additional items were referred to SCOI by the Commission.

1.3 In discussing the Agenda, several Members of SCOI suggested that the paper, 'Draft Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks' (UNCLOS Agreement), may contain information useful to the Committee's work on improvements to the System of Inspection. It was decided that this proposal be discussed under Agenda Item 2.

1.4 The item, 'Members' Reports on Sightings of Vessels in the Convention Area' was added to Item 1 of the Agenda. It was also decided that the discussions on items 'Notification of Vessels' and 'Satellite-based Vessel Monitoring System' be combined.

1.5 With these amendments the Agenda was adopted. The adopted Agenda is given in Appendix I.

1.6 In addition to papers distributed to the Commission and the Scientific Committee on subjects related to its terms of reference, SCOI considered several other papers prepared by Members and the Secretariat. The complete list of papers considered by the Committee is given in Appendix II.

OPERATION OF THE SYSTEM OF INSPECTION AND COMPLIANCE WITH CONSERVATION MEASURES

Implementation of Conservation Measures in the 1994/95 Season

1.7 All conservation measures adopted at CCAMLR-XIII were notified to Members on 8 November 1994. There were no objections to any measures and, in accordance with

Article IX 6(b) of the Convention, they became binding on all Members on 7 May 1995. A paper on the implementation of conservation measures in 1994/95 was prepared by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-XIV/BG/8).

1.8 The Committee noted that Australia provided information on steps taken to implement and ensure compliance with conservation measures adopted by the Commission. In the past, several Members informed SCOI that they had in place the legislative procedures required to give effect annually to conservation measures.

1.9 In discussing the papers CCAMLR-XIV/BG/8 and SC-CAMLR-XIV/BG/16, the Committee noted that there were a number of vessels fishing in the Convention Area which had not been notified in accordance with the System of Inspection. This required, under Article IV of the System of Inspection, that Members give the Commission by 1 May each year a list of the vessels intending to harvest during the following fishing season, and that additions to, or deletions from, this list be conveyed to the Commission as soon as possible.

1.10 In discussing this matter it was apparent that there had been a misunderstanding by some Members of the requirement to renew the list annually and also to notify the Commission of any changes to the list of vessels which occurred during the season.

1.11 It was noted that by 1 May each year Members generally do not have complete information for the following season. Consequently it was acknowledged that after that date timely and current information was particularly relevant. SCOI reminded Members of the need to comply in full with this requirement of the System of Inspection.

Inspections Undertaken in the 1994/95 Season

1.12 Thirty-six inspectors were designated by Members in accordance with the CCAMLR System of Inspection to carry out inspections in the 1994/95 season. Members which designated inspectors were Argentina (eight inspectors), Australia (five), Chile (three), Russian Federation (four), UK (13) and USA (three).

1.13 In accordance with SCOI's request in 1993 (CCAMLR-XII, Annex 5, paragraph 11), information on the number of inspectors deployed at sea in the 1994/95 season, the duration of their trips and the area covered was reported by Australia and the UK (SCOI-95/3 and 8).

1.14 Argentina advised that its inspectors designated in accordance with the System of Inspection were on board the icebreaker *Almirante Irizar* during the summer season and on board the RV *Eduardo L. Holmberg* during the research cruise carried out in February/March 1995 in the Convention Area. Unfortunately, sea and bad weather conditions at the time of encountering or sighting fishing vessels had prevented inspections being carried out.

1.15 During the 1994/95 season one inspection, conducted in accordance with the CCAMLR System of Inspection, was reported to the Secretariat. A summary of the inspection report was prepared by the Secretariat and distributed, as required, to the Commission (CCAMLR-XIV/15).

1.16 A CCAMLR Inspector designated by the UK carried out an inspection of the Korean longliner *Ihn Sung 66* on 15 December at 54°07'S, 39°56'W (Subarea 48.3, South Georgia).

1.17 The completed inspection report form was submitted to the Secretariat together with a separate written report, two photographs and a video film. The report was considered by SCOI (SCOI-95/2).

1.18 The UK commented that, although the vessel was not fishing at the time it was intercepted, the presence of a deployed longline from the vessel in the vicinity provided clear evidence that it had been fishing illegally in CCAMLR waters. The captain of the vessel also gave the inspector information which indicated that violations of CCAMLR Conservation Measures had taken place over an extended period. This inspection again highlighted the problem inspectors face in verifying compliance with conservation measures if vessels were not actually engaged in fishing at the time of an inspection.

1.19 The inspector's conclusions were summarised by the UK as follows:

- 'The Korean longliner *Ihn Sung 66* had infringed both Conservation Measures 69/XII and 80/XIII by fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* out of season in Subarea 48.3. The vessel's own log book and deployment of longline within the area verified these infringements.
- The admission of the Master indicated that, for a period in November 1994, the vessel had been fishing in Subarea 48.2 in contravention of Conservation Measure 73/XII.
- In addition, the data reporting requirements of Conservation Measures 51/XII and 71/XII (or 81/XIII) had not been complied with.'

1.20 As required by Article VIII, paragraph (e) of the System of Inspection, the completed inspection report form together with supplementary documents, photographs and a video were forwarded to the Flag State of the inspected vessel.

1.21 Comments of the Republic of Korea, the Flag State of the *Ihn Sung 66*, are given below in the section 'Report of Flag States'.

Members' Reports of Sightings of Vessels in the Convention Area

1.22 The UK submitted a paper advising the Committee of sightings of 10 fishing vessels registered with CCAMLR Members presumably infringing CCAMLR Conservation Measures and also of other unidentified fishing vessels seen within Subarea 48.3 during the 1994/95 season (CCAMLR-XIV/18). The UK expressed considerable concern over what it viewed as an escalating trend in illegal fishing within the Convention's waters. The catches resulting from illegal fishing had now, in the opinion of the UK, exceeded those taken by vessels fishing legitimately.

1.23 Pursuant to Article XXII of the Convention, the USA drew the attention of SCOI to COMM CIRC 95/43 (SCOI-95/5) which reported sightings of fishing vessels inside Subarea 48.3 between 15 September and 2 October 1995. The vessels appeared to be setting their fishing gears. The report of apparent illegal fishing was provided to the USA by the captain of the FV *American Champion*, a US flag vessel conducting an experimental crab fishery in the area pursuant to Conservation Measures 75/XII and 79/XIII.

