

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Implementation and Compliance (SCIC-2025)**

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	1
Organisation of the meeting	1
Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems	1
Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)	1
CDS Fund Review Proposal	1
Implementation of the CDS	2
Vessel Inspection	4
VMS and Vessel Movement Activity within the Convention Area	5
Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR	5
Transshipment	7
Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)	7
NCP Engagement Strategy	7
Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures	8
Conservation Measure 10-03	8
Conservation Measure 10-04	9
Conservation Measure 10-09	10
Conservation Measure 10-10	10
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02	11
Conservation Measure 31-02	11
Conservation Measure 51-06	11
Fish nest areas	12
CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)	12
Provisional Compliance Report	14
Provisional Compliance Report – Part A	15
Conservation Measure 10-03	15
Conservation Measure 10-04	15
Conservation Measure 10-05	16
Conservation Measure 10-09	16
Conservation Measure 22-08	17
Conservation Measure 26-01	17
Conservation Measure 31-01	17
Conservation Measure 91-05	18
Provisional Compliance Report – Part B	18
Review of CM 10-10	19
IUU fishing in the Convention Area	19
Current level of IUU fishing	19
IUU Vessel Lists	20
CP-IUU Vessel List	20
NCP-IUU Vessel List	24
Fishery notifications	24

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	26
Delayed fishing gear retrieval	26
Catch overruns	27
Notified gear descriptions.....	27
Early arrival of vessels to Ross Sea region toothfish fishery (Subareas 88.1 and 88.2)	27
Defining calibration and standardisation	28
Fish nests	28
Consideration of the Second Performance Review	29
Other business	29
Secretariat tasking	32
Close of the meeting	32
Appendix I: Compliance Issues 2024/25	33
Appendix II: Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26	108
Appendix III: Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26	109
Appendix IV: Secretariat Tasking	110

**Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee
on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC-2025)**
(Hobart, Australia, 20 to 24 October 2025)

Opening of the meeting

1. The Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) was held in Hobart, Australia, from 20 to 24 October 2025.
2. The Chair of SCIC, Mr A. Berry (New Zealand), opened the meeting by welcoming Members and Observers, and thanked the Secretariat for its support. The Chair further expressed thanks to Members for their intersessional work in preparation for a productive and efficient meeting.
3. While all parts of this report provide important information for the Commission, paragraphs of the report summarising SCIC's advice to the Commission have been highlighted in grey.

Organisation of the meeting

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

Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems

Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)

CDS Fund Review Proposal

5. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/12, which provided an update on the expenditure from the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) Fund in 2025 and three proposals to be considered for approval by the CDS Fund Review Panel.
6. SCIC recalled several proposals approved at CCAMLR-43, which had been successfully implemented for e-CDS enhancements and for in-person CDS training for Singapore. SCIC recalled the approval at CCAMLR-42 (paragraph 18) of funds to support online CDS training in 2024 and 2025 and noted that two online workshops were held in December 2024 and further workshops are scheduled for late 2025. SCIC further recalled that no requests for training had been received from Contracting Parties or cooperating non-Contracting Parties (NCPs).
7. SCIC noted that no funds have been expended to support the implementation of the NCP Strategy and Action Plan (2025–26) in relation to cooperation through participation in the CDS, further noting that it is anticipated that this funding will be spent in late 2025 and 2026.
8. SCIC considered the update on the outcomes and expenditure of the CDS and Port Inspection Workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa in May 2025 (CCAMLR-44/BG/07). SCIC congratulated South Africa on the successful workshop, noting the attendance covered 44

participants from 9 Contracting Parties and 1 cooperating non-Contracting Party (NCP) and that feedback was positive. SCIC noted that the workshop participants made 24 recommendations across a number of subject areas which are under consideration by SCIC in the respective agenda item.

9. Noting the requirement of CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/B, for the designation of a Review Panel to consider the CDS Fund expenditure proposal and make recommendations to the Commission, SCIC convened the CDS Fund Review Panel which comprised representatives from Australia, France, the Republic of Korea (Korea), New Zealand, the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA).

10. The CDS Fund Review Panel thanked the Secretariat for the detailed proposal and recommended the expenditure from the e-CDS fund in support of the following proposals:

- (i) online CDS training workshops, with a value of A\$10 000 for 2026 and 2027. The Panel recalled SCIC's deliberations on developing e-learning CDS modules and requested the Secretariat continue the further development of e-learning CDS modules in 2026 and 2027. The Panel noted the current staffing constraints are prohibiting further development of e-learning modules and requested that the Secretariat develop a workplan in the intersessional period on how this could be implemented in 2027
- (ii) in-person CDS training on request, with a value of A\$60 000 for use in 2026 and 2027 for two in-person CDS training workshops requested by Contracting Parties or cooperating non-Contracting Parties (NCPs)
- (iii) a regional CDS/NCP Engagement Workshop in the Middle East, with a value of A\$120 000 for 2026 or 2027. The panel noted the need for including Contracting Parties attendance, specifically those with regional trade connections. The Panel noted that the proposal noted Contracting Parties travel support (CCAMLR-44/12, paragraph 15). Additionally, the Panel recommended that Contracting Parties that wish to attend the CDS workshop could make an application for the use of the A\$60 000 approved for the in-person CDS training workshops.

11. SCIC thanked the CDS Fund Review Panel for its work and endorsed the expenditure proposal for the consideration of the Commission.

Implementation of the CDS

12. SCIC noted the implementation report of the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CCAMLR-44/13) and noted that no Specially Validated *Dissostichus* Catch Documents (SVDCDs) have been issued, or fraudulent documents identified.

13. SCIC noted the following recommendations by the participants of the CDS and Port Inspection workshop held in Cape Town:

- (i) enhance e-CDS data summaries and extraction;

- (ii) strengthen logic controls for product codes and conversion factors – this will require consideration by the Commission or its Working Groups to agree to standardised Conversion Factors;
- (iii) introduce an optional or mandatory field in the *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED)/ *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED) template for recording weight verification at point of import;
- (iv) add a field for the number of product units to the templates;
- (v) allow for users to close documents or a senior officer to block a document from being used for export/re-export;
- (vi) reconsider the current annual user account expiry setting (1 March);
- (vii) provide automated reminders for incomplete documents; and
- (viii) add a comment field to CDS documents.

14. SCIC noted in respect of recommendation (ii) ‘to strengthen logic controls for product codes and conversion factors,’ that an intersessional working group which included subject matter experts will need to be convened. SCIC further noted that conversion factors are also discussed by the Scientific Committee and encourages Members to work with their scientific colleagues on the matter.

15. SCIC recommended that an intersessional discussion group be created to consult with subject-matter experts to consider the abovementioned recommendations of the Cape Town workshop that pertain to CDS issues and tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements and reporting back on the implementation of the CDS-related recommendations at SCIC-2026.

16. As per CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraph C9, SCIC considered the current cooperating status granted to Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand.

17. SCIC noted with concern that the Secretariat has been trying to get a Mexican point of contact assigned to arrange for CDS training for the previous four years. SCIC reflected on the revocation of the CCAMLR cooperative status of Seychelles in 2017 and Singapore in 2011. SCIC recommended the Commission task the Secretariat with writing to Mexico requesting they fulfil their obligations in respect of CM 10-05 and undertake CDS training in the 2025–2026 intersessional period, noting failure to do so would be grounds for revoking their cooperative status at CCAMLR-45.

18. COLTO noted with great concern that a known IUU actor has resumed fishing for toothfish in the international waters north of the Convention Area and has notified for participation in the Ross Sea fishery. COLTO further noted the Ecuadorian-flagged vessel *Altar 11* has been fishing in the south-west Atlantic targeting toothfish since March 2025 using gillnets, as noted in the Secretariat’s CDS implementation paper CCAMLR-44/13. COLTO urged that robust due diligence is applied by SCIC to any notifications involving these vessels or operators and further encouraged the Flag State to demonstrate full transparency around vessel ownership, licensing, and operational oversight.

19. SCIC thanked COLTO for bringing this information to its attention and reminded Members that the management of vessels is the responsibility of the respective Flag State.

Vessel Inspection

20. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection in 2024/25 in CCAMLR-44/15 which noted that 124 port inspections and 24 at-sea inspections were undertaken.

21. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's proposal to convene an intersessional panel on inspection resources. The panel will prioritise the development of resources based on the results of the inspector survey (CCAMLR-44/15, Annex 1) and the provision of technical guidance and support to the Secretariat during their preparation. SCIC noted that the intersessional panel will conduct its work through a dedicated online discussion group and virtual meetings with participation from subject matter experts. SCIC tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements to facilitate and support the work of the panel.

22. SCIC also considered the recommendations of the CDS and Port Inspection workshop (CCAMLR-44/BG/07) undertaken in South Africa and recommended that the intersessional panel on inspection resources consider the following recommendations of the workshop that pertain to inspection activities:

- (i) development of a standardised inspector tool kit list
- (ii) improvements to inspection report templates/form
- (iii) improved clarity on transmission of port inspection and at-sea inspection reports to the inspected vessel
- (iv) development of an electronic CCAMLR ID card for inspectors under SOI and provision of the ID numbers on the CCAMLR website
- (v) standardised risk assessment for evaluating vessels entering port.

23. SCIC noted the progress achieved in the development of the electronic reporting project and endorsed its continued implementation. SCIC requested that further development take into account integration with internal CCAMLR data holdings, the need for offline data entry capability and consideration of interoperability with relevant external data systems, including the GIES under the PSMA.

24. SCIC affirmed that, in respect to the responsibilities of the provision of Part A of the Inspection Report, this part has to be completed by the vessel's master when providing the 48-hours' notice before entering a port.

25. SCIC considered the Secretariat's reconciliation of AIS data with CCAMLR's port inspection data holdings (CCAMLR-44/BG/13), noting that the analysis served as a proxy for assessing inspection rates by Contracting Parties in accordance with the requirements of CM 10-03. SCIC recognised the usefulness of this analysis and recommended that the Secretariat undertake it on an annual basis. SCIC further noted that future analyses should

acknowledge the limitations in the accuracy of AIS data and confirmed that such analyses are not to be used for compliance purposes.

VMS and Vessel Movement Activity within the Convention Area

26. SCIC considered the vessel monitoring system (VMS) implementation report submitted by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-44/17) and noted the implementation of CM 10-04 by Contracting Parties. The paper also reports on the Secretariat tests to prototype a system for automatic movement notifications.

27. SCIC reminded vessels and Members to ensure vessel movement reports are submitted to the Secretariat in the format specified in Annex 10-04/A.

28. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's proposed changes to CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/17, Annex 1) to clarify the requirement to use the format of Annex 10-04/A for vessel movement reports and to improve submissions of data.

29. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's continued work to develop an automated VMS movement notification functionality and highlighted its potential benefits. SCIC urged the Secretariat to prioritise this project. Some Members expressed interest in participating in any trials of the new system and requested a timeline to move the project forward.

30. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's recommendation to discontinue paying for Inmarsat position reports from the 2025/2026 season forward and have Contracting Parties with vessels continuing to report to CCAMLR via the Inmarsat email address to ensure that these positions are redirected, or that vessel operators are instructed to undertake this action.

Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR

31. SCIC welcomed Chile's submission (CCAMLR-44/01) on monitoring control and surveillance (MCS) activities undertaken by Chile in Subarea 48.1 during the 2024/25 fishing season. At-sea, the naval vessel *ATF-60 Lientur* inspected one vessel in January, and the *OPV-83 Marinero Fuentealba* inspected ten foreign-flagged vessels in April–May, all fully complying with CCAMLR conservation measures. In addition, two research flights carried out MCS activities from the air, during which no fishing vessels or abandoned fishing gear were detected.

32. SCIC thanked Chile for their extensive operations in Subarea 48.1 under challenging Antarctic conditions. SCIC reiterated the importance of operational leadership and shared efforts among Parties, noting that consistency and fairness in implementation strengthen collective confidence in vessel compliance across the CCAMLR fleet.

33. SCIC noted CCAMLR-44/BG/15 which provided an update on the intersessional work undertaken by Chile as lead for the Development of Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS) Guidelines Discussion Group.

34. SCIC noted that many Members already implement EMS through domestic regimes, further noting that vessels within the Ross Sea MSC client group and all COLTO member vessels implement some level of EMS aboard. SCIC emphasised the importance for CCAMLR in complementing established MCS practices and supporting scientific observations through the implementation of EMS.

35. SCIC encouraged all Members to complete the EMS survey to inform future discussions, with the ambition that a phased implementation approach guided by a clear roadmap that considers the views of different Members and stakeholders will come from the survey results.

36. SCIC thanked New Zealand for their aerial surveillance patrols undertaken during the 2024/25 season as reported in CCAMLR-44/BG/21 and for their commitment to conducting regular patrols of the Ross Sea region into the future. No IUU vessels or activity were detected, and no potential compliance issues were identified amongst the 13 vessels observed.

37. SCIC welcomed Argentina's report (CCAMLR-44/BG/25) on MCS activities undertaken by Argentina during the 2024/25 fishing season in Subarea 48.2. SCIC noted that 10 vessels engaged in krill fishing activities were identified, with full compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures reported. Additionally, SCIC noted that CCAMLR inspectors deployed upon the icebreaker *Almirante Irizar* were unable to undertake at-sea inspections due to the extreme weather conditions and therefore undertook radio communication with four CCAMLR-licensed fishing vessels obtaining information on the vessels fishing operations which was verified with CCAMLR's data holdings.

38. SCIC noted its appreciation to Argentina for its efforts to undertake surveillance patrols and inspection activities on behalf of CCAMLR.

39. SCIC acknowledged the value of additional compliance monitoring that could enhance the existing compliance toolbox and support Members in their efforts to monitor adherence to conservation measures, particularly in circumstances where at-sea inspections may be constrained by adverse weather conditions. SCIC recalled document CCAMLR-43/BG/25 Rev. 1, which outlined the development of radio inspection protocols. The Committee expressed appreciation for the UK's offer to collaborate with interested Parties during the intersessional period to advance these mechanisms.

40. Some Members recalled that although CM 10-04 establishes that, for krill fishing, vessels have up to 10 working days from the time of departure from the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the Secretariat, the majority of the fishing vessels observed were transmitting VMS data in real time.

41. SCIC noted the update provided by the USA on the surveillance patrol mission undertaken by the United States Coast Guard icebreaker *Polar Star* during the 2024/25 season, noting that the mission had provided information on vessel sightings within the Convention Area while transiting to and from McMurdo Station. SCIC further noted that, in light of the success of this initial mission, the USA intends to continue such efforts this season.

Transshipment

42. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/16) noting that 314 transshipments occurred from 1 December 2024 to 1 August 2025, of which 160 were of krill products.

43. SCIC considered the declining compliance with CM 10-09 but noted the overall compliance rate remains relatively high at 92%. SCIC further noted with concern that some Contracting Party vessels have made enquiries to the Secretariat regarding reflagging to non-Contracting Parties, which might be a way to avoid implementing CCAMLR Conservation Measures. SCIC noted that additional measures might be needed to address this.

44. SCIC considered the application of CM 10-09 in relation to the transshipment of crew, observers and other personnel, including their personal gear. SCIC noted that differing interpretations existed regarding the application of CM 10-09 and agreed that the measure does not clearly specify whether such activities are covered.

45. SCIC noted the extended period that transshipments were being notified for and considered the application of the requirement of CM 10-09, paragraph 2, to provide a notification 72 hours before a transshipment was intended to occur. SCIC considered that there are a number of operational and environmental factors that vessel operators contend with while operating in the Convention Area and noted that these could be contributing to Contracting Parties requesting extended notification periods.

46. SCIC agreed that CM 10-09 is due for comprehensive revision, including clarifying and addressing existing issues with the applicable monitoring requirements and associated operational challenges.

Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

47. SCIC noted WG-FSA-2025/02 which provided an update on the implementation of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) during 2024/25. Recalling its discussion from SCIC-2024 (paragraph 88), SCIC noted that no specific actions were identified as requiring consideration by SCIC at this time and emphasised the continuing importance of the SISO.

NCP Engagement Strategy

48. SCIC noted the review of the implementation of the current NCP Engagement Strategy and Action Plan for 2025–26 (CCAMLR-44/BG/11), which was endorsed by the Commission at CCAMLR-43 (paragraph 7.30).

49. SCIC acknowledged the importance of the Secretariat's continued efforts to develop relationships with non-Contracting Parties (NCPs) in order to promote their cooperation with CCAMLR and encouraged continuation of these efforts.

50. SCIC expressed concern over the lack of engagement by many NCPs, noting the failure to respond to the letters from the Executive Secretary, which limits the effectiveness of the Strategy, and encouraged all Contracting Parties to actively support these engagement efforts through diplomatic channels and trade relationships.

51. SCIC noted the positive engagement from Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and tasked the Secretariat with continuing to foster these dialogues and others with interested NCPs in the Middle East region. Additionally, SCIC endorsed the continued engagement with NCPs in the Southeast Asia region.