1.24 The USA also advised that it had received a further report from the FV *American Champion* concerning an additional sighting of a vessel apparently setting fishing gear in Subarea 48.3 and that, after the port state identified in the report has been advised, the USA will provide this information to the Commission in accordance with Article XXII of the Convention.

1.25 SCOI reaffirmed its position that any information Members wished to convey to CCAMLR in accordance with Articles X and XXII of the Convention should be submitted through official channels. CCAMLR operated at an intergovernmental level and therefore any information submitted in this way would enable Members to investigate and take action, as appropriate, against those vessels which acted in contravention of CCAMLR Conservation Measures.

Reports of Flag States

1.26 With regard to the inspection report of the Korean longliner *Ihn Sung 66*, the Republic of Korea advised that, although the company owner expressed some unwillingness to admit the infringement asserted by the UK-designated CCAMLR inspector, evidence to support his case was not provided to the Government of the Republic of Korea by the shipowner and therefore the vessel's fishing operation was suspended for 10 days.

1.27 The Government of the Republic of Korea confirmed that it had again advised the company of CCAMLR Conservation Measures and, for its part, would continue to make every endeavour to remain a responsible fishing nation.

1.28 Regarding the Chilean vessel sightings reported in CCAMLR-XIV/18, Chile advised the Committee that it had received a request from the UK to investigate only two of the three alleged sightings of its vessels in the Convention Area. Chile acknowledged that it was up to the Flag State concerned to investigate the matter.

1.29 Chile informed the meeting that it was not the vessel *Isla Camila* in the Convention Area on 23 August 1995, the date of the reported sighting, but the *Isla Sofia*, which had come to the rescue of the Argentinian vessel *Mar del Sur III*, which caught fire on the night of 22/23 August 1995. An investigation with regard to the second sighting on 21 September 1995 of the same vessel had recently been initiated, since the information had been passed on to the Chilean authorities by the UK on 11 October 1995. Regarding the third sighting involving the *Elqui*, Chile had not received any prior information. Therefore no investigation was in progress. The information contained in CCAMLR-XIV/18 would be passed on to the appropriate authorities and their response conveyed to CCAMLR in due course.

1.30 The UK accepted that the vessel sighted on 23 August 1995 may have been the *Isla Sofia*, but advised the Committee that it had additional evidence that this vessel had been fishing when sighted in the Convention Area on 21 September 1995. This information would be passed to Chile for appropriate action. The vessel *Elqui* had been seen fishing out of season twice in July 1995 and also in March 1993.

1.31 Argentina asked the Committee to note that, due to its geographical position and the fishing and other activities of its flag vessels both inside and outside its Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), navigation routes of Argentinian vessels often crossed the Convention Area. For these reasons, it was difficult to establish the activity of some vessels at the time of sighting.

1.32 In response to this, the UK commented that since no known fishing grounds were located to the east or south of Subarea 48.3, it was therefore not clear why the vessels concerned had been in the area of sighting.

1.33 Correspondence on the sighting of the Argentinian vessel *Mar del Sur III* in Subarea 48.3 on 16 January 1995 was circulated as SCOI-95/6. In its written response to the Secretariat, Argentina advised that appropriate investigations had been initiated and that it had ordered the immediate return of the vessel to port. As a result of these investigations, legal proceedings were instituted against the owners of the vessel, and they were fined and the vessel was suspended from its activities for the infringement of Conservation Measure 80/XIII. The sentence was subject to appeal by the fishing company, therefore the case could not yet be considered closed.

1.34 Argentina acknowledged the value of information provided by Members in relation to compliance with conservation measures in force. However, it pointed out the difference between information derived from inspections carried out under the CCAMLR System of Inspection and information acquired from other means in accordance with the Convention. The latter would depend on whether the Flag State considered the circumstances relevant.

1.35 Chile informed the Committee that two of the six court cases initiated in 1992/93 to deal with infringements reported by CCAMLR Inspectors had been resolved. In one case, the company was fined over US\$1 000 000. In another case, the captain of the vessel involved was fined US\$5 000 and the company fined over US\$230 000. The other four cases were still under active consideration by the Chilean courts. Chile reiterated that it had been able to take this action because the information had been submitted via the proper channels.

1.36 SCOI noted with satisfaction the way Member States were dealing with information on sightings of vessels, particularly the extent to which Argentina and Chile used their legal systems to investigate the reported inspections.

1.37 However, SCOI noted with deep concern that the reported sightings indicated that a high level of illegal fishing activity was taking place in Subarea 48.3. Some delegates said the credibility of CCAMLR was at stake and it faced a considerable challenge in bringing this illegal fishing under control. In this connection, it was stressed that the prime responsibility resided with the CCAMLR Flag States.

Activities of Non-Member States in the Convention Area

1.38 The report of the Executive Secretary in response to the Commission's request last year to write to non-Member countries fishing in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-XIII, paragraph 5.16) is given in CCAMLR-XIV/12.

1.39 The Government of Belize had responded to the request for comments regarding the Belize-registered vessel *Liberty* fishing in Subarea 48.3 in 1994 and 1995, advising that a warning had been issued to the vessel. The captain of the *Liberty* had given assurances that the vessel would undertake no further fishing activities in the Convention Area and that, if such action occurred, the company would remove him from his post (SCOI-95/7).

1.40 However, in view of the *Liberty* again being sighted fishing in Subarea 48.3 (by the UK on 10 July 1995) (CCAMLR-XIV/18), the Committee directed the Executive Secretary to write once more to the Government of Belize requesting comments regarding this latest sighting and asking, if it were the same captain, what measures had been taken by the company against him. The UK agreed to provide the Secretariat with details of the latest vessel sighting to be included in the letter.

1.41 Comments were sought, but had not so far been received, from the Government of Panama, following the Secretariat receiving advice about the Panamanian-registered vessel *Valka* fishing for krill in the Convention Area. The UK advised SCOI that it had acquired catch records of the vessel during the period 20 June to 20 July 1995. The total catch during this period was 637 tonnes of krill. These data would be passed to the Secretariat.

1.42 In accordance with the Commission's request last year (CCAMLR-XIII, paragraph 3.11), the Secretariat sought further details from Latvia of the STATLANT report from FAO of Latvia's catch of 71 tonnes of krill in the 1993 season, and from Lithuania of its activities in the southwest Atlantic in the 1993/94. No responses had so far been received from either Latvia or Lithuania.

1.43 New Zealand wrote to the Secretariat during the year, advising that it had taken the opportunity to raise the matter of Latvia's fishing activities with authorities during a visit to Latvia late last year by the New Zealand Ambassador to Russia. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Riga confirmed that Latvia had been engaged in fishing in the Convention Area and noted that, as a maritime state, it was ready to undertake the obligations of a fishing state.

1.44 SCOI recommended that the Executive Secretary write to the Government of Latvia and invite it to consider joining CCAMLR on the grounds of its fishing activities in the Convention Area.

1.45 In paper CCAMLR-XIV/18, one of the vessels reported as being in the Convention Area was the FV *Thunnus*. It appeared from the International Register of Fishing Vessels that the vessel's Flag State may possibly be Indonesia. The Executive Secretary was requested to seek further clarification of the origin of this vessel.

IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SYSTEM OF INSPECTION

UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Stocks

2.1 The UK informed SCOI that the UN Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, at its last session in August 1995, had adopted an 'Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks' (UNCLOS Agreement).

2.2 Argentina participated at the UN meeting as the CCAMLR Observer and a report for the Commission is provided in CCAMLR-XIV/BG/20.

2.3 SCOI noted that a general report on the successful conclusion of the UN Conference would be considered by the Commission under its Agenda Item 11.

2.4 Australia suggested that there would be merit in distributing the text of the UN Agreement to SCOI Members.

2.5 Some Members suggested that parts of the UNCLOS Agreement, in particular Parts V and VI relating to the duties of Flag States and to matters of compliance and enforcement, might have applicability to CCAMLR. These provisions could assist Members in continuing to build an effective observation and inspection scheme for CCAMLR fisheries. Japan expressed reservation about the applicability of the enforcement-related articles of the UN Agreement to further development of the CCAMLR System of Inspection. These reservations were shared by some other Members.

2.6 Other Members had reservations about the applicability of the agreement to CCAMLR because it dealt with the management of straddling and/or highly migratory fish stocks between waters of coastal states and the high seas.

2.7 The Delegation of the USA noted that the Commission had addressed the issue of stocks which are harvested both within and outside the Convention Area in Resolution 10/XII, and the Commission continued to be concerned about the illegal harvest of stocks of *D. eleginoides* which occur in the coastal waters of some Member States and on the high seas of the Convention Area.

2.8 Australia stated that it did not share the reservations of Japan and some other Members about the applicability of the UNCLOS Agreement to CCAMLR. Australia's view was that the Agreement was of direct relevance to CCAMLR and that it established a comprehensive framework for improved compliance and enforcement in international fisheries. In making available the text of the UNCLOS Agreement to other Members of SCOI, Australia encouraged them to carefully examine its provisions.

2.9 The text of the UNCLOS Agreement was distributed to Members of SCOI for information (as SCOI-95/9) since the agreement had only recently been concluded and some Members had not had the opportunity to consider it in detail.

Definition of Fishing and Rights of Inspectors

2.10 SCOI considered improvements to the CCAMLR System of Inspection, following the Committee highlighting at its last meeting two potential deficiencies in the System concerning: the right of inspectors to board any fishing or fisheries research vessel and the reporting of possible infringements (CCAMLR-XIII, paragraphs 5.19 to 5.20), the so-called 'definition of fishing' questions.

2.11 Members were requested to consider further the 'definition of fishing' proposal and advise the Secretariat of their comments and specific suggestions, or other alternatives to deal with the problem of the identification of infringements. To assist in this consideration, Australia's definition of fishing, as contained in its national legislation, was circulated to Members in COMM CIRC 95/8 of 10 March 1995.

2.12 The following Members responded before the start of the 1995 meeting of SCOI: Australia, Chile, Germany, Japan, Italy, New Zealand and the UK. Their responses are summarised in the Secretariat's paper (CCAMLR-XIV/5). The Secretariat's paper also included a comparison of the Australian and New Zealand definitions of fishing.

Rights of Inspectors

2.13 In respect of the right of inspection, SCOI considered that it should be confirmed explicitly in the CCAMLR System of Inspection and consequently decided to recommend to the Commission that the first sentence of Article III of the System of Inspection be replaced with the following sentence:

‘III. In order to verify compliance with Conservation Measures adopted under the Convention, Inspectors designated by Members shall be entitled to board a fishing or fisheries research vessel in the area to which the Convention applies, to determine whether the vessel is, or has been, engaged in scientific research, or harvesting, of marine living resources.’

2.14 Australia advised that duly-designated CCAMLR Inspectors would be permitted to board Australian vessels fishing in that area of Australia’s EEZ around Australia’s external territory of Heard and McDonald Islands which is within the Convention Area.

‘Definition of Fishing’

2.15 SCOI considered three proposals regarding the ‘definition of fishing’ (CCAMLR-XIV/5):

- (i) UK’s proposal of a list of indicators;
- (ii) Australia’s proposal for a conservation measure concerning the stowage of fishing equipment in prohibited areas ; and
- (iii) Australia’s and New Zealand’s definition of fishing.

2.16 The SCOI Chairman advised that, on the question of a ‘definition of fishing’, Members expressed two different opinions on the Australian and New Zealand definitions. Some felt that the Australian definition was comprehensive while others felt it was too broad.

2.17 While some SCOI Members supported, in principle, the Commission adopting a definition of fishing, some were concerned that such a course of action may require an amendment to the CCAMLR Convention and may also create an undesirable precedent for other international organisations. Rather than a definition of fishing, Japan suggested that SCOI should consider another approach to formulate a common understanding among Members, that certain activities could be considered as an ‘inexcusable’ indication that ‘fishing’ had occurred.

2.18 SCOI gave consideration to a list of indicators, proposed by the UK, which would assist inspectors in making their observations. If the inspector observed one or more of these indicators, it would be presumed that some fishing had occurred or was about to occur. SCOI agreed that it was not the role of the inspector to ‘conclude’, based on his observations, that there had been an infraction of a conservation measure. Rather, an inspector was required to report his observations to the Commission, and it was the Flag State’s responsibility to take enforcement or any other legal action in respect of a vessel which had breached a conservation measure. The inspector’s report was only part of the evidence that may lead to a conclusion, by the Flag State, that an infraction of a conservation measure had occurred.