52. SCIC noted the importance of transshipment in the context of NCP engagement and requested the Secretariat to engage with NCPs that provide transshipment services in the Convention Area to support their understanding of and compliance with CCAMLR Conservation Measures.

53. SCIC further noted that a mechanism to apply a cooperating status to extend to transshipment vessels flagged to NCPs could be considered and that this would require further discussion (paragraph 43).

Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures

Conservation Measure 10-03

54. SCIC considered the proposal by Australia, Korea, New Zealand and the USA to amend CM 10-03 (CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1) to require Contracting Parties to inspect all vessels carrying any Antarctic marine living resources, including krill or krill products that were harvested in the Convention Area, and propose updates to Annex 10-03/B. The proponents noted that these amendments would improve CCAMLR's understanding of which flag states are landing krill and krill products and improve CCAMLR's ability to monitor trade and evaluate compliance with relevant conservation measures.

55. SCIC did not reach consensus to increase the rate of port inspections of all vessels entering ports carrying species other than *Dissostichus* spp. China noted that it supported the sustainable management strategies but was concerned that this proposal was overstating risk. China stated that the catch in Subareas 48.1, 48.2 and 48.3 is reasonable, below the catch limit and aligns with predators' low-demand period. China also emphasised that some Contracting Parties were not meeting their compliance requirements with port inspections of *Dissostichus* spp. and was concerned that increasing the rate of port inspections of krill vessels would create an additional burden to port states and possible risk of IUU *Dissostichus* spp. opportunities. China stressed that port inspections for marine mammal exclusion devices on trawl gear and measures to mitigate seabird mortality are unnecessary – on-board inspections already cover these devices, and port checks cannot verify their sea use.

56. SCIC considered the inclusion of additional product codes to the Port Inspection Report in Annex 10-03/B, noting that these new codes represented the different types of products on inspected vessels and increased the transparency of the fishing activities. The proposed amendments were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption. SCIC did not reach consensus on the remaining amendments of the proposal and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

57. SCIC also considered a proposal to amend CM 10-03, led by Australia, to improve the Secretariat's knowledge of port landings by requiring vessels simultaneously submit the information required in CM 10-03/Annex A to both the Contracting Party and the Secretariat. Australia noted the proposal would lead to increased transparency and a clearer understanding of the number of port visits by vessels and would assist in determining the number and location of landings. SCIC noted the discussion on this proposal and that Members would continue to develop the proposal during the intersessional period.

Conservation Measure 10-04

58. SCIC considered the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway Korea, the UK and the USA to amend CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/19 Rev. 2) to require all Contracting Parties whose fishing vessels are operating in the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the CCAMLR Secretariat no later than one hour after receipt. The proponents noted that such an amendment would make the VMS reporting requirement for krill and other CCAMLR fisheries consistent with the reporting requirement for CCAMLR exploratory longline fisheries, which in conjunction with the development of the Catch Documentation Scheme has been effective at preventing trade in illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) harvested toothfish. They also noted that expanding this requirement to all CCAMLR fisheries would ensure the integrity and legality of all CCAMLR-harvested products and improve the ability to monitor and manage CCAMLR's krill fishery.

59. Korea emphasised the importance of real-time transmission of VMS data for the effective monitoring of fishing activities, noting that most vessels already transmit such data directly to the Secretariat. Korea further highlighted that ensuring real-time transmission from all vessels is critical from a safety perspective.

60. Some Members considered that the proposal presented an invalid causality between the transmission frequency and improvements in krill management outcomes. These Members further noted that there is no identified IUU risk that would justify the proposed change, and that existing practices already ensure an adequate level of safety and oversight for vessels operating in the Convention Area.

61. SCIC noted Secretariat advice that real-time reporting would not increase financial costs and would not result in an increased workload for the Secretariat.

62. SCIC could not reach consensus to amend CM 10-04 with this proposal and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

63. SCIC recalled its discussion on improving vessel movement report submissions (paragraphs 27 and 28), noting the proposal to modify CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/17, Annex 1) to clarify the requirement to use the format of Annex 10-04/A for vessel movement reports. The proposed amendments were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption.

Conservation Measure 10-09

64. SCIC considered the proposal by Korea to amend CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/29) to encourage both Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties to provide, to the extent possible, the information specified in CM 10-02, paragraph 2, for carrier vessels under their flag that engage in transshipment activities in the CAMLR Convention Area and the creation of a CCAMLR record of carrier vessels.

65. Reflecting SCICs deliberation on the CCEP report (paragraphs 100 and 116 to 122), SCIC also gave consideration to:

- (i) the application of the 72-hour notification period required for transshipments of harvested marine living resources, bait and fuel;
- (ii) the notification to the Secretariat of the transshipment of crew, observer or personnel together with, as applicable, their personal gear; and
- (iii) the application of a force majeure, distress, or a medical emergency clause.

66. SCIC endorsed the revision of CM 10-09 and referred it to the Commission for adoption.

Conservation Measure 10-10

67. SCIC considered the proposal by Korea to amend the table in CM 10-10, Annex 10-10/B (CCAMLR-44/30) to include a new category, 'Differing Views Unresolved.' This category would apply when SCIC cannot reach agreement on a compliance designation despite all reasonable efforts being exhausted. In such cases, the compliance issue would be forwarded to the Commission, with the associated discussions reflected in the SCIC report. This approach ensures that SCIC can accurately record its deliberations, assign compliance designations where agreement exists, and still adopt a Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report.

68. Many Members expressed their support for the proposed revisions, noting that this is an issue of efficiency and would be a better use of SCIC's time. These Members reflected with disappointment being unable to adopt a compliance report in previous years.

69. China noted that they respect the aim of the proposal but had concerns that it would not address the root cause of compliance and could lead to Contracting Parties avoiding accountability. China was also concerned about Contracting Parties refusing to acknowledge their obligations.

70. Russia recognised the intention to improve compliance process and procedure but was concerned that the additional category would not address previous challenges of not adopting a CCAMLR Compliance Report. Russia noted the role of the Chair of SCIC to decide if an issue is unresolvable or not and reiterated the rule of consensus in the CCEP.

71. SCIC did not reach consensus on this proposal, and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02

72. SCIC considered the proposal by the European Union (EU) to amend CMs 21-01 and 21-02 (CCAMLR-44/18). The proposed changes were to specify in CM 21-01 that the presence of a scientific observer on board is required for new fisheries, and to specify in CM 21-02 that the scientific observers should be appointed in accordance with SISO.

73. Many Members expressed their support for the proposed revisions, but some Members recalled that no notifications for new fisheries were submitted this year, that these fisheries have more of a scientific nature and that the requirement of an extra observer would increase costs when it comes their implementation.

74. The EU explained that it would be desirable to put in place the requirement to have a SISO observer onboard for new fisheries before any notifications for such a fishery are received, noting that SISO observer coverage is a relevant element to be considered by the Scientific Committee in its review of the Fisheries Operations Plan and the development of the data collection plan. The EU noted that having a SISO observer onboard is essential to ensure the collection of objective and high-quality data and other information in respect of new fisheries.

75. SCIC could not reach consensus on revisions to CM 21-01 and CM 21-02. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Conservation Measure 31-02

76. SCIC considered the proposals by the Russia (CCAMLR-44/31) to amend CM 31-02 to clarify the management procedures regarding the delayed retrieval of longline gear after fisheries close in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2. Some Members recalled this was considered during SCIC-2023 and SCIC-2024, further noting that drafting suggestions previously provided on this matter should be incorporated into any future proposals.

77. SCIC could not reach consensus on the revision of CM 31-02 and the proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Conservation Measure 51-06

78. SCIC considered the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the UK and the USA to amend CM 51-06 (CCAMLR-44/20 Rev. 2) to require at least one observer on every vessel be appointed under SISO. The proponents noted that requiring data collection that is standardised across the fishing fleet is necessary to ensure robust and consistent data collection across the krill fishery. In addition, the text of SISO includes provisions to ensure the safety of SISO observers.

79. China expressed the view that the proposal discriminates against national observers and recalled that a Chinese national observer won a SISO award at CCAMLR-43. Additionally, Russia noted that observer tasks differ between the krill and toothfish fisheries, and noted that there was no advantage in deploying a SISO observer instead of a national observer.

80. SCIC could not reach consensus on the revision of CM 51-06. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Fish nest areas

81. SCIC considered the proposal from the EU and its Member States (CCAMLR 44/21) for a new CM 32-XX to provide protection to fish nest areas and promote non-destructive research to understand their importance in the CAMLR Convention Area.

82. The EU recalled that the proposal had been developed following the discovery of Jonah's icefish (*Neopagetopsis ionah*) fish nest areas in the southern Weddell Sea, and noted that the proposal takes a circumpolar approach, as recommended by the Scientific Committee.

83. Many Members welcomed the proposal, recalling that this topic had been discussed in-depth in previous years, highlighted the need for protection of essential habitats and reiterated that protecting these nests is a crucial measure for conservation. Noting that the matter was considered further by the Scientific Committee Chair (paragraph 212), some Members stated that they could not support the proposal at this time, noting that further work was needed.

84. SCIC could not reach consensus on this proposal and referred it to the Commission for further consideration.

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)

85. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report and analysis of the CCEP (CCAMLR-44/11 Rev. 2), noting that compliance rates exceeded 95% for the majority of assessed obligations. SCIC further noted that a comparative analysis of recent CCEP reports indicates overall stability in compliance with CMs 10-04, 10-05, 26-01 and 91-05. However, SCIC observed an increase in instances of non-compliance with CM 10-09 over the period 2023 to 2025.

86. SCIC noted that the use of fireworks by a CCAMLR Member vessel in December 2024 in the Ross Sea region had been reported to the Secretariat. Some Members considered that such use within the Convention Area could constitute a potential breach of CM 26-01 and CM 91-05. Accordingly, SCIC recommended that the Commission review its mandate on this matter and, in doing so, consideration be given to developing a conservation measure to regulate the use of fireworks and explosives.

87. SCIC recalled COMM CIRCs 24/138, 25/01 and 25/12 regarding several gear conflict incidents and noted that the Secretariat's review of the Conservation Measures did not identify that a breach had occurred. SCIC further noted Ukraine's concern on the issue and its emphasis on building relationships as a national priority, whilst noting that no gear was removed in the incident and that Ukraine will continue to closely monitor its vessels' activities into the future.

88. SCIC noted that the development of a protocol on inter-vessel conduct within CCAMLR would be beneficial in such circumstances and requested that COLTO and ARK consider leading an industry initiative on this matter. COLTO recalled that approximately 90% of toothfish operators are COLTO members with well-established working relationships and

indicated that it would consider ways to extend this standard of cooperation to non-COLTO members.

89. SCIC considered a request from the Secretariat to provide advice on the pre-season entry of seven licensed vessels that entered Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 between 16 October and 4 November 2024. SCIC noted that some vessels entered the area up to 46 days prior to the start of the fishing season, further noting that such entry is not currently prohibited by Conservation Measures (see also paragraphs 201 to 208).

90. Some Members observed that domestic definitions of ‘fishing’, and those used by regional fisheries management organisations, may include searching for fish or other preparatory activities.

91. Many Members expressed concern over the pre-season entry and noted that this is a significant change from past practice. They also requested additional information to gain an understanding of the reasons behind such early entries.

92. China expressed concern that such early entry could not reasonably be considered preparation for the season and may constitute entry into a closed area, which in other fisheries management organisations could be regarded as indicative of IUU activity.

93. Many Members expressed the potential need for an amendment to a relevant conservation measure to address the issue in limiting pre-season entry to the fishing grounds and recommended further intersessional discussion.

94. South Africa noted that any such amendment should ensure vessels are not required to leave an open fishery only to return on the new opening date.

95. COLTO expressed support for the development of a measure addressing this issue.

96. SCIC noted the Secretariat’s request for clarification on how fishing gear deployed on a vessel, where such gear differs from that specified in the fishery notification or fishing licence, should be addressed within the compliance evaluation procedure.

97. Some Members considered that a certain level of flexibility should be secured in terms of operational necessity while at the same time recognising that such change should be minimal, without causing negative impacts to the environment and ecosystem.

98. SCIC considered the matter to be technical in nature and sought further advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (see paragraphs 198 to 200).

99. SCIC considered a request from the Secretariat seeking clarification on whether the role of CCEP Contact may be assigned to industry representatives, noting that CCAMLR users holding this role are contacted by the Secretariat throughout the year regarding compliance-related matters. SCIC reaffirmed that it remains the prerogative of each Member to determine who is assigned this role. However, SCIC also noted that responses to draft compliance reports shall only be provided by government officials holding the CCEP Contact role.

100. SCIC considered the request from the Secretariat to clarify how the transshipment of sick and injured crew shall be treated in the compliance evaluation procedure, noting previous discussions of SCIC on the priority of safety of life at sea above administering reports. In

relation to the transshipment of crew, observers and other personnel, including their personal gear, SCIC noted that differing interpretations existed regarding the application of CM 10-09. SCIC further noted that CM 10-09 does not cover the transshipment of crew, observers, personnel and their personal gear.

101. Some Members noted that not adequately monitored transshipment activity is broadly acknowledged to facilitate IUU fishing and associated activities and highlighted the importance of receiving notification any time two vessels come together in the Convention Area, whether for transshipment of fish, supplies, or crew.

102. SCIC considered the following recommendations from the CDS and Port Inspection workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa which related to the CCEP:

- (i) development of a mechanism in CM 10-10 which facilitates bilateral resolution between CCAMLR parties through the draft report on the CCAMLR portal before draft reports are returned,
- (ii) permit the use of open-source data by the Secretariat in the CCEP, and
- (iii) recognise the differences of a scientific observer and compliance observer.

103. In respect of the development of a mechanism to facilitate bilateral resolution, SCIC did not agree that facilitation of bilateral discussions through the online CCEP CCAMLR portal was appropriate and did not endorse the recommendation.

104. In relation to the use of open-source data by the Secretariat within the CCEP, SCIC noted that such data should be objective and reliable before being used for compliance analysis. SCIC requested that the Secretariat further explore this option with caution and provide additional information to SCIC in 2026.

105. In relation to the distinction between scientific and compliance observers, SCIC noted that CCAMLR deploys only SISO observers. SCIC reiterated that SISO observers, as scientific observers, are focused on the collection of scientific data. SCIC further noted that they should not be tasked with assessing compliance matters, though their information can be more broadly relevant, and recalled that there are no designated compliance observers within CCAMLR.

Provisional Compliance Report

106. In accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i), SCIC considered the 73 potential compliance incidents across nine different conservation measures in the CCEP Summary Report (CCAMLR-44/11 Rev. 2). Following consultation, SCIC adopted, for further consideration by the Commission, its annual Provisional Compliance Report (Appendix I) in accordance with CM 10-10, noting that consensus on a compliance status was not achieved on two compliance issues. For most issues, SCIC agreed to assess the preliminary status provided by the relevant Contracting Party.

107. The Provisional Compliance Report contains two parts. Part A contains compliance issues identified in the CCEP for the period 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025. Part B contains the

issues noted by the Commission as requiring additional information from a Contracting Party in the previous year's CCAMLR Compliance Report (CCAMLR-43).

Provisional Compliance Report – Part A

Conservation Measure 10-03

108. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 4, by New Zealand regarding the requirement for vessels seeking entry to port to provide 48 hours' notice. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliant status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the issue.

109. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 5, regarding the requirement for a port inspection to be conducted within 48 hours of port entry by Chile, France, Namibia, South Africa for one issue each; New Zealand for two issues; and Uruguay for three issues. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for the issues regarding France and Namibia, and to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the issues regarding Chile, New Zealand, South Africa and Uruguay.

110. In respect of the three issues concerning Uruguay, SCIC noted that the Port of Montevideo can experience congestion due to the volume of incoming vessels. Uruguay advised that, due to personnel constraints, it applies a risk-based approach to determine inspection priorities. Uruguay further noted that, as a signatory to the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), it implements a number of pre-arrival requirements, including the submission of cargo declarations, crew lists, and permits. These documents, together with the vessel's past compliance history and recent activity, are assessed to determine the level of compliance risk associated with each vessel. SCIC thanked Uruguay for providing context on the application of its risk assessment approach, and the UK noted that it did not share the view that one of the vessels inspected represented a 'low risk'.

111. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 8, regarding the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat more than 30 days after the inspection date by Chile, Namibia and the United Kingdom, for one issue each, South Africa for two issues, and Uruguay for three issues. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all issues.

Conservation Measure 10-04

112. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-04, regarding the requirement for Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from, and movement between subareas of the Convention Area by France, Korea and South Africa for three issues each. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all issues for France and South Africa. For the issues for Korea, SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant in two issues, noted the additional information provided in COMM CIRC 25/98 and revised the suggested remaining compliance status to compliant.