Some Members were concerned that an intention to take a course of action was not embodied as an offence in criminal or civil law. Some Members would not be able to modify their legal system to incorporate ‘intention’ as an illegal act.

2.19 The required indicators were defined and SCOI recommended that the Commission should adopt, under Article XXIV of the Convention, the following new Article for the CCAMLR System of Inspection:

‘IX bis. A fishing vessel present in the area of application of the Convention shall be presumed to have been engaged in scientific research, or harvesting, of marine living resources (or to have been commencing such operations) if one or more of the following four indicators have been reported by an inspector, and there is no information to the contrary:

- (a) fishing gear in use, recently in use or about to be used, e.g.:
 - nets, lines or pots in the water;
 - baited hooks or thawed bait ready for use;
 - log indicates recent fishing or fishing commencing;

- (b) fish which occur in the Convention Area are being processed or have recently been processed, e.g.:
 - fresh fish or fish waste on board;
 - fish being frozen;
 - operational or product information;

- (c) fishing gear from the vessel in the water, e.g.:
- fishing gear bears the vessel's markings;
 - fishing gear matches that on the vessel;
 - log indicates gear in the water;
- (d) having on board stowed fish (or their products) which occur in the Convention Area.'

2.20 SCOI recommended to the Commission that the new article should not at the moment apply to krill, but should a closed season or area be declared for krill, appropriate modifications to the above indicators should be made by the Commission to take account of the particular circumstances of krill harvesting and processing.

2.21 SCOI also recommended that the Commission agree to incorporate the list of indicators into the *Inspectors Manual*.

2.22 SCOI considered there was some merit in Australia's suggestion that the Commission adopt a conservation measure requiring that all fishing vessels have their fishing gear stowed while they were transiting an area closed for fishing (CCAMLR-XIV/5). However, such a measure should not place constraints on fishermen undertaking activities associated with fishing, such as mending nets.

2.23 Australia noted the views of some Members about their difficulties in adopting new conservation measures as one option to deal with illegal fishing.

2.24 Australia advised that, in light of the difficulties some Members had in adopting a new conservation measure to deal with illegal fishing, it would withdraw its suggestion for such a measure. However, Australia expressed its strong concern at the substantial indications that large-scale illegal fishing in contravention of some conservation measures in force was taking place in the Convention Area. Australia suggested that there was benefit in the Commission's further considering the adoption of a conservation measure requiring all vessels equipped for harvesting species, the harvesting of which was prohibited by a conservation measure in force, to have their fishing gear securely stowed, in a manner which prevented its ready use for harvesting, when transiting areas where the measures were in force. Vessels which were transiting such closed areas would be permitted to repair or construct their fishing gear.

2.25 Australia recognised the need for Members to consider intersessionally both Australia's suggestion and other possible ways to minimise illegal fishing and requested that these issues be discussed further at the next meeting of SCOI.

Inspection Report Form

2.26 In accordance with SCOI's request last year (CCAMLR-XIII, Annex 5, paragraphs 1.70 and 1.72), a draft revision of the inspection report form, based on the draft outlined by Dr I. Everson (UK) in CCAMLR-XIV/BG/12, had been prepared and forwarded to Drs Everson and R. Holt (USA) for comment. A revised form and an expanded glossary of terms from the *Inspectors Manual* was prepared for the meeting by the Secretariat and circulated as CCAMLR-XIV/BG/22.

2.27 The original inspection report forms for trawl and longline fisheries had included the requirement that duplicate copies of photographs taken during the course of an inspection should be given to the master of the vessel at the time of the inspection. It was accepted that, except in exceptional circumstances, this requirement was impractical, even though there was a necessity that duplicate copies of photographs should be provided to the Flag State and the Secretariat as soon as possible after the inspection.

2.28 Accordingly, SCOI recommended to the Commission that the text of the inspection form and the rules for inspections be amended to reflect this change. The recommended amended text of the System of Inspection is given below:

Article VI(d)

'Inspectors may take photographs and/or video footage as necessary to document any alleged violation of Commission measures in force.'

Article VIII(d)

'The Inspector shall provide a copy of the completed inspection form along with copies of photographs and video footage to the designating Member at the earliest opportunity.'

Article VIII(e)

'The designating Member shall, as soon as possible, forward a copy of the inspection form, along with two copies of photographs and video footage to the CCAMLR Executive Secretary who shall forward one copy of this material to the Flag State of the inspected vessel.'

2.29 Other minor amendments were proposed to the text by SCOI Members and in its revised version the inspection report form was approved by SCOI (Appendix III). Drs Everson and E. Sabourenkov (Science Officer) were requested to prepare a final layout of the approved form for publication in the four languages of CCAMLR.

Vessel Notification and Satellite-linked Vessel Monitoring Systems

2.30 In accordance with the decision taken at the opening of the meeting of SCOI, discussion of the items on vessel notification and satellite-based vessel monitoring systems were combined.

2.31 At its 1994 meeting, the Secretariat was requested to conduct a feasibility study on the use of a vessel notification system in the Convention Area and to prepare a draft configuration of a CCAMLR satellite-based Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) (CCAMLR-XIII, Annex 5, paragraph 1.65 and CCAMLR-XIII, paragraph 5.23).

2.32 It was suggested that the VMS proposal should concentrate on finfish fisheries and should consider such factors as the results of current EEC pilot projects to be reported by September 1995 (CCAMLR-XIII, Annex 5, paragraph 1.44). At the meeting, Germany advised SCOI that the duration of these projects had been extended until the end of 1995 and their results would not be available until then.

2.33 The feasibility study on the use of a vessel notification system and a draft configuration of a CCAMLR VMS were prepared by the Science Officer and submitted to SCOI for consideration (CCAMLR-XIV/13 and 14). According to the study, the modified hail system could strengthen the System of Inspection if it were combined with a reliable system of advance notification of fishing vessels.