Conservation Measure 10-05

113. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-05, paragraph 6, regarding the prohibition on exporting or re-exporting toothfish without an accompanying *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED) or *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED) by Argentina, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain and Uruguay.

114. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of Compliant for Argentina, France (in relation to one of its issues) and New Zealand. SCIC also agreed to the suggested compliance status of Minor Non-Compliant (Level 1) for Chile, France (in relation to its remaining issue) Japan, South Africa, and Uruguay.

115. Uruguay noted the significant progress achieved over time in improving compliance with CM 10-05, while highlighting the need for additional personnel to further strengthen its capacity. Uruguay also recalled the participation of new staff members in the recent CDS Port Inspection Workshop held in South Africa and expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for facilitating this opportunity.

Conservation Measure 10-09

116. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 2, regarding that each Contracting Party as a Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area for Ukraine and Vanuatu for one issue each, Panama for two issues, Russia for three issues, Norway for five issues and the Netherlands for six issues.

117. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for Panama for one issue. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all the issues for the Netherlands, Russia and Ukraine, and for the remaining Panamanian issue.

118. SCIC noted that for consistency across all issues of non-compliance with CM 10-09, paragraph 2, it revised the suggested compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all Norwegian issues. SCIC noted that whilst an explanation was provided by Vanuatu, no suggested compliance status was provided for the issue of non-compliance and agreed to assign the compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

119. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 3, by China, which requires each Contracting Party to notify the Secretariat at least two hours in advance of the transshipment if any of its vessels propose to tranship items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel within the Convention Area. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant.

120. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 5, regarding that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided in a transshipment notification within 3 working days of having transhipped, for China and the Netherlands for one issue each, and Korea, Norway and Russia for two issues each.

121. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for Korea, and to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for China, the Netherlands and

Russia. SCIC noted that for consistency across similar issues of non-compliance with CM 10-09, paragraph 5, it revised the suggested compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all Norwegian issues.

122. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 8, by Panama, Russia and Vanuatu, which states that no vessel may conduct transshipment within the Convention Area for which prior notification, pursuant to CM 10-09, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, has not been given. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant. SCIC noted that whilst an explanation was provided by Vanuatu, no suggested compliance status was provided for the issue of non-compliance and agreed to assign the compliance status of compliant.

Conservation Measure 22-08

123. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-08, paragraph 1, by Korea regarding the prohibition of fishing in exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in depths shallower than 550 meters. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant.

Conservation Measure 26-01

124. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 26-01, paragraph 8, by Namibia and Norway, regarding the prohibition of the dumping or discharging of offal or discard south of 60°S. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance statuses of compliant for Namibia, and minor non-compliant (Level 1) for Norway.

Conservation Measure 31-01

125. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 31-01, which states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3) in connection with the fishing activities of the UK vessels *Argos Helena* (Appendix I, item 69) and *Nordic Prince* (Appendix I, item 70).

126. Argentina, in the interests of saving time, recalled its clear position on the matter, made during discussions in the agenda item on IUU fishing (paragraph 150).

127. The USA made the following statement:

‘Members’ differences should not prevent us from working together toward our common goal of setting toothfish catch limits and other necessary measures for Subarea 48.3, based on the recommendations of the Scientific Committee and relying upon the best scientific evidence available, as prescribed in Article IX 1. (f) of the CAMLR Convention. We have been frustrated in previous years by one Member’s refusal to adopt such a Conservation Measure, and hope that we can get past that this year. Like other Members, we believe that CCAMLR should adopt a Conservation Measure establishing catch limits, bycatch limits, mitigation measures, data collection and reporting, and other requirements for toothfish fishing in 48.3. The United States

holds the same position regarding this matter for this season that we have had in previous years.’

128. Russia reiterated its positions that the absence of the relevant Conservation Measure does not permit fishing to occur in Subarea 48.3 in violation of CM 31-01 and recommended this being considered as seriously, frequently or persistently non-compliant (Level 3).

129. The UK recalled its previous stated position on the matter (see paragraphs 151 and 154) and reaffirmed that the UK does not accept that the UK-flagged vessels were non-compliant with CM 31-01 and cannot accept any status other than compliant.

130. SCIC noted that there was no consensus on the compliance status for these issues.

Conservation Measure 91-05

131. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 91-05, paragraph 24, by Russia regarding the requirement for Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA. SCIC noted that the vessel was unable to transmit the movement notification from the vessel due to the service provider terminating the contract without prior notification to the vessel and the operators. SCIC agreed to revise the compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1).

Provisional Compliance Report – Part B

132. SCIC recalled its request to Peru for additional information in SCIC-2024 (paragraph 180) in relation to the implementation of CM 10-05, paragraph 6, regarding the prohibition on exporting or re-exporting toothfish without an accompanying *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED) or *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED), as Peru did not provide a response to the compliance report.

133. SCIC noted the additional information submitted by Peru in COMM CIRC 24/118 and agreed to assign a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

134. SCIC recalled its request to Vanuatu for additional information in SCIC-2024 (paragraphs 205 to 207) in relation to the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 8, which states that no vessel may conduct transshipment within the Convention Area for which prior notification, pursuant to CM 10-09, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, has not been given. SCIC sought clarification on the date the notification was transmitted, as noted by Vanuatu in their Draft Compliance Report response.

135. SCIC noted Vanuatu had provided the additional information requested and the Secretariat could identify the email containing the transshipment notification. SCIC agreed to assign the compliance status of compliant.

136. Many members emphasised the critical importance of CCAMLR’s compliance processes, and ensuring that compliance issues are addressed appropriately, consistently and transparently with the collective goal of continuous improvement. They requested that Russia

provide the outstanding information and investigations detailed in CCAMLR-40/BG/21. They also noted several issues in the 2024 Summary Compliance Report relating to the *Alpha Crux* requiring additional information from Russia and sought an update on the findings of Russia's investigations.

137. Russia stated that accusations raised by some Members go beyond the scope of the Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report and do not reflect objectively outcomes of previous discussions on this matter. Russia recalled its request to New Zealand for the original photo materials with metadata, noting that this had not been received.

138. New Zealand reiterated that comprehensive data and images had been supplied.

139. Russia reiterated that the EXIF metadata of the photographs provided by New Zealand through the Secretariat was changed before being handed over to Russia and the submission of primary photographs with the original (raw) metadata is still necessary.

Review of CM 10-10

140. SCIC considered the operation of CM 10-10 and had no recommendation for the Commission at this time.

IUU fishing in the Convention Area

141. SCIC considered IUU fishing activity and trends in 2024/25 in the Convention Area and IUU Vessel lists as reported in CCAMLR-44/14. SCIC noted that no vessels included on the Contracting Party (CP) or the non-Contracting Party (NCP)-IUU Vessel Lists were reported as sighted by Members inside the Convention Area in 2024/25.

Current level of IUU fishing

142. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/BG/09 and CCAMLR-44/BG/10, which outlined CCAMLR's ongoing cooperation with international organisations to combat IUU fishing. Discussion particularly highlighted collaboration with INTERPOL and the Joint Analytical Cell (JAC) throughout 2024 and 2025 to identify and deter illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities, supported through a grant provided by the EU.

143. SCIC thanked the EU for providing this funding and welcomed this collaboration with INTERPOL and the JAC. SCIC also thanked the Secretariat for these ongoing efforts with INTERPOL, JAC and others to combat IUU fishing in the Convention Area and endorsed continuing these efforts.

144. SCIC noted INTERPOL's ongoing collaboration with CCAMLR and the tools and resources made available to CCAMLR Members through this collaboration. INTERPOL highlighted their recent activities in combatting IUU fishing activities globally, noting the

benefits to accessing INTERPOL’s global police network to address IUU fishing and crimes associated with IUU fishing.

145. SCIC noted that INTERPOL had developed a Vessel Boarding Guide intended for operational vessel inspectors and this would be released later in the year. SCIC also noted that INTERPOL, in collaboration with the USA’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, will be conducting webinars on CCAMLR-related fisheries inspections during the week of 17 November 2025 with further information soon to be shared with all Contracting Parties via Commission Circular.

146. SCIC considered the report on the implementation of CM 10-08 (CCAMLR-44/BG/12), including the initial reporting of efforts by the JAC to identify ultimate beneficial ownership and any linkages to past, known IUU fishing activity. SCIC noted that no direct links of interest to CCAMLR were identified by this initial review.

147. The EU provided an update on an investigation into activities of a Spanish national involved with the previously IUU listed vessel *El Shaddai*. The investigation was initiated and initially reported at SCIC-2024, but the case was ultimately time barred under domestic legislation before further formal action could be taken. SCIC thanked the EU for this update.

148. SCIC considered the update provided by the Secretariat on the workplan to address unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area. SCIC acknowledged the progress made in this area and endorsed the extension of the workplan for 2026–2027.

IUU Vessel Lists

CP-IUU Vessel List

149. SCIC considered the Provisional Contracting Party IUU Vessels for 2025/26 noting the proposed inclusion of two UK-flagged vessels: *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince*.

150. Argentina made the following statement:

‘We have once again included these two vessels, the *Argos Helena* and the *Nordic Prince*, on the list of vessels engaged in illegal fishing, given a situation that has been ongoing for years. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach a consensus at the 2021 meeting because only one party, in this case the Russian Federation, opposed the decision. From that point on, we did not have a conservation measure, 41-02, which sets, among other things, the catch limits for Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3. From that point on, we no longer have a conservation measure due to the opposition of one party. However, since we did not have one, the vast majority, if not almost all, of the Commission members clearly understood that without a conservation measure, we cannot fish. Conservation Measure 31-01 clearly establishes this. It's objective; it's not Argentina's opinion. Unfortunately, only one country continued fishing despite not having a conservation measure authorizing it. I also want to highlight the conduct of the countries that previously fished in Subarea 48.3, which realised that without a conservation measure, fishing was impossible, and they stopped fishing. I also want to highlight the conduct of the main country that imported this toothfish. Seeing that there was no conservation measure making this fishing legal, that country also stopped

importing toothfish because it's not a fishing activity supported by a conservation measure. So, once again, we call for consideration of including these two vessels, the *Nordic Prince* and the *Argos Helena*, on the list of illegal vessels for fishing that is objectively illegal and outside the scope of the Commission's conservation measures. The United Kingdom itself claims that its fishing is 'consistent' with CCAMLR. When something is consistent with something else, it is something else; in other words, it is not CCAMLR fishing, despite attempts to disguise it with so-called inspections or other measures. So let's hope that this time these vessels are included on this list. We urge everyone, first, to agree on a conservation measure in 48.3, and second, that until we have one, we should do what most Members do, which is refrain from fishing because we are not authorised and this cannot be done.'

151. The UK made the following statement:

'The UK has previously articulated its position on this matter, most recently in COMM CIRC 25/71 and COMM CIRC 25/100, including our position in relation to Conservation Measure 31-01. The issue has also been the subject of extensive discussion in prior meetings of both SCIC and the Commission.

The UK rejects any suggestion that the vessels operating under its flag within Subarea 48.3 could be characterised as engaging in illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing activities, including under the provisions of Conservation Measure (CM) 10-06. There is no basis on which any of these vessels might be said to have engaged in any of the activities described in paragraph 5 of CM 10-06 and they should not therefore have been included on the draft CP-IUU list.

The UK does not agree to the inclusion of these vessels on the final CP-IUU Vessel List on the basis of their participation in a fishery under lawful domestic regulation which is operated in compliance with all relevant conservation measures and with the UK's obligations under the Convention.'

152. Argentina made the following statement:

'We truly regret that the United Kingdom has once again rejected the inclusion of the *Nordic Prince* and the *Argos Helena* on this list of illegal fishing vessels, even though it is clear and objective that these vessels fished in violation of the legal framework of this Convention and thus contributed to undermining the effectiveness of our organization's conservation measures. These vessels are not complying with current conservation measures and are violating Conservation Measure 31-01. We regret that once again a party opposes including these vessels on this list.'

153. Argentina also made the following statement:

'There are many parties that, understanding what the Convention establishes, have voluntarily stopped fishing. There are other parties that have stopped importing this product. There are parties that are making a great effort in all of this, and if the only result that emerges from this is an empty list where nothing is achieved, it seems to me that there is a very unfair situation with respect to all those countries that are doing what they have to do, even if it comes at a cost, and there is only one country that is benefiting from illegal fishing not authorized by the Commission. So, beyond the final result of a

list or no list, I think it must be clear the efforts that each and every one of us is making to ensure the functioning of the Commission, and that it must be clearly stated what each of the Parties is doing. Otherwise, it seems to me that the mere adoption of an empty list is very unfair to the vast majority of the Parties to this Convention.'

154. The UK referred to COMM CIRCs 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69, 25/71 and 25/100 regarding the UK's consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery within statistical Subarea 48.3 (South Georgia).

155. Argentina made the following statement:

'All these circulars cited by the United Kingdom are intended in some way to justify a fishery that they themselves claim is not CCAMLR-related; it is, according to them, a domestic fishery outside of CCAMLR. First, the 1980 Statement by the Chair has a point 5 that states that for domestic measures to be taken, there must be State sovereignty recognised by all of us. Unfortunately, in Subarea 48.3, there is no State sovereignty recognized by all, because at least we do not recognize British sovereignty, and the British do not recognize ours. Therefore, fishing is not allowed according to the Statement by the Chair, based on point 5, which clearly states that it is not possible. Second, there is a sovereignty dispute over these islands, and the Parties are under an obligation not to take unilateral actions that would aggravate the issue. This is an international law obligation that the United Kingdom is also violating. Therefore, neither under the Convention nor under the law of the sea can the United Kingdom take the type of measures it is taking. All of this is contained in all the notes Argentina has submitted on this issue, but it's very clear that neither the Convention nor the law of the sea can allow them to do what they're doing.'

156. The Russian Federation made the following statement:

'The UK's flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* engaged in prohibited activities according to subsections (iii) and (viii) of paragraph 5 of CM 10-06, as they fished in closed area in contravention of CM 31-01. In this regard, Russia recommends to include mentioned UK-flagged vessels on the CP-IUU Vessel List taking into account information circulated to Members.

In accordance with Article XXI, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, each Contracting Party shall take appropriate measures within its competence to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Convention and with conservation measures adopted by the Commission to which the Party is bound in accordance with Article IX of this Convention. In this context, we consider any claims that the Contracting Parties have grounds to unilaterally issue licences for toothfish fishing in Subarea 48.3 in the absence of CCAMLR Conservation Measures being in force to be unfounded.'

157. The UK rejected the interpretation of the Chairman's statement set out by Argentina and reiterated its position on sovereignty, known to all Members.

158. The Russian Federation recalled its previous position on this issue, expressing the view that the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List, which includes the *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince*, would go forward to the Commission in the absence of consensus to exclude the vessels. Russia

further expressed the view that without consensus on adopting the Proposed List, SCIC could not adopt the CP-IUU Proposed List.

159. The Secretariat provided to SCIC clarification of the process for listing vessels under CM 10-06 and recalled that the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List is based on information submitted to, or available to, the Secretariat and circulated to all Contracting Parties for additional information. The Secretariat further noted that the Provisional List incorporates this information to assist SCIC in adopting a Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List by consensus, as is required by CM 10-06. SCIC agreed not to add or remove any vessels to or from the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at the previous meeting.

160. SCIC noted that no consensus could be reached for the inclusion of the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26, therefore no changes were proposed to the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43 (see Appendix II).

161. Russia enquired about the information presented in COMM CIRC 25/113 regarding an ongoing investigation of the vessels *Fortunagracht* and *Saga Sea* related to allegations of unauthorised activities during a port visit in Puerto Williams, Chile.

162. Russia expressed concern related to possible unauthorised activities of the vessels *Fortunagracht* and *Saga Sea* during a port visit in Puerto Williams, Chile.

163. Chile confirmed that it does not intend to request the inclusion of the vessels on the CP-IUU Vessel List 2025/26 this year and has circulated this information for SCIC's general awareness. Notwithstanding the above, and pending the outcome of the ongoing investigation, Chile could proceed with the corresponding actions within the timeframe established in CM 10-06.

164. Norway and the EU expressed their confusion regarding the information contained in COMM CIRC 25/113.

165. The EU noted that, from a procedural perspective, the alleged incident took place outside of the reporting period and that the circulation date was also beyond the deadlines for meeting paper submissions and for IUU listing proposals. The EU further expressed concern regarding the lack of detail provided in the Circular and that no other information had been received from Chile as regards the alleged incident, and noted that the information that was provided indicates an unrelated customs issue rather than an infringement of CCAMLR Conservation Measures. The EU indicated they have initiated an investigation and called on Chile to provide it with detailed information and evidence about the alleged incident.

166. Russia thanked Chile for the report, expressed disappointment that procedural matters have prevented those involved from clarifying allegations and undertaking the necessary investigations, and encouraged the EU and Norway to cooperate with Chile during this investigation and report any results to SCIC-2026.

167. Korea indicated that they had read the COMM CIRC 25/113 and noted that it was outside the timeframe for SCIC to effectively consider the information but respected Chile's plan to continue the investigation and report back to SCIC as appropriate.

168. Russia reiterated that the timeline was sufficient for Members to consider the information provided by Chile.

NCP-IUU Vessel List

169. SCIC considered the request from the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran) to remove the *Koosha 4* from the CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List.

170. Some Members acknowledged the information provided by Iran which indicated the vessel is in the process of scrapping but noted that independent vessel records from IHS and other independent sources still indicate the vessel is 'in service'. Some Members expressed reservations with removing the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List before there were independent verifications that the vessel is no longer in service.

171. Russia expressed that Iran had provided sufficient information to warrant delisting of the *Koosha 4*.

172. Some Members expressed willingness to consider an intersessional delisting of the *Koosha 4* through the Rule 7 procedure if additional, independent corroboration confirms the vessel is no longer in service prior to SCIC-2026.

173. SCIC did not reach consensus to remove the *Koosha 4* from the CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26.

174. SCIC considered information submitted by the EU on the ongoing scrapping of the NCP-IUU vessel *Antony*. The EU indicated that they intend to submit a report to CCAMLR once the scrapping has been completed and verified and proposed that it is premature to remove the vessel before verification has been attained.

175. SCIC reflected on its considerations of the information of the scrapping of the *Koosha 4* and the *Antony*, and noted a need for an exhaustive list on the requirements to be met when scrapping a vessel so it can be considered for the delisting from an IUU Vessel List.

176. SCIC agreed that there were no changes to the NCP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43. SCIC recommends that the Commission consider the Proposed NCP-IUU Vessel List as adopted at CCAMLR-43 (see Appendix III) and adopt the 2025/26 Final NCP-IUU Vessel List.

Fishery notifications

177. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report on fishery notifications for the 2025/26 season (CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1).

178. SCIC noted that the vessel *More Sodruzhestva*, which was notified by two Members, will fish under the Namibian flag for the 2025/26 season.

179. SCIC noted the late submission of the VME impact assessment and eight data fields required by CM 10-02, paragraph 3, by Ecuador for the fishery notification for the *Altar 45* in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 and referred this matter to the Commission for further consideration.

180. SCIC also noted the concerns raised by COLTO regarding the *Altar 45* which identified possible ties to known IUU fishing individuals as well as use of gillnet gear to target toothfish north of the Convention Area by the vessel's sister ship *Altar 11* (IMO 8904082).

181. The UK confirmed that the fishing vessel *Altar 11* is currently operating on the high seas in FAO Area 41 carrying gillnets and SCIC noted gillnets are prohibited within the Convention Area and in many other jurisdictions due to well-recognised concerns regarding their potential impacts on marine ecosystems and non-target species.

182. SCIC noted with concern that there is limited publicly available information on the ownership structure of Transmarina C.A. or any potential beneficial owners of the *Altar 45*.

183. SCIC requested assurances from Ecuador that they will exercise their Flag State responsibilities through implementation of the appropriate monitoring and control measures of the vessel; that the master, charterer, owner, and any beneficial owners have no association with IUU fishing; and that *Altar 45* will not carry gillnets while operating within the Convention Area. SCIC tasked the Secretariat with contacting Ecuador in this regard.

184. SCIC recommended that CM 10-05 should be amended to enable excluding trade in toothfish caught with gillnets from the CDS in order to prevent such catches entering the markets of Contracting Parties.

185. ASOC thanked COLTO for providing this information and noted that the possibility of links between a notorious fishing criminal and the *Altar 45* was a very serious issue. ASOC encouraged CCAMLR to ensure that licensed vessels do not use gillnets and do not have any links to IUU fishing.

186. SCIC noted the concerns raised by some Members and agreed to refer the matter to the Commission for further consideration.

187. Russia raised concerns related to the notification the two UK-flagged vessels, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* from all fishery notifications, noting the vessels' inclusion on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26.

188. The UK made the following statement:

'The UK confirms that the notifications for the two British-registered vessels were submitted in full compliance with all relevant Conservation Measure requirements. Accordingly, there is no basis on which to exclude them from participation in the Ross Sea exploratory toothfish fishery.

The UK also remains seriously concerned about the notifications submitted by the Russian Federation for FV *Alpha Crux* and FV *Yantar 31* for the upcoming Ross Sea toothfish season.

There is a history of unresolved compliance issues involving Russian-flagged vessels. Last year SCIC considered several serious compliance issues regarding *Alpha Crux*,

many of which required further investigation to demonstrate effective Flag State control. To date, no updates or reassurances have been provided.

Yantar 31 has also been re-notified, operated by Orion Co Ltd, the same operators as the *Yantar 35*, who's data still remains quarantined after unexplained high catch rates in Subarea 48.5. By Russia's own admission in CCAMLR 35/BG/29 Rev. 1, discrepancies identified with the activities of *Yantar 35* warranted the suspension of Orion Co Ltd from all fishing activities in the Convention Area. Yet without further evidence of investigation or reassurance that the operator can conduct their operations in a compliant manner, the Russian Federation now apparently seems content to support this notification.

The UK further notes that the Russian Federation has yet to respond to previous SCIC requests for information on several other matters, including the STS-50 investigation (SCIC-2018), gear recovery in Subarea 88.1 during a fishery closure (SCIC-2019), and the conduct of the *Palmer* in 2021.

Given these ongoing concerns, the UK is unable to support the inclusion of *Alpha Crux* and *Yantar 31* in the Ross Sea toothfish fishery for the forthcoming season.'

189. Many Members agreed with the UK's concerns regarding the Russian vessel notifications and did not support the notifications for the *Alpha Crux* and *Yantar 31*.

190. China encouraged all parties to reach consensus as soon as possible to formulate a new conservation measure to manage the fishery in Subarea 48.3 and further noted that no fishing should be allowed without a catch limit established.

191. Russia recalled that the notifications for the two Russian-flagged vessels were submitted in full compliance with relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measure requirements and there were no grounds to exclude them from participation in the Ross Sea exploratory toothfish fishery.

192. SCIC noted the concerns raised by some Members and agreed to refer these matters to the Commission for further consideration.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

193. SCIC considered the advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (Dr C. Cárdenas (Chile)) on several topics and thanked him for his time.

Delayed fishing gear retrieval

194. Russia sought clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee on the impacts and extent of overfishing resulting from delayed retrieval of longline gear in the toothfish fishery and how tagging data received after the season's closure is assessed.

195. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled that WG-FSA-2025 and the Scientific Committee have discussed delayed gear retrieval, noting that late retrieval and vessel departures

may affect the quality of data collection. The Chair of the Scientific Committee further recalled that the Scientific Committee had made a recommendation for further research in the intersessional period to account for this factor in the analyses.

Catch overruns

196. The United States recalled the discussion from WG-FSA-2022 on catch overruns in SSRU 88.2H, which had been mitigated by delaying the start of the fishery for that area, and asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether the Scientific Committee could identify underlying causes to inform practical solutions to prevent catch overruns.

197. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted overruns affect data quality in the fishery and recognised the need to explore alternatives, particularly considering delayed gear retrieval and the short fishing season in the area.

Notified gear descriptions

198. South Africa asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether changes to fishing gear during operations, compared with the original notifications, should be considered by the Scientific Committee and whether such changes could affect vessel catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE).

199. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that analyses are based on data collected by onboard observer. While there may be differences between notified gear and that reported by observers, the Chair of the Scientific Committee reassured SCIC that these do not affect the analytical outcomes.

200. China noted that how to modify fishing gear might be a matter for the Scientific Committee to consider, however, whether it can be modified and how to notify in a timely manner after modification should be addressed by SCIC.

Early arrival of vessels to Ross Sea region toothfish fishery (Subareas 88.1 and 88.2)

201. Concerning the early entry of vessels prior to the commencement of the fishing season, China asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee for their advice.

202. The UK recalled the significant overrun of toothfish in N70 Management Area and asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether the Scientific Committee had reviewed the CPUE of the vessels operating in this region, particularly for those vessels that entered early.

203. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled that this topic had been discussed during WG-FSA-2025 and the Scientific Committee, noting that this behaviour might affect the interpretation of the catch and effort data. He also noted that this may be a contributing factor in the short season in N70, and that it had been referred to the Commission for further consideration. The Chair also sought SCIC guidance on the apparent inconsistency whereby

vessels should leave immediately after the fishery closes but may re-enter before the next season.

204. Some Members noted that several vessels had entered the Convention Area before the conservation measure had been adopted by CCAMLR-43.

205. Some Members suggested a solution of amending the conservation measure to impose a time limit on entry to the fishing grounds.

206. China reiterated that these vessels' behaviours are not pre-season entry. Although the fishery has been closed, the fishing season is still ongoing, in accordance with CM 31-02, and these fishing vessels still stay in the fishing grounds instead of real departure after the fishery closure. Before the next fishing season begins, any vessel should not enter these closed fishing grounds.

207. Russia recalled the activities of Norwegian fishing vessels after a closure in the 2023/24 fishing season and noted that CM 31-02 applies to all fisheries. Russia also considered whether specifying how far in advance vessels may enter is appropriate.

208. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted ongoing efforts to assess the impact of pre-season activity on fishing grounds and to identify measures to prevent recurrence.

Defining calibration and standardisation

209. The Chair of the Scientific Committee sought SCIC's guidance on the definition and interpretation of 'Calibration/standardisation of sampling gear' in CM 24-01, Annex 24-01/A, Format 2, 3(a).

210. Russia noted that there are global standards on fishing gear and in its view, SCIC does not have the competence to address this issue and requested the Scientific Committee to consult alternative sources of information.

211. Many Members noted the need for SCIC to provide guidance on interpreting the terms 'calibration' and 'standardisation' in Format 2, and that this issue had been raised in the past by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-41). These Members noted, in the context of the CM, 'calibration' would appear to refer to calibrating between different types of gear, while 'standardisation' could refer to using the same type of gear, and that both are distinct terms which do not prohibit the use of multiple gear types under Format 2. These Members further noted that all Members of the Scientific Committee except for Russia share this interpretation.

Fish nests

212. Some Members asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether depth-limited measures for active fish nests should be considered in the context of CCAMLR-44/21 (paragraphs 81 to 84). The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled the discussions formulated in the reports of the Scientific Committee meetings in 2022 and 2023 regarding the

protection of fish nests areas in the Convention Area and noted that he would refer the question back to the Scientific Committee.

Consideration of the Second Performance Review

213. SCIC considered the summary of outcomes from the Second Performance Review (PR2) (CCAMLR-44/06) which provided an updated report on the actions taken by CCAMLR in response to PR2 recommendations. SCIC, along with the Commission and Scientific Committee, were invited to approve revisions to the text.

214. SCIC noted the outcomes and progress made regarding the SCIC relevant items and encouraged the Secretariat to consider proposals made by some Members regarding a few outstanding items in the PR2, such as Recommendations 11 (refining compliance follow up procedures), 12 (operationalising verification for transshipment) and 14 (enhance cooperation with adjacent regional fisheries bodies).

215. SCIC noted that significant time has passed since the PR2 was approved in 2017 and that the recommendations should be reviewed for their suitability. SCIC noted that a proposal for a Third Performance Review (PR3) (CCAMLR-44/25) will be considered by the Commission.

Other business

216. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/BG/27 submitted by ASOC, which brought developments relevant to fishing vessel and environmental safety, as well as other vessel matters, to the attention of SCIC.

217. ASOC made the following statement:

‘CCAMLR-44/BG/27 draws CCAMLR’s attention to new IMO regulations on navigation and voyage planning that would be mandatory for fishing vessels in the Antarctic Area during the coming season. ASOC recommended that CCAMLR review and update Resolution 23/XXIII and Resolution 34/XXXI to be in line with the Polar Code and IMO Guidelines for safety measures for fishing vessels. ASOC further recommended that CCAMLR develop a new CCAMLR Resolution requiring CCAMLR registered fishing vessels to follow the IMO’s safety guidelines throughout the Convention Area and that the IMO Guidelines for safety measures for fishing vessels of 24 m in length be uploaded to CCAMLR’s website. Finally, ASOC urged CCAMLR to take action to reduce lost, abandoned and discarded fishing gear and other sources of marine plastics from fishing vessels, and to address the management of grey water from fishing vessels.’

218. SCIC thanked ASOC for their work and emphasised the importance of CCAMLR remaining informed of developments within the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

219. Russia recalled the outcomes of the interim report reflected in the MAIB safety bulletin 4/2024 regarding the foundering of the UK-flagged fishing vessel *Argos Georgia* in 2024 and

requested that the UK provide information regarding safety measures for the vessels built based on an identical design being exploited in the CAMLR Convention Area to prevent future loss of life at sea.

220. The UK made the following statement:

‘The UK expresses its deep sorrow over the tragic loss of the fishing vessel and crew members of the *Argos Georgia* and we extend our condolences to all those affected. The UK regrets that this incident has been raised in this manner. Given that the matter has been raised however, the UK wishes to respectfully remind delegates that the vessel was lost outside the Convention Area and is not an appropriate matter for SCIC discussions.

The UK affirms that all UK vessels notified for the exploratory Ross Sea toothfish fishery possess the required Flag and Vessel Class certifications to operate in the Southern Ocean. This includes compliance with the UK’s mandatory requirement for all vessels operating south of 60 degrees to be ice-strengthened, in accordance with CCAMLR Resolution 20/22. Something we would continue to advocate for all vessels operating in this fishery.’

221. Russia noted concern at the tragedy and indicated that vessels with similar characteristics are operating in the Convention Area and sought clarification on reviews or inquiries made by the UK that may affect other vessels facing similar risks.

222. The UK referred to their previous statement (paragraph 220) on this matter.

223. Argentina made the following statement:

‘In its note of September 10, 2025, Argentina noted that the United Kingdom, in its COMM CIRC 25/71, stated that the measures it intends to implement to authorize its vessels to fish in Subarea 48.3 are consistent with CCAMLR regulations. This demonstrates that they fall outside the framework of the Convention and the Convention’s regulations. Consequently, we are concerned that attempts are being made to use the mechanisms and instruments for certifying the legality of fisheries provided by CCAMLR, such as inspection forms and its website, to publish the reports that motivated our note, as this seeks to give illegal British fishing activities an appearance of legality that they objectively lack. In other words, the dissemination of such inspection reports through CCAMLR unlawfully seeks to give the impression that the vessels’ activities are carried out in compliance with the Convention and its regulations, and it is clearly the United Kingdom, in its own note, that says that this is a domestic measure consistent with CCAMLR but outside of CCAMLR, so what we are asking is that the Secretariat remove these British inspection reports from the CCAMLR website. What concerns us is that all parties are aware of this problem, they know what’s happening, which is why the vast majority of Parties are not fishing or importing this fishery. But perhaps a third party, in good faith, sees that this fishing is taking place anyway, even though it shouldn’t be, because conservation measure 41-02 is not in force. They see that there are inspection reports, they see that there is a catch documentation system, and perhaps in good faith they would like or understand that this is within the CCAMLR framework, but it isn’t. Therefore, we must be clear and transparent about this. Regarding the catch documentation system and the information the Secretariat receives regarding this fishery under 48.3, Argentina understands that it is important

that all fishing data in the Convention area be available, whether legal or illegal, because we need to know everything that is being caught. But it is clear, since there is a footnote that says specifically regarding fishing in 48.3, that the Secretariat received information regarding vessels fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 and that fishing for *Dissostichus* in Subarea 48.3 is being conducted in the absence of a CCAMLR conservation measure, since Conservation Measure 41-02 was not re-adopted for the 2024/25 fishing season. In closing, I want to say that we allow this catch data to be there with this explanatory footnote, but it is not appropriate in any way for a CCAMLR inspection report to be issued for a non-CCAMLR activity.’

224. The United Kingdom made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects the suggestion that the fishery in Subarea 48.3 is being operated outside the framework of Convention. We recall our previous statements about the management of the South Georgia toothfish fishery and that strict controls are implemented to ensure that fishing occurs only on a sustainable basis and in line with the best available science. The fishery is managed and operated to comply fully with the Convention and all applicable Conservation Measures.

In particular, the United Kingdom rejects any suggestion that the 48.3 toothfish fishery is being operated in contravention of Conservation Measure 31-01 or that the UK vessels engaged in the fishery are non-compliant. Our position has been set out in detail, most recently in response to the Draft CCEP summary report, COMM CIRC 25/100 and we have had an exhaustive discussion of this matter during this meeting and previous meetings.

With respect to the vessel inspection reports referenced by Argentina, these vessels were inspected under the established CCAMLR System of Inspection and found to be compliant with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures. The UK is therefore firmly of the view that these inspections were CCAMLR inspections and should be recorded as such.’