2.34 The study compared the expected performance of the proposed hail system with the performance of a satellite-based VMS (Inmarsat-C/GPS). According to the study, the comparison indicated that the hail system's performance in such areas as fishing regulation enforcement, optimisation of the deployment of inspectors and verification of submitted information was lower than the proposed satellite-based system. However, the comparison in the study also indicated that implementation of the hail system would take less time than a satellite-based system and the installation costs of the hail system would be lower.

2.35 A draft configuration of a CCAMLR VMS was also prepared by the Science Officer and submitted for consideration by SCOI (CCAMLR-XIV/14). The draft configuration had taken into account available expertise in the design and implementation of satellite-based vessel monitoring of several CCAMLR Members and of the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA).

2.36 The paper CCAMLR-XIV/14 concluded that the eventual establishment of a CCAMLR VMS would be based on consideration of its various technical, financial, administrative and legal aspects. Having assumed that all fishing vessels of CCAMLR Members would be equipped with Inmarsat-C/GPS terminals, the study deemed that the establishment of a CCAMLR VMS, until it became fully operational, would take from 1.5 to 2 years approximately.

2.37 The Delegation of the USA noted that there were at least two possibilities, in addition to the vessel notification and vessel monitoring systems described in CCAMLR-XIV/13 and CCAMLR-XIV/14, to detect illegal fishing. These are (i) requiring that an international inspector be present on all vessels fishing in areas and for species covered by conservation measures in force, and (ii) having ships or aircraft conduct patrols to locate and identify vessels fishing in violation of agreed conservation measures.

2.38 The USA believed that, in the longterm, a satellite-linked VMS, as described in CCAMLR-XIV/14, would be both the most effective and most inexpensive means whereby Contracting Parties can ensure that vessels subject to their jurisdiction are not fishing at times and in places where fishing has been prohibited by the Commission. Carrying an appropriate transceiver could be made a condition of participating in certain fisheries, and failure to carry a functioning transceiver could be made to constitute violation of the conservation measure requiring it.

2.39 The USA noted that it had made a special US\$23 000 contribution to help purchase the computer hardware and software necessary to establish a VMS Base Station at CCAMLR Headquarters. The USA proposed that the additional funds necessary to establish the Base Station be included in the 1996 budget and that, to begin developing experience in the use of the system, Members should volunteer to place transceivers on a representative subset of their vessels intending to engage in fisheries, other than the krill fishery, in the Convention Area. The USA indicated that FV *American Champion*, which would be continuing experimental crab fishing in Subarea 48.3 in accordance with Conservation Measure 75/XII, had volunteered to purchase and carry a transceiver to help demonstrate how the VMS could be used to improve compliance with time and area closures adopted by the Commission.

2.40 Argentina and Chile shared the concern on ensuring conservation of Antarctic marine living resources and expressed their readiness to continue making every effort to improve compliance with conservation measures in force. They recalled their commitment since the signing of the Convention in 1982 and their endeavour to achieve its objectives shown since that time. Both delegations expressed, however, strong reservations in respect to the approach followed by systems of notification and monitoring under consideration. They also expressed some reservations in respect to several parts of documents CCAMLR-XIV/13 and 14 which, in their opinion, were not neutral and went beyond a study or report prepared by a secretariat.

2.41 Argentina and Chile recalled that the geographical location of their mainland territories in South America and their EEZs were in the closest proximity of Antarctica and adjacent to the Convention Area. Hence, maritime navigation and traffic of these two countries in those areas was more than frequent since last century. They also considered that the notification and monitoring approaches being considered were incompatible with general international law and, in particular, with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982. Freedom of navigation for all ships in the high seas and EEZs was recognised by the whole international community, as was the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea.

Requiring prior notification from vessels which are bound for the CCAMLR Area or navigating through it, not intending to fish or conduct fisheries research, was incompatible with that freedom and with that right. Moreover, for claimant states, like Argentina and Chile, Antarctica generates an EEZ and continental shelf, though these countries refrained from exercising jurisdiction, given the provisions of the Antarctic Treaty and related instruments.

2.42 These delegations also expressed the opinion that an additional incompatibility would therefore arise if notification to an international system, or monitoring by it, was required for their vessels which were not intending to fish or conduct fisheries research, while navigating within what they considered their EEZ.

2.43 Both delegations stated that CCAMLR was not a regional fisheries organisation and consequently it was not pertinent to follow the approaches for notification and monitoring which may have been in practice in some other such organisations. There were two different legal and conceptual frameworks. They expressed the opinion that the transformation of CCAMLR into a regional fisheries organisation would need a structural amendment to the Convention. This, in turn presupposed a prior political will, shared by all Parties.

2.44 Both delegations further stressed that, in addition to these substantive problems, there were serious budgetary, administrative and practical implications arising from the approach of the systems of notification and/or monitoring under consideration. In this respect they underlined that the cost and the burden of an administrative structure aimed at dealing with these systems could not be justified and such a structure was neither feasible nor commensurate with the problem SCOI was trying to address. Furthermore, they were not prepared to accept the administrative and budgetary implications that the systems under consideration would have upon the Secretariat and the Commission.

2.45 Finally, they reminded the meeting that possibilities for improving the System of Inspection and ensuring compliance with conservation measures were demonstrated during this session. Additional improvements to that end could be further pursued without the need to follow the approaches of notification and monitoring under consideration.

2.46 Referring to the substance of paragraph 2.41, France, Australia and the UK expressed the view that, although the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) does not impose such obligations of prior notification, it is possible for States to create them under a cooperative agreement under Article 118 of UNCLOS, under which States can take all measures they deem to be pertinent in order to protect marine living resources. Such an agreement could therefore be concluded in the framework of CCAMLR by its Members.

2.47 Norway expressed the opinion that illegal activities in the Convention Area represented a serious threat to the credibility of CCAMLR and informed SCOI that it would accept an increase in its contribution to CCAMLR to cover both vessel notification and VMS projects.

2.48 The UK indicated that it saw merit in both a vessel notification scheme and a VMS, but stressed that the important requirement was that practical steps be taken to implement one or other system at the earliest opportunity.

2.49 In that respect, the UK preferred a notification scheme which used a simpler formulation than that presented by the Secretariat. A scheme which allowed for 'real-time' inputs, accurate to within two to three days, that enabled an up-to-date database on notification to be held by the Secretariat, but allowed for distribution of data only at the specific request of a Member, would provide a simpler, more cost-effective mechanism of notification.