225. Argentina made the following statement:

‘I believe our duty is to be responsible and not create confusion, especially in third countries, with things that aren’t true. So I think the logical thing to do, if these reports aren’t going to be removed because there’s no consensus, is to include a footnote similar to the one used when the Secretariat receives information regarding fishing of *Dissostichus* in this Subarea. There’s a footnote agreed upon by all that says that *Dissostichus* fishing in this Subarea is being carried out in the absence of a CCAMLR conservation measure, given that 41-02 wasn’t adopted for this season. Therefore, the minimum requirement we ask for, in order to be fair to the other Parties and especially to third parties, in good faith, is that these inspection reports make it clear that this fishing is being carried out without a conservation measure authorizing it, such as 41-02. A footnote like this in the inspection reports is the same as what is currently in the monthly catch reports, so I don’t think this is an inconvenience, and at least anyone who reads it will realize that in these cases there is an irregular situation.’

226. Russia noted that the inspection reports submitted were inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention and therefore should not be accessible on the website, given that there is no Conservation Measure in place for the area where fishing occurred.

227. China noted that a new conservation measure for Subarea 48.3 is required, and in the absence of catch limits, no catches are permitted.

228. The UK recalled its previous statements on this matter (paragraph 224).

229. SCIC was unable to reach consensus on whether to remove the inspection reports from the website.

230. Argentina noted that if removal was not possible, the minimum expectation would be to include a descriptive caption on the inspection report webpage as follows:

‘The Secretariat received information regarding vessels fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3. Fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 is being conducted in the absence of a CCAMLR Conservation Measure, given that CM 41-02 was not readopted for the 2024/25 fishing season.’

231. SCIC agreed to task the Secretariat with implementing the descriptive caption on the inspection report webpage as requested.

232. SCIC encouraged interested Members to consider nominations of a SCIC Vice-Chair, however noted that no nominations were received.

Secretariat tasking

233. SCIC reviewed the Secretariat tasking table prepared based on the requests made during SCIC-2025 and noted the high prioritisation of the ongoing electronic reporting and automated VMS movement notification projects (Appendix IV).

234. SCIC agreed to retain this agenda item to review Secretariat tasking by SCIC on its agenda for SCIC-2026.

Close of the meeting

235. SCIC expressed its appreciation to Mr Berry for his effective chairmanship of the meeting.

236. The Chair thanked Members for their constructive engagement and noted the significant progress achieved, as well as the ongoing work to be advanced in future years.

Summary CCAMLR Compliance Report 2024/2025
Part A

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
CM 10-03						
44-001	New Zealand	<i>San Aspiring</i>	<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 4, requires vessels seeking entry to port to provide the information contained in Annex 10-03/A at least 48 hours in advance to allow adequate time to examine the required information.</p> <p>The inspection report for the <i>San Aspiring</i> for the inspection undertaken by New Zealand on 3 February 2025 noted that Part A of the port inspection was submitted on the same day (3 February 2025).</p>	<p>The <i>San Aspiring</i> failed to submit their Part-A port inspection form within the required timeframe specified in the CM,</p> <p>New Zealand has issued the operator of the vessel with an official warning and reminded them of the conditions under its Permit.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-002	Chile		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Korean-flagged vessel <i>Blue Ocean</i> entered the Chilean port of Punta Arenas at 05:00 13 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 16:15 15 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 11 hours 15 minutes</p>	<p>En relación al retraso de 11 horas y 15 minutos para la inspección en puerto del buque coreano <i>Blue Ocean</i> el día 13 de febrero de 2025 en el puerto de Punta Arenas, se informa que ello se debió a un problema puntual de disponibilidad de personal durante el plazo establecido por la Medida de Conservación para su materialización. Es relevante señalar que este retraso ocurrió sólo en 1 de las 33 inspecciones realizadas por Chile durante el período analizado, lo que refleja un alto</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>estándar de cumplimiento general por parte de Chile.</p> <p>Con el fin de evitar que este tipo de situaciones se repita en el futuro, se instruirán las medidas de reforzamiento en la jurisdicción respectiva, solicitando a los equipos de inspección optimizar su coordinación y disponibilidad operativa para asegurar que las inspecciones en puerto se materialicen dentro de los plazos normativos previstos.</p> <p>Regarding the 11-hour and 15-minute delay in the port inspection of the Korean vessel <i>Blue Ocean</i> on 13 February 2025 in the port of Punta Arenas, it is reported that this was due to a specific problem with staff availability during the period established by the Conservation Measure for its implementation. It is important to note that this delay occurred in only 1 of the 33 inspections carried out by Chile during the period analysed, reflecting a high standard of overall compliance by Chile.</p> <p>In order to prevent this type of situation from recurring in the future, reinforcement measures will be implemented in the respective jurisdiction, requesting inspection teams to optimize their coordination and operational availability to ensure that port inspections are carried out within the established deadlines.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-003	France		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The French-flagged vessel <i>Sainte Rose</i> entered the French port of Le Port, Reunion at 17:00 19 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 07:00 24 Feb 2025. The fishing activity occurred in Division 58.4.2.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 2 days 14 hours</p>	<p>The inspection has begun on the 19th of February with the check and report of the seals, and then has been continued and finalised on the 24th of February with the breaking of the seals. An error has been made reporting the date of the end of the inspection. We have joined to this answer an internal administrative report indicating that the inspection started on the 19th of February. The inspection was effectively conducted within 48h of the port entry, as required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-004	Namibia		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> entered the Namibian port of Walvis Bay at 04:30 UTC 15 June 2024 and was inspected at 09:00 UTC 17 June 2024.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 4 hours 30 minutes</p>	<p>The vessel was pre-inspected on arrival in port 15 June 2024. Offloading of cargo was concluded on 17 June 2024 whereafter the full inspection report was completed and submitted to SEAFO Secretariat.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-005	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The New Zealand-flagged vessel <i>Janas</i> entered the New Zealand port of Nelson at</p>	<p>The <i>Janas</i> had notified that it would be coming into port on the 7th February 2025. A Fishery Officer was arranged to inspect the vessel within the 48-hour period.</p> <p>The vessel came in earlier than expected on the 5th February. The vessel manager</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>15:00 05 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 10:04 08 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 19 hours 4 minutes</p>	<p>did not notify MPI of this and the Fishery Officer had not checked to see of the vessel arrival date had changed.</p> <p>New Zealand has investigated this. Relevant staff have been briefed, and training has been updated to prevent recurrence. Improved monitoring of vessel movements into Port Nelson has also been put in place.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-006	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Australian-flagged vessel <i>Antarctic Discovery</i> entered the New Zealand port of Nelson at 09:00 01 Sep 2024 and was inspected at 12:00 05 Sep 2024.</p> <p>In submission of the inspection report New Zealand noted the following: “Unfortunately, this inspection falls outside of the 48-hour timeframe. The inspection was delayed due to miscommunication from the local office (after notification from the international team of the vessels arrival) and the inspecting fishery officer.”</p>	<p>The inspection was delayed because of miscommunication between the inspecting officers and the national team; the inspecting officers did not realise that the CCAMLR Conservation Measures applied to the vessel, which was returning from the SPRFMO area and was carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp.</p> <p>New Zealand has investigated this. Relevant staff have been briefed, and training has been updated to prevent recurrence</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 2 days 3 hours			
44-007	South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i> entered the South African port of Cape Town on 09:30 1 May 2025 and was inspected at 09:00 8 May 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 4 days 23 hours 30 minutes.</p>	<p>Following the delay in inspecting the Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i>, the following measures have been implemented to ensure strict compliance with Port State obligations and relevant conservation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity Building: All Fishery Control Officers (FCOs) will continue inhouse targeted training on CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO conservation measures. A recent workshop conducted by the Secretariat will ensure that officials are fully equipped to be familiarized and cross-train other officials with the relevant regulations. 2. Dedicated Oversight: A dedicated FCO has been appointed to manage all inspections of CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO-flagged vessels. In their absence, alternate FCOs are instructed to provide immediate coverage to prevent delays. 3. Streamlined Communication & Reporting: The assigned FCO will oversee all correspondence related to inspections, under the close supervision of the Acting Director: Compliance, who will be copied on all reports to ensure no submissions are overlooked. 4. Monitoring and Continuous Improvement: Compliance monitoring will 	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>be enhanced through regular reviews of inspection timelines. Lessons learned from any delays will inform ongoing training and operational adjustments, ensuring that future inspections meet all deadlines and regulatory obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-008	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Russian-flagged vessel <i>Yantar 31</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 18:00 28 March 2025 and was inspected at 13:30 31 March 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 19 hours 30 minutes</p>	<p>La inspección se realizó con un retraso por la imposibilidad de acceso físico al barco. La inspección se puede llevar a cabo una vez que se habilita el acceso físico de los inspectores al barco, situación que provoca retrasos sistemáticos en relación a la fecha de ingreso oficial del barco a puerto.</p> <p>Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: considerando los antecedentes, operaciones anteriores y revisión de documentación, el <i>Yantar 31</i> RUS fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p>The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 110