2.50 The UK saw such a scheme as an interim measure to be phased out as and when a VMS was introduced.

2.51 The Delegation of Japan stated that, in general, it supported an investigation of various alternatives for cost-effective monitoring devices. Any decision on the implementation of vessel notification, hail system or VMS, should depend on clear objectives such as monitoring of closed seasons/areas. In the case of the krill fishery in the Convention Area, Japan reminded the Committee that SCOI, at its 1994 meeting, did not see any need or justification to introduce a VMS, mainly because the level of fishing was far too low compared to total allowable catches (TACs), and there were no closed areas and seasons.

2.52 The Delegation of Spain said that Spain had recently installed VMS in Spanish vessels operating in EEC waters and in Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) waters and that the NAFO hail system had been working for several years. Nevertheless, comparative studies on cost-effectiveness were not yet available. The control and monitoring of those systems were always the responsibility of the authorities of the Flag State. In that respect, Spain reserved its position on the possible implementation of the proposed system.

2.53 Germany thanked the Secretariat for the presentation of its excellent reports concerning the description of a hail system and a VMS. The Delegation of Germany referred to the hail system in force in the NAFO area and introduced in the western area of EEC waters from the beginning of 1996. Germany emphasised the need for effective control and enforcement. One way to improve control and enforcement in the CCAMLR Convention Area could be the introduction of a hail system with a simple notification mechanism to avoid any bureaucracy. It seemed to be obvious that the introduction of such a system would be simple and relatively cheap. Concerning the VMS, Germany pointed out some doubts and reservations, especially referring to the cost/benefit ratio.

2.54 Australia commended the Secretariat for the outstanding quality of its papers on both approaches and did not share the reservations expressed by others.

2.55 Australia endorsed the remarks of the USA and observed that a VMS offered greater future enhancement capabilities for CCAMLR to achieve its objectives than a hail system. While a hail system could also achieve some of the desired benefits, these could be better achieved by a VMS. Australia regarded a VMS as more effective from both a financial and fishery management perspective. Australia's experience was that a VMS was a cost-effective enforcement and monitoring system. Australia noted that inspections were required regardless of whether a hail system or a VMS was adopted and that neither option would prevent fishing in the Convention Area by non-Member States. However, a VMS offered the means for Flag States to control their own vessels better.

2.56 Australia felt that the purchase and operation of a VMS was financially achievable by the Commission this year given the Membership contribution received from Ukraine. Australia would support a one-year increase in the Commission's budget for the purchase of a VMS and noted that the cost to a vessel owner of purchase and installation of a VMS was less than the market value of 1 tonne of *D. eleginoides*.

2.57 Australia stated that it would be inappropriate to adopt a hail system as an interim measure pending the adoption of a VMS.

2.58 The Delegation of New Zealand supported the introduction of a VMS in the CCAMLR Convention Area. It was concerned about the level and incidence of illegal fishing in the Convention Area and viewed the introduction of a VMS as an effective means of helping to resolve the problem for Member States' vessels.

2.59 New Zealand currently had 300 vessels (both national and foreign-licensed) on a VMS. It would be happy to join the USA and Australia in offering its experience and technical assistance in developing such a system for CCAMLR.

2.60 While New Zealand acknowledged that VMS would not resolve the problem of illegal fishing by non-Member States operating in the Convention Area, Members should ensure that CCAMLR Member States operating in the Convention Area did so in accordance with the Convention and the relevant conservation measures.

2.61 The Delegation of Brazil commended the strenuous efforts of the Secretariat in preparing the documents. It agreed with the USA's remarks that illegal fishing was now the paramount problem threatening CCAMLR and recognised that Argentina and Chile shared special difficulties.

2.62 Brazil reserved its position on the matters under discussion indicating that, over and above the question of alternatives available for notification, it would be of paramount concern to initiate the proposals for international monitoring in terms of the compatibility between the mandate of the Commission and the principles and prescriptions of the Law of the Sea Convention.

2.63 Sweden supported statements made by several Members that illegal fishing represented the most serious threat to CCAMLR and its credibility. It also considered that VMS was the best possible option if CCAMLR was to deal effectively with the problem.

2.64 Russia stressed that effective control of illegal fishing was important. The major problem with both the notification system and VMS would not be with those vessels which complied with the systems' requirements, but with those which did not. Russia was currently investigating the applicability of VMS in its national program to enforce fishery regulations in its EEZ waters. It believed that, for the present, the implementation of a vessel notification system, similar to NAFO's, appeared to be more feasible than VMS for CCAMLR. However, Russia reserved its position until the completion of an evaluation of both systems.

2.65 The USA suggested that, given the differing opinions of Members with regard to VMS, the following two possibilities might be considered:

- equipment be purchased for the CCAMLR VMS Centre by using the USA special fund and other Members' contributions, and interested Members voluntarily install transceivers on their vessels fishing in the Convention Area to gather information on the potential value of a mandatory VMS;
- CCAMLR Members who have established their own VMS be asked to conduct a trial monitoring project in the CCAMLR Convention Area using vessels which voluntarily agree to install transceivers.

2.66 Australia supported the USA's call for voluntary use of a VMS in the Convention Area. Australia noted that it was using an automated system to help monitor the movement of vessels engaged in certain domestic fisheries and that the Australian vessel intending to initiate the new fisheries in the Convention Area, as described in CCAMLR-XIV/8, would be required to carry a transceiver. Australia indicated that it would be willing to use its Base Station in Canberra to receive data from a small number of additional transceivers that other Members, including the USA, might place on their vessels fishing in the Convention Area, and to transmit the data to CCAMLR to demonstrate the utility of such systems.

2.67 As a result of the above discussion, SCOI concluded that, at this stage, it was not possible to reach any agreement or a compromise solution with regard to either a notification system or VMS.

Advice to SCAF

2.68 SCOI recommended that SCAF consider an allocation in the 1996 budget for translation and publication of the new inspection report forms in the four official languages of the

Commission. The inspection report forms currently used for trawl and longline fisheries are printed on multiple-copy carbon paper. The cost of printing 500 forms in 1993 was A\$ 3 620.

2.69 Funds should be also allocated for translation of the amended 'List of Questions and Statements' from the *Inspectors Manual* into all languages of CCAMLR Flag States fishing in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-XIII, Annex 5, paragraph 1.72).

OPERATION OF THE SCHEME OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATION

3.1 The Secretariat reported on scientific observations undertaken in the 1994/95 season in accordance with the Scheme. A summary of observation programs undertaken in accordance with the Scheme is given in SC-CAMLR-XIV/BG/16.

3.2 As was the case last season and in accordance with Conservation Measure 80/XIII, scientific observers designated under the Scheme conducted observations aboard each of the 13 vessels fishing for *D. eleginoides* in the 1994/95 season in Subarea 48.3. A scientific observer designated by the USA also conducted an observation program aboard the Japanese vessel *Chiyo Maru No. 2* fishing for krill in Statistical Area 58. In addition, scientific observers from Ukraine were placed on board two krill trawlers as part of the Ukrainian national research program.

3.3 In accordance with the Scheme, copies of bilateral agreements on observers were submitted to the Secretariat and made available to Members on request.

3.4 All reports of scientific observers on board vessels fishing for *D. eleginoides* were submitted to the Secretariat and considered by the Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment (WG-FSA) and the Scientific Committee. The observer's report on the Japanese krill fishing vessel was also submitted to the Secretariat and considered by the Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM). Other reports from krill fishing vessels have also been submitted and will be considered in full at the next meeting of WG-EMM.

3.5 Chile submitted a paper describing its experience in the implementation of the Scheme during the 1994/95 season (CCAMLR-XIV/BG/17). The aim of the paper was to evaluate the Scheme's implementation by Chile in the *D. eleginoides* fishery in Subarea 48.3 in 1994/95. One of the conclusions of this evaluation was that, due to the large number of observations of fish and seabirds which had to be conducted, it would require the placement of two observers

on each vessel. If only one observer was available, the observation program should be restricted to a limited number of tasks, the priority order of which should be defined by the Scheme.

3.6 SCOI was informed by the Chairman of the Scientific Committee of the Committee's Draft Advice on the operation of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation.

3.7 SCOI welcomed with satisfaction this information and concurred with the Scientific Committee's recommendations regarding the continuation and expansion of observer coverage with respect to all finfish fisheries in the Convention Area.

3.8 As observer coverage is often the only means to obtain verifiable data from fisheries in the Convention Area, SCOI also concurred with the Scientific Committee's recommendation to employ a technician to assist with the compilation, validation and analysis of observer data.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

4.1 The report of the meeting was adopted. Delegates thanked the Chairman of SCOI for his guidance and for steering the Committee through its, at times, difficult deliberations. They looked forward to working under his chairmanship next year.

AGENDA

Standing Committee on Observation and Inspection (SCOI)
(24 to 27 October 1995)

1. Operation of the System of Inspection and Compliance with Conservation Measures
 - (i) Implementation of Conservation Measures in the 1994/95 Season
 - (ii) Inspections Undertaken in the 1994/95 Season
 - (iii) Members' Reports of Sightings of Vessels in the Convention Area
 - (iv) Reports of Flag States
 - (v) Activities of Non-Member States in the Convention Area

2. Improvements to the System
 - (i) UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Stocks
 - (ii) Rights of Inspectors
 - (iii) Definition of Fishing
 - (iv) Inspection Report Forms
 - (v) Notification of Vessels and Satellite-based Vessel Monitoring System
 - (vi) Advice to SCAF

3. Operation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation

4. Any Other Business Referred by the Commission

5. Adoption of the Report.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Standing Committee on Observation and Inspection (SCOI)
(24 to 27 October 1995)

SCOI-95/1	LIST OF DOCUMENTS
SCOI-95/2	REPORT OF INSPECTION OF THE KOREAN VESSEL R/V <i>IHN SUNG 66</i> United Kingdom
SCOI-95/3	DEPLOYMENT OF AUSTRALIAN INSPECTORS Australia
SCOI-95/4	ARTICLES X AND XXII OF THE CONVENTION Secretariat
SCOI-95/5	SIGHTINGS OF FISHING VESSELS IN SUBAREA 48.3 IN SEPTEMBER- OCTOBER 1995 USA
SCOI-95/6	CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SIGHTING OF THE ARGENTINIAN VESSEL <i>MAR DEL SUR III</i> IN SUBAREA 48.3 ON 16 JANUARY 1995 Secretariat
SCOI-95/7	CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SIGHTING OF THE BELIZE-REGISTERED VESSEL <i>LIBERTY</i> IN SUBAREA 48.3 ON 16 JANUARY 1995 Secretariat
SCOI-95/8	DEPLOYMENT OF INSPECTORS BY THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 1994/95 United Kingdom
SCOI-95/9	DRAFT AGREEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA OF 10 DECEMBER 1982 RELATING TO THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF STRADDLING FISH STOCKS AND HIGHLY MIGRATORY FISH STOCKS Australia
CCAMLR-XIV/1	PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES
CCAMLR-XIV/2	ANNOTATED PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES
CCAMLR-XIV/5	PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE THE CCAMLR SYSTEM OF INSPECTION Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/12	FISHING IN CCAMLR WATERS BY NON-MEMBER STATES Executive Secretary

CCAMLR-XIV/13	VESSEL NOTIFICATION Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/14	A PROPOSAL FOR A CCAMLR VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/15	SUMMARY OF INSPECTIONS Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/18	A RECORD OF VESSELS INFRINGING CCAMLR CONSERVATION MEASURES PLUS OTHER FISHING VESSELS SEEN WITHIN SUBAREA 48.3 DURING THE 1994/95 FISHING SEASON United Kingdom
CCAMLR-XIV/BG/8	IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION MEASURES IN 1994/95 Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/BG/17	SISTEMA DE OBSERVACION CIENTIFICA INTERNATIONAL DE LA CCRVMA EN NAVES CHILENAS Chile
CCAMLR-XIV/BG/22	PROPOSAL FOR A NEW INSPECTION REPORT FORM Secretariat
CCAMLR-XIV/MA/8	REPORT OF MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES IN THE CONVENTION AREA 1994/95 Australia
CCAMLR-XIV/MA/10	REPORT OF MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES IN THE CONVENTION AREA 1994/95 United Kingdom
CCAMLR-XIII/17	PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE THE CCAMLR SYSTEM OF INSPECTION United Kingdom
SC-CAMLR-XIV/BG/16	SCHEME OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATION - SUMMARY OF OBSERVATION PROGRAMS 1994/95 SEASON Secretariat

**COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF
ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES**

REPORT OF INSPECTION

(Inspector: Please use BLOCK CAPITAL LETTERS)

Note to Master of the vessel to be inspected

The CCAMLR Inspector will produce his CCAMLR document of identity on boarding. He is then entitled to inspect and measure all fishing gear on or near the working deck and readily available for use and the catch on and/or below decks and any relevant documents. This inspection will be to check your compliance with CCAMLR's measures to which your Country has not objected and, notwithstanding any such objection, to inspect the logbook entries and fishing records for the Convention Area and the catches on board. The Inspector is authorised to examine and photograph the vessel's gear, catch, logbook or other relevant document. The Inspector will not ask you to haul your fishing gear. However, he may remain on board until the fishing gear in use is hauled in. The information you provided during the course of this inspection will only be made available to the CCAMLR Secretariat and to the Flag State of your vessel. Subsequently it will be considered within the rules of confidentiality of CCAMLR.

1. AUTHORISED INSPECTOR(S)

1.a	Name	Designating Country
1		
2		
3		

1.b Name and identifying letters and/or number of vessel carrying the Inspector
.....

2. INFORMATION ON VESSEL INSPECTED

2.a Vessel's name and registration number

2.b Country and port of registration

2.c Radio call sign

2.d Type of vessel (fishing, research)

2.e Tonnage: GRT..... Net RT.....

2.f Master's name

2.g Owner's name and address

.....

3. DETAILS OF INSPECTION

3.a Date Time arrived on board GMT; Time of departureGMT

3.b Opinions of the Master and Inspector regarding the position of the vessel:

	Time (GMT)	Latitude		Longitude		Equipment used in Determining Position, e.g. GPS	CCAMLR Area, Subarea or Division
		Deg.	Min.	Deg.	Min.		
Master							
Inspector							

3.c Type of fishing gear in current or recent use (e.g. trawling, longlining)

3.d Target species

3.e Current conservation measures applicable, in the opinion of the Inspector, to this fishery:

Reference Number	Summary Title
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

4. GEAR INSPECTED ON OR NEAR THE WORKING DECK

4.1 TRAWL GEAR

4.1.a Net type (pelagic or bottom trawl)

4.1.b Manufacturer or design reference

4.1.c Mesh measurement:

Net material Single or double twine

Condition of net (rigging)

(wet-dry)

4.1.d Initial measurement pursuant to Conservation Measure 4/V (Article 6):

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	

Total mm for 20 mesh ÷ 20 measurements = average mesh size

4.1.e 40 additional measurements in accordance with Conservation Measure 4/V (Article 6):

21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40

41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60

Total mm for 60 mesh ÷ 60 measurements = average mesh size

If Master disputes initial 60 mesh measurements, a further 20 meshes will be measured using a weight or dynamometer in accordance with Conservation Measure 4/V (Article 6 (2)). This measurement will be considered final.

4.1.f Final measurement in case of dispute, Conservation Measure 4/V (Article 6 (2)):

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

Total mm for 20 mesh ÷ 20 measurements = average mesh size

4.2 LONGLINE GEAR

	1st gear	2nd gear	3rd gear
Length of a longline section (m)			
Diameter of main line (mm)			
Material and/or breaking strength of main line			
Length of branch lines (m)			
Diameter of branch lines (mm)			
Material and/or breaking strength of branch line			
Spacing of branch lines (m)			
Type of hooks: (a) straight (b) curved (c) other			
Brand name and size of hooks			
Number of hooks			
Type of bait			
Mean weight of bait per hook (g)			
Remarks			

4.3 CRAB POT (TRAP) GEAR

	1st gear	2nd gear	3rd gear
Description of pots: Shape			
Dimensions			
Mesh size			
Funnel attitude			
Number of chambers			
Presence of an escape port			
Total number of pots on the line			
Spacing of pots on the line			
Type of bait			
Remarks			

5. DETAILS OF THE LAST ENTRIES IN VESSEL'S FISHING LOGBOOK

5.1 Setting gear:

Setting No.	Date	Time (GMT)	Start Position	
			Latitude	Longitude

5.2 Hauling gear:

Setting No.	Date	Time (GMT)	Start Position	
			Latitude	Longitude

5.3 Total catch:

	Species	Species Code	Type of Product*	Processed Weight (tonnes)	Conversion Factor	Weight of Catch (tonnes)
Target species						
By-catch						
Discards						

* e.g. Whole, Fillets, Headed+Gutted, Meal, etc.

6. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY IN WHICH THE VESSEL WAS ENGAGED

Vessel Activity:	When Sighted:	When Boarded:
Steaming		
Setting Gear		
Hauling Gear		
Towing Gear		
Stationary		
Transshipping		
Other (describe)		

7. COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT CONSERVATION MEASURES

7.1 Inspector's opinion on whether or not the conservation measures outlined in paragraph 3 above were being complied with.

NB: An entry of NO must be followed by a statement by the Inspector. The Master may also make a statement but is not obliged so to do.

Reference Number (see paragraph 3 above)	Evidence for Compliance (Yes/No) and Short Comments
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

7.2 Indicate items of gear marked with an official CCAMLR marker and the reasons for marking such gear:

Marker Reference Number	Gear	Reason for Marking

7.3 Inspector's Statement
.....
.....
.....
.....

7.4 Master's Statement
.....
.....
.....
.....

8. COMPLETION OF INSPECTION

8.1 Signature of Inspector in Charge
Name (Please use BLOCK CAPITAL LETTERS)

8.2 Signature of Second Inspector
Name (Please use BLOCK CAPITAL LETTERS)

8.3 Acknowledgment and receipt of report:

I, the undersigned, Master of the vessel, hereby confirm that a copy of this report has been delivered to me on this date. My signature does not constitute acceptance of any part of the contents of the report.

Date

Time

Signature of Master
Name (Please use BLOCK CAPITAL LETTERS)