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p>During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities; after considering the vessel's background, past operations, and documentation, the <i>Yantar 31</i> RUS was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p> <p>Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones en el sistema GIES (Global Information Echange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p>Work is under way to improve the processes for prior vessel notification to the port authority in order to streamline inspection times. It should be noted that as of May 2025, inspections began to be entered into the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation to enter the port of Montevideo.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-009	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 08:00 26 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 13:00 28 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 5 hours</p>	<p>La inspección de realizó con un retraso por la imposibilidad de acceso físico al barco. La inspección se puede llevar a cabo una vez que se habilita el acceso físico de los inspectores al barco, situación que provoca retrasos sistemáticos en relación a la fecha de ingreso oficial del barco a puerto.</p> <p>Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: considerando los antecedentes, operaciones anteriores y revisión de documentación, el <i>Helena Ndume</i> NAM fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p>The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p>During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities: after considering the vessel's background, past operations, and documentation, the <i>Helena Ndume</i> NAM was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones en el sistema GIES (Global Information Echange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p>There is ongoing work to improve the processes for the vessels’ prior notification to the port authority in order to improve inspection times. It should be noted that as of May 2025, inspections began to be entered into the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation to enter the port of Montevideo.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-010	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 08:00 10 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 17:30 12 Feb 2025.</p>	<p>La inspección de realizó con un retraso por la imposibilidad de acceso físico al barco. La inspección se puede llevar a cabo una vez que se habilita el acceso físico de los inspectores al barco, situación que provoca retrasos sistemáticos en relación a la fecha de ingreso oficial del barco a puerto.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 9 hours 30 minutes	<p data-bbox="1167 252 1615 587">En concreto, esta unidad pesquera FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> (URY), contaba con el sistema de VMS centralizado y un Observador Científico nacional a bordo. Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: el citado FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 624 1615 831">The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 868 1615 1139">Specifically, the FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> (URY) had a centralized VMS system and a national scientific observer on board. During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities: the FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1176 1615 1390">Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que, a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>en el sistema GIES (Global Information Exchange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p>Work is under way to improve the processes for prior vessel notification to the port authority in order to streamline inspection times.</p> <p>It should be noted that, as of May 2025, inspections began to be recorded in the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation for entry to the port of Montevideo.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-011	Chile		<p>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 inspection of the Chilean-flagged vessel <i>Globalpesca I</i> occurred on 25 March 2025 at Punta Arenas, Chile.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p>	<p>Con relación al retraso en el envío a la Secretaría del informe de inspección en puerto a la embarcación chilena <i>GLOBALPESCA I</i>, la cual fue realizada el 25 de marzo de 2025 en el puerto de Punta Arenas y notificada a la Secretaría el día 17 de julio de 2025 (84 vencido el plazo), se informa que ello se debió a una confusión asociada a un problema de control y supervisión para su envío dentro de los plazos establecidos en la Medida de Conservación. Es relevante señalar que este retraso ocurrió sólo en 1 de las 33 inspecciones realizadas por Chile durante el período analizado, lo que refleja un alto estándar de cumplimiento general por parte de Chile.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 84 days	<p>Con el fin de evitar la reiteración de este tipo de situaciones, se han reforzado los mecanismos internos de control y supervisión, con el objeto de asegurar que los informes de inspección sean remitidos a la Secretaría dentro de los plazos normativos previstos.</p> <p>Regarding to delay in sending the port inspection report on the Chilean vessel <i>GLOBALPESCA I</i> to the Secretariat, which was carried out on March 25, 2025, in the port of Punta Arenas and notified to the Secretariat on July 17, 2025 (84 days after the deadline), it is reported that this was due to confusion associated with a control and supervision problem for its submission within the deadlines established in the Conservation Measure. It is important to note that this delay occurred in only 1 of the 33 inspections carried out by Chile during the period analysed, reflecting a high standard of overall compliance by Chile.</p> <p>In order to prevent the recurrence of such situations, internal control and supervision mechanisms have been strengthened to ensure that inspection reports are submitted to the Secretariat within the prescribed timeframes.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-012	Namibia		<p>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>Namibia issued DCD NA-24-0002-E which states that the <i>Helena Ndume</i> unloaded 4 905 kg of toothfish from Area 47 on 17 June 2024 at Walvis Bay, Namibia.</p> <p>The inspection of the Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> occurred on 17 June 2024 at Walvis Bay, Namibia.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 365 days</p>	<p>The <i>Helena Ndume</i> was licence to harvest toothfish in SEAFO Convention Area. She complied with all SEAFO Reporting Requirements, and the SEAFO port inspection report was submitted to SEAFO Secretariat within the required time frame. Namibia unfortunately neglects to submit copy of the port inspection report to CCAMLR Secretariat and when made aware by the Secretariat, the inspection report was submitted on the same date of 17 June 2025 as requested.</p> <p>Further Action: Namibia commits to ensure that port inspection reports will be shared with both CCAMLR and SEAFO irrespective of where the vessel operates and unload her cargo.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-013	South Africa		<p>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 inspection of the Ukrainian-flagged vessel <i>More Sodruzhestva</i> occurred on 25 May 2024 by South African port officials</p>	<p>The inspection was done timeously, however the delay to submit the report was due to the lack of dedicated inspectors with specific roles to take responsibility of submitting the reports.</p> <p>This matter has been addressed and officials have been assigned to this function.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>and the transmission of the port inspection report occurred on 6 August 2024.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 43 days</p>	<p>There was no compliance issues reported in the inspection form, with the vessel being fully compliant with all Conservation Measures for the trip.</p> <p>To address this challenge and prevent delays in reporting, South Africa has strengthened its inspection procedures. These reports will be updated and finalized as soon as offloading concludes, ensuring timely communication regardless of operational delays.</p> <p>To reinforce consistency, a dedicated Fishery Control Officer (FCO) has been assigned to all CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO vessels. All inspection reports will be copied to the Acting Director: Compliance, who will provide oversight and ensure that no submissions are missed.</p> <p>South Africa regrets the delay in reporting in this instance and is confident that the above measures will ensure more timely inspection reporting in the future, while maintaining full compliance with Port State obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: None required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-014	South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the</p>	<p>South Africa is committed to strengthening the effectiveness and consistency of its Port State measures across all relevant RFMOs.</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i> occurred on 08 May 2025 by South African port officials. A IOTC port inspection report was transmitted to the CCAMLR Secretariat on 26 Jun 2025. A CCAMLR port inspection form was requested and provided on 2 July 2025. The fishing activity occurred in Area 47 and Subareas 88.1 and 48.6. Only toothfish and bait species were reported in the inspection reports, no tuna species.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: IOTC inspection report 20 days and CCAMLR inspection report 26 days</p>	<p>To further improve efficiency, a dedicated Fishery Control Officer (FCO) has been assigned to oversee inspections of all CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO vessels. Where the assigned officer is unavailable, coverage will be provided by other trained FCOs to ensure continuity.</p> <p>To ensure robust oversight, the Acting Director: Compliance will be copied on all reports and will monitor submissions to confirm their timely transmission.</p> <p>Through these measures, South Africa aims to reinforce its commitment to full transparency, accountability, and cooperation with CCAMLR and other RFMOs</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-015	United Kingdom		<p>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 inspection of the UK-flagged vessel <i>Argos Helena</i> occurred on 08 April 2025.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection</p>	<p>The UK investigated this potential compliance issue.</p> <p>The port inspection was carried out on 8 April, in accordance with Conservation Measure 10-03. On the same day, the inspection report was submitted to the single contact point at the monitoring centre, rather than to the monitoring team, as required.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 70 days</p>	<p>Subsequently, the responsible individual attempted to submit the report to the Secretariat on 10 April. However, due to a system error, the email remained in the outbox and was not delivered. This issue went unnoticed as the individual commenced a period of annual leave immediately afterward.</p> <p>Following notification from the Secretariat, the report was promptly submitted to the Secretariat on 17 July.</p> <p>A consultation with the relevant departments has since been completed. As a result, internal guidance and procedures have been updated to prevent similar issues from occurring in the future.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-016	Uruguay		<p>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 inspection of the Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> occurred on 12 Feb 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection</p>	<p>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 26 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 134 days</p>	<p>de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-017	Uruguay		<p>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>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The inspection of the Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> occurred on 26 May 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 26 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 31 days</p>	<p>2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los periodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-018	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to</p>	<p>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Russian-flagged vessel <i>Yantar 31</i> occurred on 31 March 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 23 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 84 days</p>	<p>técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)						
CM 10-04						
44-019	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Albius</i> for entry into Division 58.4.4b. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 0551 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 0825 UTC 05 August 2024 for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Division 58.4.4b notifying the entry time of 0322 UTC 26 July 2024.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 9 days 5 hours 3 minutes</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. The vessel hadn't expected her course to go that South and enter the CCAMLR area, so the crew forgot to provide a notification.</p> <p>Further Action: A reminder to be careful and diligent with CCAMLR notification has been made to the vessel.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-020	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Albius</i> for entry into Division 58.5.1. The Secretariat requested a movement</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. The vessel hadn't expected her course to go that South and enter the CCAMLR area, so the crew forgot to provide a notification.</p> <p>Further Action: A reminder to be careful and diligent with CCAMLR notification has been made.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 0551 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 0825 UTC 05 August 2024 for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Division 58.5.1 notifying the entry time of 1920 UTC 26 July 2024.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 8 days 13 hours 5 minutes</p>	<p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-021	France	<i>Ile de la Reunion II</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Ile de la Reunion II</i> for entry into Division 58.4.4b. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 13 August 2024 2258 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 14 August 2024 0429 UTC for the <i>Ile de la Reunion II</i> entry into Division 58.4.4b notifying the entry time of 13 August 2024 0250 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 1 hour 39 minutes</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided 1 hour and 39 minutes after the 24h-deadline. The ship forgot to transmit the notification.</p> <p>Further Action: Reminders to the ship have been issued.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-022	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Master</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24</p>	<p>This case does not constitute non-compliance. Both the <i>SAE IN MASTER</i></p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Sae In Master</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0519 UTC for the <i>Sae In Master</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1500 UTC.</p> <p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 14 hours 19 minutes</p>	<p>and <i>SAE IN PIONEER</i> submitted entry and movement reports when transiting from the Ross Sea SRZ into 88.2A MPA GPZ 1. These reports were filed on 27 January 2025 at 01:44 and 07:35 UTC, respectively—within 24 hours of their entry into Subarea 88.2A as required by CM 10-04.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances</p> <p>The Ross Sea SRZ covers Subareas 88.1K and 88.2A. Both vessels filed entry and movement reports when first entering the SRZ, and thereafter continued navigating within the SRZ.</p> <p>Because GPZ 1 is located inside Subarea 88.2A, the reports submitted upon entering GPZ 1 were treated as the required entry and movement reports for Subarea 88.2A.</p> <p>The vessels did not exit the SRZ (e.g. from 88.1K into 88.1I) and then re-enter Subarea 88.2A, which would have required an additional set of intention and movement reports. Instead, they remained continuously within the Ross Sea SRZ before proceeding into GPZ 1 of 88.2A.</p> <p>Both vessels submitted their movement reports for 88.2A MPA GPZ 1 on 27 January 2025 within 24 hours of entry, thereby meeting the requirements of CM 10-04.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>4) Record of Reports Submitted (UTC times)</p> <p><i>SAE IN MASTER</i></p> <p>A. 88.1 SRZ Intention Entry Report: 25 Jan 2025, 10:54</p> <p>B. 88.1 SRZ Movement Report: 26 Jan 2025, 02:23</p> <p>C. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Intention Entry Report: 26 Jan 2025, 05:09</p> <p>D. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Movement Report: 27 Jan 2025, 01:44</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-023	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Pioneer</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Sae In Pioneer</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0512 UTC for the <i>Sae In Pioneer</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1900 UTC.</p>	<p>This case does not constitute non-compliance. Both the <i>SAE IN MASTER</i> and <i>SAE IN PIONEER</i> submitted entry and movement reports when transiting from the Ross Sea SRZ into 88.2A MPA GPZ 1. These reports were filed on 27 January 2025 at 01:44 and 07:35 UTC, respectively—within 24 hours of their entry into Subarea 88.2A as required by CM 10-04.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances</p> <p>The Ross Sea SRZ covers Subareas 88.1K and 88.2A. Both vessels filed entry and movement reports when first entering the SRZ, and thereafter continued navigating within the SRZ.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 10 hours 12 minutes</p>	<p>Because GPZ 1 is located inside Subarea 88.2A, the reports submitted upon entering GPZ 1 were treated as the required entry and movement reports for Subarea 88.2A.</p> <p>The vessels did not exit the SRZ (e.g. from 88.1K into 88.1I) and then re-enter Subarea 88.2A, which would have required an additional set of intention and movement reports. Instead, they remained continuously within the Ross Sea SRZ before proceeding into GPZ 1 of 88.2A.</p> <p>Both vessels submitted their movement reports for 88.2A MPA GPZ 1 on 27 January 2025 within 24 hours of entry, thereby meeting the requirements of CM 10-04.</p> <p>4) Record of Reports Submitted (UTC times)</p> <p><i>SAE IN PIONEER</i></p> <p>A. 88.1 SRZ Intention Entry Report: 25 Jan 2025, 19:32</p> <p>B. 88.1 SRZ Movement Report: 26 Jan 2025, 09:13</p> <p>C. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Intention Entry Report: 26 Jan 2025, 02:54</p> <p>D. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Movement Report: 27 Jan 2025, 07:35</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-024	Korea, Republic of	<i>Southern Park</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Southern Park</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0616 UTC for the <i>Southern Park</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1306 UTC.</p> <p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 17 hours 10 minutes</p>	<p>Timeline</p> <p>Jan 25, 2025 23:30 UTC: Hongjin Corp. HQ sent a directive to the Hongjin fleet to report their movement after concluding operations in subarea 88.1.</p> <p>Jan 26, 2025: Hongjin Corp. HQ and the vessel received an official letter from the Republic of Korea's FMC, based on a letter sent from the CCAMLR Secretariat to the ROK FMC on Jan 28.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 04:47 UTC :After confirming the official letter, HQ attempted to contact the <i>Southern Park</i> again but failed due to poor communication. HQ then contacted the <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> and instructed it to submit the movement report on behalf of the <i>Southern Park</i>.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 05:25 UTC: The <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> and <i>Seven Park</i> completed their movement reports from subarea 88.1 to 88.2. It was confirmed through the fleet that the <i>Southern Park's</i> report was delayed due to poor communication, and the vessel would report once the connection stabilized.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 05:40 UTC: The <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> submitted the movement report to the Secretariat on behalf of the <i>Southern Park</i>.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 06:16 UTC: A corrected report was resubmitted due to an error in the previously reported information.</p> <p>Despite the best efforts of the <i>Southern Park</i> to respond as proactively as possible, the transmission was not successfully completed within the regulated 24-hour period during the transit, leading to a delay</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>in the movement report due to communication errors.</p> <p>During the 24/25 fishing season, the <i>Southern Park</i> was equipped with a total of four communication systems (two Inmarsat FBB sets, GX equipment, and an Iridium phone). However, communication failures frequently occurred in certain areas. To prevent compliance issues arising from such failures in the upcoming season, Hongjin Corp. plans to install additional Starlink communication equipment on all its vessels to minimize connection disturbances. A trial installation of Starlink on the <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> during the same season confirmed its stable connectivity in the Antarctic region. As follow-up actions, the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries issued a warning to the operator, provided an educational session and instructed to submit a plan for preventive measures.</p> <p>As part of the measures, the vessel will be using its electronic reporting system which features two-way communication between the vessel and the Korean FMC in addition to its communication with the CCAMLR Secretariat, to make sure all required information is transmitted in a timely manner even with weather-induced communication disturbances.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-025	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 16 December 2024 0209 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 16 December 2024 0638 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 13 December 2024 0811 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 1 day 22 hours 27 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s finding regarding the absence of a clear and timely entry notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> into Subarea 58.7 on 13 December 2024.</p> <p>The vessel did transmit several emails during this period, including positional reports and explanations of movements. However, these communications were not expressed in the prescribed CM 10-04 Annex 10-04/A format and were therefore not interpreted by the Secretariat as constituting a formal entry notification. South Africa accepts that this caused uncertainty and resulted in the notification being considered late.</p> <p>We apologise for this lack of clarity. The master of the vessel has been formally instructed to ensure that all future subarea entry, exit, and movement reports are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transmitted explicitly as entry notifications when crossing into a subarea; • made strictly in compliance with CM 10-04, paragraph 13, using the prescribed Annex 10-04/A format; and • submitted within the required 24-hour timeframe. <p>To prevent recurrence, the Department has re-issued guidance to the vessel master, reinforcing the need for clarity, format compliance, and timeliness in all movement notifications.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Further Action: No further action required</p>		
				<p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-026	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 18 December 2024 0927 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 14 December 2024 0816 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 3 days 1 hour 11 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s observation regarding the movement notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> on 18 December 2024, relating to its entry into Subarea 58.7 at 08:16 UTC on 14 December 2024.</p> <p>It is noted that while the vessel master did transmit a position and activity update to various recipients on 14 December 2024, the formal movement notification to the Secretariat was only received on 18 December 2024, thereby exceeding the 24-hour reporting deadline set out in CM 10-04, paragraph 13.</p> <p>This delay arose due to the sequencing of notifications and the failure to submit the report in the prescribed CM 10-04A format, which created uncertainty and ultimately resulted in non-compliance with the strict timeline.</p> <p>Corrective measures have been taken. The vessel master has been reminded of the specific requirements under CM 10-04, paragraph 13, and instructed to ensure all future reports are submitted directly to the Secretariat, within the required timeframe, and in the prescribed format. Furthermore, the Department has reiterated reporting</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>obligations to all operators and strengthened internal monitoring procedures to prevent recurrence.</p> <p>South Africa reaffirms its commitment to ensuring full compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures and will continue working with the Secretariat to maintain consistency and accuracy in reporting</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-027	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 30 September 2024 1851 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 29 September 2024 0722 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 11 hours 29 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s observation regarding the movement notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> on 30 September 2024.</p> <p>We note that the vessel master submitted notifications on 29 September 2024 regarding entry into the EEZ as well as commencement of fishing activities. However, the subsequent movement notification to the Secretariat was received outside of the 24-hour period prescribed in CM 10-04, paragraph 13.</p> <p>The delay resulted from the sequencing and format of the transmitted messages, which may have created difficulty in verifying compliance within the required timeframe. While notifications were indeed submitted, they were not provided in the prescribed CM 10-04A format.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>The Department has since reminded the master of the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> of the strict requirement to submit all movement reports within the 24-hour deadline and in the correct format. In addition, guidance has been reinforced to all operators to prevent recurrence of similar issues, and enhanced monitoring measures are being applied to ensure future compliance with CM 10-04.</p> <p>South Africa remains committed to maintaining full transparency and adherence to CCAMLR conservation measures and appreciates the Secretariat’s continued engagement in strengthening implementation</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
CM 10-05						
44-028	Argentina		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i></p>	<p>With regard to this incident, the Argentine National Directorate of Fisheries Coordination and Supervision has informed that all the steps in the eCDS of this document were completed and validated on June 28, 2024, prior to the date of export, except for Step 4, where the signature was omitted due to an inadvertent error. Alerted to this by the exporting company about the box that had</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Argentina validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for <1% of Argentina's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p> <p>1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>been left unvalidated, this error was corrected. The merchandise was able to enter its destination in Port Everglades.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action is needed.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-029	Chile		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Chile validated 3 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for <1% of Chile's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p>	<p>Con relación a la identificación de 3 DEDs que fueron validados en forma extemporánea, se informa que ellos se encuentran asociados 3 embarques diferentes de <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> (TOP) realizados por Chile durante el período analizado.</p> <p>El primer caso (DED 3E7E-94A4-7D28), con fecha de exportación del 16 de abril de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 9 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 08 de mayo de 2025 (22 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>El segundo caso (DED E517-A696-3F64), con fecha de exportación del 20 de abril de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 36 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 04 de junio de 2025 (45 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>El tercer caso (DED DAEC-9500-EBD3), con fecha de exportación del 10 de mayo de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 49 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 05 de junio de 2025 (26 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>Una característica del sistema eCDS implementado en Chile, es la gran cantidad de DCD y DED que se validan (sobre el 65% del total mundial), lo que se explica por tener que registrar en el sistema eCDS</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 21–50 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>las capturas de TOP realizadas dentro de nuestra Zona Económica Exclusiva (ZEE) por embarcaciones artesanales (174 aproximadamente), implicando por ello la generación de una gran cantidad de documentos de exportación (DEDs) en el sistema, lo que consecuentemente redundó en una gran cantidad de DEDs asociados a nuestros embarques.</p> <p>Dado el contexto anterior, y en relación a los 3 DED validados en una fecha posterior a la de exportación, se informa que todos estos casos se debieron a errores involuntarios de carácter puntual, en la medida que los Inspectores de Pesca no completaron el paso 4 en el sistema eCDS para dichos DEDs, toda vez que los restantes documentos asociados a cada uno de los embarques se encontraban validados correctamente.</p> <p>Frente a ello, junto con reiterar las instrucciones realizadas a los Inspectores Nacionales respecto a los procedimientos que aplican a este tipo de certificación, es preciso señalar que los 3 casos detectados comprometen sólo el 0,1% de los DEDs validados por Chile durante el período analizado (3056 en total). Esta cifra supone una significativa disminución para estos hallazgos respecto de las temporadas anteriores, lo que estaría dando cuenta de la efectividad de las medidas dispuestas por Chile para enfrentarlos y evitarlos.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Regarding to three DEDs that were validated after the deadline, it is reported that they are associated with three different shipments of <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> (TOP) made by Chile during the period analyzed.</p> <p>The first case (DED 3E7E-94A4-7D28), with an export date of April 16, 2025, was part of a shipment that included nine DEDs, of which only one was validated on May 8, 2025 (22 days after the export date).</p> <p>The second case (DED E517-A696-3F64), with an export date of April 20, 2025, was part of a shipment that included 36 DEDs, of which only 1 was validated on June 4, 2025 (45 days after the export date).</p> <p>The third case (DED DAEC-9500-EBD3), with an export date of May 10, 2025, was part of a shipment that included 49 DEDs, of which only 1 was validated on June 5, 2025 (26 days after the export date).</p> <p>One feature of the eCDS system implemented in Chile is the large number of DCDs and DEDs that are validated (over 65% of the global total), which is explained by the requirement to register in the eCDS system the TOP catches made within our Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) by artisanal vessels (approximately 174), thereby generating a large number of export documents (DEDs) in the system, which consequently results in a large</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>number of DEDs associated with our shipments.</p> <p>Given the above context, and in relation to the three DEDs validated after the date of export, it is reported that all these cases were due to unintentional one-off errors, insofar as the Fisheries Inspectors did not complete step 4 in the eCDS system for those DEDs, since the remaining documents associated with each of the shipments were correctly validated.</p> <p>In view of this, in addition to reiterating the instructions given to National Inspectors regarding the procedures that apply to this type of certification, it should be noted that the three cases detected represent only 0.1% of the DEDs validated by Chile during the period analyzed (3,056 in total). This figure represents a significant decrease in these findings compared to previous seasons, which would indicate the effectiveness of the measures taken by Chile to address and prevent them.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-030 (a)	France		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>We have investigated these incidents.</p> <p>In the case of 3 DEDs (FR-24-0030-E, FR-24-0029-E, and FR-24-0018-E,</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p>	<p>corresponding to export reservation number EBKG11039890), an encoding error was made. The date entered for the export (13 December 2024) was in fact the date on which the DEDs were requested.</p>		
			<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p>	<p>The actual export took place on 26 December 2024 as indicated on the booking confirmation, which is after the DEDs were validated by the competent authorities (16 December 2024). As a result, the shipment was accompanied by validated DEDs as required by CM 10-05, paragraph 6. The competent authorities have been reminded of the importance of ensuring the correct encoding of information in the e-CDS.</p>		
			<p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified France validated 4 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 1% of France's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p>	<p>Further Action: None Preliminary status: Compliant</p>		
			<p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p>			

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.			
44-030 (b)	France		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified France validated 4 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>We have investigated these incidents.</p> <p>In the case of one DED FR-24-0011-E, our investigation found that the export took place before the DED was validated. The export took place on 14 July 2024 but validation of the DED was delayed due to incomplete information having been provided by the exporter. The missing information (bill of lading number) was provided on 31 July and the DED was subsequently validated on 1 August 2024. The competent authorities have reviewed and improved their internal procedures to avoid this happening again. We note that the identified DED represents less than 1% of France’s exports.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-031	Japan		<p>The identified DED accounts for 1% of France's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the</p>	<p>(1) On 22 May 2025, an exporter inquired of the Fisheries Agency (FAJ) about the procedure of issuance and validation of DRED. During communications with this exporter, it was found that the toothfish products in question had already departed for Hong Kong.</p> <p>(2) FAJ immediately asked the exporter to explain the reason why this situation occurred. The exporter explained that it had never re-exported toothfish and was unfamiliar with the procedures for re-export of toothfish. Then, it was turned out that they overlooked the requirements for the necessary validation, which resulted in the above mentioned “late” inquiry after the export vessel had departed.</p> <p>(3) On the same day (22 May), the relevant authority of Hong Kong provided with</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Japan validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 100 % of Japan's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>FAJ the information on the mentioned re-exported products arriving there inquiring the status of DRED validation. Considering that the exporter promised to prevent a recurrence of such mistake, FAJ exceptionally conducted a document review and validated the re-export certificate retrospectively.</p> <p>(4) Although the requirement regarding the issuance and validation of DRED had already been widely publicized to exporters, following this incident, FAJ gave a stern instruction to the exporter to meet the requirements upon re-export. Since then, the exporter has fully complied with the requirements on DRED issuance and validation and been proceeding with re-exports without incidence.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action needed</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-032	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p>	<p>The DED was issued to the requesting company for an export date of the 2nd of April.</p> <p>The exporter requested an amendment to their DED on the 22nd of April to show an export date of the 26th of March. This amendment was requested to reflect the internal (within NZ territorial sea) movements of the container as the importing country had a change to its trade</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-033	South Africa		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified New Zealand validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for 1% of New Zealand's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>policy and wanted this information to be reflected on the DED.</p> <p>The container departed at Timaru Port on the 2nd of April for Port Chalmers Port before departing New Zealand on the 6th of April.</p> <p>Because these ports are both in New Zealand the movement between the ports is within New Zealand’s territory (according to paragraph 6 of CM 10-05), therefore, it did not require a DED. The DED was amended to account for this domestic movement at the request of the importer.</p> <p>This shipment had a complete and valid DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified South Africa validated 3 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 7% of South Africa's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p>	<p>permits (DEDs) relating to consignments exported on 12 January 2025.</p> <p>The client submitted complete applications for all applicable DEDs on Friday, 10 January 2025, prior to the estimated export date. The Department duly processed the applications and issued the corresponding DCDs (ZA-24-0002-E-1, ZA-24-0002-E-2, ZA-24-0002-E-3, ZA-24-0003-E-1, and ZA-24-0003-E-2), which correctly reflected the importers and product quantities. At the time, it was understood that all relevant DEDs had been issued.</p> <p>However, upon review by the client, it was identified that three of ten DEDs forming part of the original application were inadvertently omitted. This omission was immediately corrected by the Department on Tuesday, 14 January 2025, when the matter was brought to its attention. Unfortunately, this meant that the three outstanding DEDs were issued two days after the actual export date of 12 January 2025.</p> <p>The delay in reporting the omission was not intentional. The client experienced an urgent family crisis, which delayed their ability to review the documents and notify the Department promptly. Once notified, the Department took immediate corrective action.</p> <p>We regret this administrative oversight and the late reporting and assure the</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>3 DED were issued between 1 – 2 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>Commission that all applications were submitted on time and that corrective action was taken at the earliest possible opportunity. Measures are being reinforced to prevent such oversights in future</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-034	Spain		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>This incident relates to the DRED with export code 38A9-5B63-5654 that was validated after the export date. Steps 1–3 of the DRED were completed by the export authorities in the e-CDS on 8 May 2025. However, due to an administrative error, step 4 ‘Export state confirmation’ remained pending and the exporter was notified of the DRED without this step having been completed. Upon noticing this omission following cross-checks, the export authorities proceeded to confirm the export in the e-CDS by completing step 4 on 21 May 2025. As a result, the date of confirmation by the exporting State is recorded as later than the date of export. Although the shipment was accompanied by the DRED and the export authorities had confirmed their agreement to the exporter on 8 May, this was not reflected in the e-CDS until 21 May 2025. The export authorities have been reminded of</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Spain validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for <1% of Spain's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>the importance of ensuring that consignments of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. are not exported without a DED/DRED that is validated in the e-CDS and to take the necessary actions to prevent this to happen in the future. The identified incident accounts for less than 1% of Spain's exports.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action needed</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-035	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is</p>	<p>Se reconoce el incumplimiento en cada caso.</p> <p>Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal de certificación, y se envió a un técnico al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>Non-compliance was acknowledged for each one of the issues.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 115

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Uruguay validated 20 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for 14% of Uruguay's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p> <p>2 DED were issued between 1 – 2 days after declared export date 6 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 4 DED were issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date 3 DED were issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date 4 DED were issued between 21 – 50 days after declared export date 2 DED were issued between 51 – 100 days after declared export date</p>	<p>In 2025, new certification staff were hired, and a technician attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). Plans are under way to increase the number of qualified staff during peak periods of vessel arrivals at the port of Montevideo. Also, companies were advised of the importance of the timely issuance of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>Both the monitoring authority and the fishing companies were advised of the importance of the timely issuance of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.			
CM 10-09						
44-036	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transshipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 15:16 UTC 19 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 12:00 UTC 22 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 68 hours 44 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transshipment. The notification was provided 3 hours and 16 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-037	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transshipment of</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 22:13 UTC 25 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel and shipments with the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> at 22:00 UTC 28 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 47 minutes</p>	<p>transhipment. The notification was provided 13 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-038	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 19:18 UTC 23 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> at 16:00 UTC 26 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 68 hours 42 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 3 hours and 18 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-039	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 13:29 UTC 15 March 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> at 12:00 UTC 18 March 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 70 hours 31 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 1 hour and 29 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-040	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 2 hours and 17 minutes late.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The Secretariat received a notification on 19:17 UTC 10 April 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 17:00 UTC 13 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 69 hours 43 minutes</p>	<p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-041	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:10 UTC 12 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 11:00 UTC 15 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 65 hours 50 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 6 hours and 10 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)						
44-042	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 18:48 UTC 23 May 2025 from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 16:00 UTC 26 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 69 hours 12 minutes</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-043	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 12:24 UTC 15 March 2025 from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 12:00 UTC 18 March 2025.</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time difference: 71 hours 36 minutes	Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)		
44-044	Norway	<i>Antarctic Sea</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 12:44 UTC 19 May 2025 from the Antarctic Sea notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 12:00 UTC 22 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 16 minutes</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-045	Norway		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 18:41 UTC 26 July 2024 from the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill, Fuel, supply, provisions</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			and personnel with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 01:00 UTC 29 July 2024. Time difference: 54 hours 19 minutes	Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)		
44-046	Norway		CM 10-09, paragraph 2 , states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel. The Secretariat received a notification on 18:46 UTC 26 July 2024 from the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill, Fuel, supply, provisions and personnel with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 01:00 UTC 29 July 2024. Time difference: 54 hours 14 minutes	Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error. Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2. Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-047	Panama	<i>Frio Hellenic</i>	CM 10-09, paragraph 2 , states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel. The Secretariat received a notification on 16:10 UTC 02 August 2024 from the <i>Frio Hellenic</i> notifying its intention to tranship	Panama confirms that the activity initially notified by the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> on 2 August 2024 at 16:10 UTC was rescheduled due to adverse weather conditions and subsequently reported to the Competent Authority and the Secretariat of the Commission on 5 August 2024 at 12:28 UTC. Consequently, the vessel submitted a new notification with a scheduled date of 9 August 2024 at 10:00 UTC.	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Krill with the <i>Shen Lan</i> at 10:00 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 65 hours 50 minutes</p>	<p>For this activity, the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> complied with the minimum 72-hour advance notice requirement established under paragraph 2 of Conservation Measure 10-09. Attached is an email and notification template that proves compliance (Annex 1.1 y 1.2).</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-048	Panama	<i>Frio Poseidon</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 21:25 UTC 21 April 2025 from the <i>Frio Poseidon</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Sae In Leader</i> at 10:00 UTC 23 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 36 hours 35 minutes</p>	<p>Panama acknowledges the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat and confirms that, according to the notification records received, the communication submitted by the vessel <i>FRIO POSEIDON</i> did not comply with the minimum 72-hour advance notice required under paragraph 2 of Conservation Measure 10-09.</p> <p>Accordingly, this non-compliance has been referred to the Enforcement Department of the competent Panamanian authority for the initiation of an administrative investigation in order to determine responsibilities and, if applicable, impose the sanctions established under national legislation.</p> <p>Panama will keep the Commission and its Members informed of the final outcome of this process.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-049	Russian Federation	<i>Atmoda</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 14:16 UTC 01 May 2025 from the <i>Atmoda</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 23:00 UTC 03 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 56 hours 44 minutes</p>	<p>времени вызвана техническими проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-050	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:27 UTC 15 June 2025 from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 01:00 UTC 18 June 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 55 hours 33 minutes</p>	<p>Проведено расследование данного случая и по итогам выявлено следующее. 15.06.2025 с судна "Память Ильича" направлено сообщение в 14.27 LT о планируемой на 18.06.2025 работе в 01.00 UTC приём топлива с <i>Sealion</i>. Вместе с тем из-за ухудшения погодных условий (с учетом прогноза погоды) во избежания риска безопасности мореплавания капитан принял решения о корректировки сроков необходимости. 16.06.2025 отправлено уведомление в 15.46 (UTC -3) в котором указывается, что из-за непогоды приём топлива с <i>Sealion</i> будет 17.06.2025 в 01.00 UTC, т.е. на сутки раньше (из-за непогоды). В виду нарушения установленных сроков, судовладельцу вынесено предупреждение в части контроля</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>действия на судах при проведении операций в море.</p> <p>This matter was investigated, and the following findings were made. On 15.06.2025 at 14.27 LT a notification had been sent from the vessel <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> informing about the intended refuelling from <i>Sealion</i> that had to take place on 18.06.2025 at 01.00 UTC. However, due to deteriorating weather conditions (taking into account the weather forecast) and in order to avoid risks to maritime safety, the skipper made a decision to adjust the relevant deadlines.</p> <p>On 16.06.2025 at 15.46 (UTC -3) a notification was sent stating that due to the poor weather conditions refuelling from <i>Sealion</i> was to take place on 17.06.2025 at 01.00 UTC, that is, one day early (due to adverse weather). Given the violation of the established deadlines, the shipowner was issued a warning regarding the control of the on-board actions during at-sea operations.</p> <p>Further Action: Не требуются Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-051	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Kirova</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 10:09 UTC 25 March 2025 from the <i>Pamyat Kirova</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i> at 10:00 UTC 28 March 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 51 minutes</p>	<p>проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: Не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-052	Ukraine		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 16:08 UTC 31 Jan 2025 from the <i>Simeiz</i> notifying its intention to tranship bait and a mainline with the <i>Calipso</i> at 17:00 UTC 02 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 48 hours 52 minutes</p>	<p><i>SIMEIZ</i> and <i>CALIPSO</i> failed to submit the notifications earlier.</p> <p>The shipowner was reminded of the need to strictly comply with the requirements of the CCAMLR Conservation Measures and was obliged to conduct additional training for vessel's crews.</p> <p>Further Action: Additional trainings introduced. Additional check-list implemented.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-053	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 678</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its</p>	<p>As per our investigation, <i>HAI FENG 678</i> in fact sent notification notice email on 1st Apr 2025. Due to poor satellite signal</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transshipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 10:32 UTC 04 April 2025 from the <i>Hai Feng 678</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and fuel with the <i>Hua Xiang 9</i> at 10:00 UTC 6 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 47 hours 28 minutes</p>	<p>sometimes even no signal in some area of Antarctic, the email was actually send unsuccessfully. When captain found this failure and resent email again, time already comes to 04 Aug 2025. That's why in the email the sending time shows UTC time 10:31 04 Apr 2025.</p> <p>According to the confirmation notice, the actually transshipment start time was 12:10 06 Apr 2025, and finish time was 17:00 08 Apr 2025. The time difference between emial sending and actual transshipment start time is only about 60 hours 40 miniuts, indeed less than 72 hours.</p> <p>We're sorry about this case, the Capitain only remembered that he sent email on 01 Apr 2025 but neglect the real eail resending time was actually on 04 Apr 2025. We have warned the operator of <i>HAI FENG 678</i> and her captain to be more carefully when sending the notification email. daily check the status of email system, make sure such case will never happen again.</p> <p>Sincerely sorry for any inconvenience that brought to you.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Nil Response</p>		
44-054	China	<i>Shen Lan</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 3, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance from the</p>	<p>In accordance with CM 10-09, paragraph 3 states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance of the transshipment of items other than</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>transhipment of items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received notification from the Chinese-flagged vessel the <i>Shen Lan</i> on 11:41 UTC 16 Feb 2025 of their intended transhipment of crew at 12:00 UTC 16 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 19 minutes</p>	<p>harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>In accordance with CM 10-09, footnote 1 “Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels”.</p> <p>The definition of transshipment does not include the transfer of personnel.</p> <p>The submitted personnel notification is voluntary.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-055	China	<i>Fu Xing Hai</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from China on 03:56 UTC 13 August 2024 of the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>'s transhipment of fuel from 16:24 UTC 06 August 2024 - 07:00 UTC 07 August 2024 with the <i>Jason</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 4 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p><i>FU XING HAI</i> started the bunkering with <i>JASON</i> at 16:24 August 6th 2024 and finished it at 07:00 August 7th 2024 (UTC). The confirmation was sent to her company at 13:40 8th 2024 (UTC). Unfortunately, the data manager of the company was ill at that time. This is the reason for the late confirmation.</p> <p>Further Action: China will strictly submit the transhipment notifications and confirmations in accordance with CM 10-09 to prevent similar issues from happening.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-056	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Leader</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>Due to the change of the bunkering vessel, the initial advance report sent on 14 June (MT <i>SEALION</i>, MGO 600KL) was amended on 15 June to reflect the change of the fuel supply vessel (MV <i>PAMYAT</i></p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 01:08 UTC 14 June 2025 from the <i>Sae In Leader</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 13:00 UTC 19 June 2025.</p> <p>No confirmation has been received by the <i>Sae In Leader</i> or Korea</p>	<p><i>ILICHA</i>, MGO 600KL). Subsequently, the bunkering took place on June 21 and completion of bunkering was reported (MV <i>PAMYAT ILICHA</i>, MGO 600KL) on the same day.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances:</p> <p>While operating in FAO Area 48.2, the <i>SAE IN LEADER</i> submitted on 14 June at 01:08 UTC the initial 72-hour advance transshipment report (plan to transship 600MT of krill and 45MT of krill meal to MV <i>TAGANROGSKIY ZALIV</i> on 22 June UTC) and, at 01:09 UTC the same day, the initial 72-hour advance bunkering report (plan to receive 600KL MGO from MT <i>SEALION</i> on 19 June UTC), in preparation for the anticipated transshipment and bunkering around 20 June.</p> <p>On the following day, due to changes in the carrier vessel’s schedule, the originally planned separate bunkering and transshipment operations were combined into one vessel. Accordingly, on 15 June at 23:14 UTC, the first amendment report was submitted (plan to transship 600MT of krill and receive 600KL MGO from MV <i>PAMYAT ILICHA</i> on 21 June UTC).</p> <p>Later, after coordination with the carrier vessel, changes occurred in the transshipment volume, the scheduled date/time, and the position. Two additional amended reports were submitted on 19 June, and finally, on 21 June at 12:01</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>UTC, the completed transshipment and bunkering report was submitted (859.35MT krill, 48.8MT krill meal, and 600KL MGO). It is therefore considered that all changes and completions were duly reported.</p> <p>Chronological Summary of Reports by <i>SAE IN LEADER</i></p> <p>A. 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT REPORT: UTC 2025.06.14 01:08</p> <p>B. 72 HOURS PRIOR BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.14 01:09</p> <p>C. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.15 23:14</p> <p>D. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.19 11:13</p> <p>E. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.19 12:06</p> <p>F. COMPLETED TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.21 12:01</p> <p>Further Action: no further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-057	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sein Honor</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>The vessel notified its intention to fuel and transfer a worker with the <i>PAMYAT ILLICHA</i>. However, due to some technical issues of the <i>PAMYAT ILLICHA</i>, the fueling was canceled and only the transfer</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:34 UTC 30 May 2025 from the <i>Sein Honor</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> at 13:00 UTC 05 June 2025.</p> <p>No confirmation has been received by the <i>Sein Honor</i> or Korea</p>	<p>of the work took place. Paragraph 5 stipulates that “Within three (3) working days of any of its vessels having transhipped within the Convention Area, each Flag State shall confirm the information provided in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat” As no fueling took place, and the transfer of a person does not constitute “transshipping” as per footnote 1 (Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels) the vessel had not “transshipped.” The obligation to notify any changes within three days gets triggered from the point when a vessel has “transshipped” and therefore the vessel is not obliged to report the cancellation. If the intention is to require a vessel to notify a cancellation within 3 days, the language of the CM should be revised to clarify that.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-058	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> on 18:36 UTC 05 June 2025 of its transshipment of krill,</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted within 3 working days after transshipment. The notification was provided 1 working day late.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>supplies, provisions from 09:00 28 May 2025 – 22:40 UTC 29 May 2025 with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 4 working days after the transshipment.</p>	<p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-059	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> on 18:10 UTC 05 June 2025 of its transshipment of krill, supplies, provisions from 09:00 28 May 2025 – 22:40 UTC 29 May 2025 with the <i>Fortunagracht</i>.</p> <p>Time difference: 6 days 19h 30 min</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the required confirmation for the transshipment of a trawl net within 3 working days of having transhipped due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 121
44-060	Norway		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the required confirmation for the transshipment of a trawl net within 3 working days of having transhipped due to a human error.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 121

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the Norwegian flagged <i>Antarctic Provider</i> on 17:56 UTC 06 June 2025 of the transhipment of a trawl net from 10:30 – 13:00 UTC 08 May 2025 with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 20 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>		
44-061	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> on 21:16 UTC 02 June 2025 of the transhipment of fuel, spare parts and provisions from 15:55 – 21:40 UTC 20 May 2025 with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 9 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-062	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими причинами и человеческим фактором. В связи со сложной навигационной</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> on 21:16 UTC 02 June 2025 of the transhipment of Krill from 15:00 UTC 20 May 2025 – 04:40 UTC 22 May 2025 with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 7 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>обстановкой: большого количества айсбергов, льда, прохождения узкостей-проливов капитан первоочередно обеспечивал безопасность мореплавания и, как результат, своевременно не проконтролировал подачу уведомления об окончании грузовых операции.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error. Due to a difficult navigational situation: a large number of icebergs, ice, and the need to pass through narrows and straits, the skipper gave priority to ensuring maritime safety and, as a result, failed to supervise the submission of a notification concerning the completion of freight operations in a timely manner.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-063	Panama	<i>Frio Hellenic</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 11 Aug 2024 10:05 UTC from the <i>Frio Hellenic</i> confirming its transhipment of</p>	<p>Panama confirms that the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> submitted to the Competent Authority and the Secretariat of the Commission, on 2 August 2024 at 16:09 UTC, the prior notification of the transfer of one crew member to be carried out with the vessel <i>Shen Lan</i>, together with the possible transshipment of product.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>crew with the <i>Shen Lan</i> on 10 August 2024.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>	<p>Accordingly, the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> complied with the requirements of paragraph 8 of Conservation Measure 10-09. Attached is an email and notification template that proves compliance (Annex 2.1 y 2.2).</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-064	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:34 UTC 30 May 2025 from the <i>Sein Honor</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> at 13:00 UTC 05 June 2025.</p> <p>No notification has been received by the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> or Russia.</p>	<p>Проведено расследование данного случая и по итогам выявлено следующее. Сообщение о предстоящей работе: выдача топлива/приём пассажиров с <i>Sein Honor</i> отправлено 30.05.2025 в 15.20 LT (UTC -3). Вместе с тем, судовладелец "Память Ильича" информировал <i>Sein Honor</i>, что по техническим причинам отсутствует возможность выдачи топлива. 07.05.2025 суда ошвартовались, получили только пассажиров. Топливо не выдавалось. 07.06.2025 отправлено сообщение в 17.56 LT приём пассажиров с <i>Sein Honor</i>, выдачу топлива не осуществляли по техническим причинам. Согласно сноски 1 к пункту 2 МС 10-09 под перегрузкой понимается перемещение добытых морских живых ресурсов и любых других товаров или материалов с одного судна на другое. Пересадка только пассажиров не подпадает под понятие перегрузка, как обозначено в МС 10-09.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>This matter was investigated, and the following findings were made. A notification of intended operations: fuel delivery/passengers boarding from <i>Sein Honor</i> had been sent on 30.05.2025 at 15.20 LT (UTC -3). At the same time the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> vessel owner had informed <i>Sein Honor</i> that no fuel could be dispensed for technical reasons. On 07.05.2025 the vessels moored and received passengers only. No fuel was dispensed. On 07.06.2025 at 17.56 LT the following notification was sent: passengers transferred from <i>Sein Honor</i>; no fuel dispensed for technical reasons. As per Footnote 1 to paragraph 2, CM 10-09 “Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels”. Under CM 10-09 transfer of passengers only does not constitute a transshipment.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-065	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 688</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 11 March 2025 07:11 UTC from the <i>Hai Feng 688</i> confirming its transshipment of Krill with the <i>Hua Xiang 9</i> on 9–10 March 2025.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>	<p>We confirm that the notification notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 688</i> was received at UTC time 17:24 01 Mar 2025, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p> <p>The Confirmation notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 688</i> was received at UTC time 07:11 11 Mar 2025, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p>	Compliant	See paragraph 122

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Due to the force majeure factors, the actual trasshipment with <i>HUA XIANG 9</i> delayed from 5th March to 9th - 10th March.		
				Preliminary Status: Nil Response		
CM 22-08						
44-066	Korea, Republic of	<i>Hong Jin No. 701</i>	<p>CM 22-08, paragraph 1, prohibits fishing in exploratory fisheries for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. in depths shallower than 550 m.</p> <p>The <i>Hong Jin No. 701</i> whilst participating in the exploratory <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i> fishery in Subarea 88.1 as per CM 41-09, reported the depth of fishing as 540 metres at the end of the line when setting haul 33 on 26 Dec 2024.</p>	<p>Upon reviewing the C2 data, it was determined that for Haul 33, the number of droppers (540) was mistakenly entered in the depth field, incorrectly recording the depth as 540m. For this haul, 12 hooks were attached to each dropper, resulting in a total of 12 hooks x 540 droppers = 6,480 hooks being set. (※ Reference 2-2)</p> <p>Furthermore, as the start position of the line for Haul 53 is nearly identical to the end position of the line for Haul 33, the depth was checked and confirmed to be recorded as 715m. (※ Reference 2-3) In addition, the VME data for Haul 33 also indicates that the depth was between 1284m and 695m. (※ Reference 2-4)</p> <p>Conclusion: After reviewing this case, it is clear that the misunderstanding arose from a typographical error during the C2 data entry. By comparing the depth information for the same location and reviewing the VME data, we can prove that no fishing activity was conducted within the 550m depth limit that was cited as the violation. Nonetheless, the government instructed the operator to ensure that the crews on all their vessels to minimize such errors in C2 data entry in the future.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Further Action: As this is compliant, no action is required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
CM 26-01						
44-067	Namibia	<i>Helena Ndume</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 8, prohibits the discharging or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S.</p> <p>Section 7.3 of the Commercial Data Collection Manual – Longline Fisheries – Version 2023, states that any species that is caught and retained on the vessel for discard at a later date shall be reported in the C2 data as “Retained” and any species landed on the vessels and then discarded overboard without processing is to be reported as “Discarded”.</p> <p>From 03 Dec 2024 to 15 Jan 2025 the <i>Helena Ndume</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 415 individuals of Rajidae.</p>	<p>Namibia can confirm that no discarding took place rather the live release of 410 RAJ species. The report from the Ukrainian International Observer confirms that all skates were returned to sea alive and all other offal/bycatch was strictly retained on board and only discharged north of 60 degrees south.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-068	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 8, prohibits the discharging or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Norwegian flagged <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> reported in observer trip report number 2504 in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, the following:</p> <p>Section 6.3 – comments “On 20/04/2024, the observer saw a small amount of offal being released with the stickwater of the</p>	<p>The incident described in the observer report occurred during factory cleaning.</p> <p>A small amount of krill was discharged when the screen mesh was removed from the scupper for cleaning. The screen mesh was immediately reinstalled, whereupon the discharge of offal ceased.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			vessel, this was due to a mesh trap on the factory being removed. The vessel was notified, and the scupper was refitted to stop the offal release.”			
CM 31-01						
44-069	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Helena</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRC 25/65: CM 31-01 states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3).</p> <p><i>Argos Helena</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 which COMM CIRC 25/65 alleges is contrary to CM 31-01.</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIRC 25/71.</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 25/66).</p>	<p>The UK rejects the assertions contained in COMM CIRC 25/65 concerning the compliance of the <i>Argos Helena</i> and <i>Nordic Prince</i> with Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>COMM CIRC 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69 and 25/71 set out the UK’s consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery in the part of the proclaimed maritime zone of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands that lies within statistical Subarea 48.3.</p> <p>There is no scientific or legal justification for any Member seeking the closure of the Patagonian toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3. All Members of the Commission, apart from Russia, agreed that the proposed catch limit and terms on which Conservation Measure 41-02 was to be re-adopted at CCAMLR-43 were consistent with the best available science and in accordance with the CCAMLR decision rules.</p> <p>In relation to Conservation Measure 31-01, this requires CCAMLR to ‘establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary’ for fishing in Subarea 48.3, but</p>		See paragraphs 126-130

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>does not provide, or imply, that if CCAMLR does not adopt such a measure (even if objectively required), any limitation on fishing will nonetheless come into existence. In connection with this, the UK notes that fishing for toothfish took place in Subarea 48.3 prior to a catch limit being set for that species, including in the years after Conservation Measure 31-01 was adopted. There is no suggestion (such as in the records of meetings at the time) that such fishing prior to the adoption of a catch-limit was contrary to the CAMLR Convention or any Conservation Measure, including Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>For the information of Members, the UK continues to operate the South Georgia toothfish fishery consistently with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures including, but not limited to, Conservation Measure 10-02, Conservation Measure 10-04, Conservation Measure 10-05 and Conservation Measure 23-01.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-070	United Kingdom	<i>Nordic Prince</i>	As stated in COMM CIRCs 25/65: CM 31-01 states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3).	The UK rejects the assertions contained in COMM CIRC 25/65 concerning the compliance of the <i>Argos Helena</i> and <i>Nordic Prince</i> with Conservation Measure 31-01.		See paragraphs 126-130

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p><i>Nordic Prince</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 which COMM CIRC 25/65 alleges is contrary to CM 31-01.</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIRC 25/71.</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 25/66).</p>	<p>COMM CIRCs 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69 and 25/71 set out the UK’s consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery in the part of the proclaimed maritime zone of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands that lies within statistical Subarea 48.3.</p> <p>There is no scientific or legal justification for any Member seeking the closure of the Patagonian toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3. All Members of the Commission, apart from Russia, agreed that the proposed catch limit and terms on which Conservation Measure 41-02 was to be re-adopted at CCAMLR-43 were consistent with the best available science and in accordance with the CCAMLR decision rules.</p> <p>In relation to Conservation Measure 31-01, this requires CCAMLR to ‘establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary’ for fishing in Subarea 48.3, but does not provide, or imply, that if CCAMLR does not adopt such a measure (even if objectively required), any limitation on fishing will nonetheless come into existence. In connection with this, the UK notes that fishing for toothfish took place in Subarea 48.3 prior to a catch limit being set for that species, including in the years after Conservation Measure 31-01 was adopted. There is no suggestion (such as in the records of meetings at the time) that such fishing prior to the adoption of a catch-limit was contrary to the CAMLR</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Convention or any Conservation Measure, including Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>For the information of Members, the UK continues to operate the South Georgia toothfish fishery consistently with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures including, but not limited to, Conservation Measure 10-02, Conservation Measure 10-04, Conservation Measure 10-05 and Conservation Measure 23-01.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
CM 91-05						
44-071	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p>CM 91-05, paragraph 24, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the Alpha Crux for entry into RSR MPA SRZ. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the Russian VMS Contact Officers on 9 December 2024 0357 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification for the Alpha Crux was provided on 9 December 2024 1159 UTC which notified entry into RSR MPA SRZ on 7 December 2024 2347 UTC.</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения вызвана внешним фактором, а именно: оператор VSAT, предоставляющий компании услугу спутниковой связи, без уведомления судовладельца и экипажа прекратил предоставление услуги. Это невозможно к прогнозированию обстоятельство привело к сбою в обеспечении связи судно-берег, в части передачи текстовых сообщений с борта судна в адрес Секретариата.</p> <p>Оперативно уполномоченные службы отреагировали на ситуацию и совместно с береговым техническим персоналом было произведено переключение и</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 131

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time difference: 36 hours 12 minutes after entry	<p>настройка судового радиооборудования к другому оператору. В кратчайшие сроки повторное уведомление было направлено в Секретариат АНТКОМ в установленном порядке.</p> <p>A detailed investigation revealed that the deviation was caused by an external factor, namely: the VSAT satellite communications service provider working with the company terminated the service without notifying the shipowner and crew. This unforeseeable circumstance led to a failure in ship and shore communications, specifically in terms of text messages transmission from the ship to the Secretariat.</p> <p>The authorised authorities responded promptly to the situation and, together with the shore-based technical personnel, configured the onboard radio equipment to switch to a different provider. The repeat notification was sent to the CCAMLR Secretariat as soon as possible as per the established procedure.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

**Summary CCAMLR Compliance Report 2024/2025
Part B**

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
CM 10-10						
44-072	Peru		<p>CM 10-10, paragraph 1, notes that the draft CCAMLR Compliance Report shall include ... issues noted by the Commission as requiring additional information from a Contracting Party in the previous year’s CCAMLR Compliance Report.</p> <p>For the following compliance issues under CM 10-05, CC-43 was able to reach a common understanding on needing additional information as no response to the draft compliance report was provided.</p> <p>Peru provided additional information in COMM CIRC 24/118.</p> <p>The compliance event considered by SCIC-2024 was: CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification</p>	Nil Response	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraphs 132-133

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
44-073	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 718</i>	<p>provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the eCDS data has identified Peru validated 6 DEDs after the declared export date. Therefore these shipments did not have a completed DED available to accompany them at the time of export. The identified DEDs account for 6 % of Peru's exports and <1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DEDs were issued between 1 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 21 – 50 days after declared export date</p>	<p>We confirm that the notification notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 718</i> was received at UTC time 07:54 03 Feb 2024, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p> <p>The Confirmation notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 718</i> was received at UTC time 12:43 09 Feb 2024, this email was also</p>	Compliant	See paragraphs 134-135

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
			<p>The Secretariat requested the information on 21 January 2025, 10 June 2025 and 1 July 2025. Vanuatu has not responded to any of these emails.</p> <p>The compliance event considered by SCIC-2024 was: CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 9 Feb 2024 1243 UTC from the Hai Feng 718 confirming its transhipment of Krill and Fuel with the Hua Xiang 9 from 07 – 08 Feb 2024.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>	<p>copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.com</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Nil Response</p>		

Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26 (Conservation Measure 10-06)

No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2024/25 CP IUU Vessel List](#)

Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26 (Conservation Measure 10-07)

No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2024/25 NCP IUU Vessel List](#)

Secretariat Tasking

SCIC agenda item	Topic	Task	SCIC report reference
3.1	e-CDS resource development	SCIC requested the Secretariat continue the development of e-learning CDS modules in 2026 and 2027.	10 (i)
3.1	e-CDS resource development	Requested that the Secretariat develop a workplan in the intersessional period on how this could be implemented in 2027.	10 (i)
3.1	CDS-related Cape Town workshop recommendations	Tasked the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements and to report back on the implementation of the CDS-related recommendations at SCIC 2026.	15
3.2	Inspection resources intersessional panel	SCIC tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements to facilitate and support the work of the panel.	21
3.2	Electronic reporting project High priority	SCIC requested that further development take into account integration with internal CCAMLR data holdings, the need for offline data entry capability and consideration of interoperability with relevant external data systems, including the GIES under the PSMA.	23
3.2	AIS and port inspection data holdings proxy analysis	SCIC recognised the usefulness of this analysis and recommended that the Secretariat undertake it on an annual basis. The AIS and port inspection analysis would be reviewed annually for its applicability. SCIC further noted that future analyses should acknowledge the limitations in the accuracy of AIS data and confirmed that such analyses are not to be used for compliance purposes.	25
3.3	Automated VMS movement notifications High priority	SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's continued work to develop an automated VMS movement notification as a matter of priority and highlighted its potential benefits.	29
3.3	Inmarsat	SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's recommendation to discontinue paying for Inmarsat position reports from the 2025/2026 season forward and have Contracting Parties with vessels continuing to report to CCAMLR via the Inmarsat email address to ensure that these positions are redirected, or that vessel operators are instructed to undertake this action.	30
3.7	NCP Engagement – Kuwait and UAE	SCIC noted the positive engagement from Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and tasked the Secretariat with continuing to foster these dialogues and others in interested NCPs in the Middle East region. Additionally, SCIC also endorsed the continued engagement with NCPs in the Southeast Asia region	51
3.7	Transshipment NCP strategy	SCIC noted the importance of transshipment in the context of NCP engagement and requested the	52

		Secretariat to engage with NCPs that provide transshipment services in the Convention Area to support their understanding of and compliance with CCAMLR Conservation Measures.	
4	Open-source data analysis and CCEP	In relation to the use of open-source data by the Secretariat within the CCEP, SCIC noted that such data should be objective and reliable before being used for compliance analysis. SCIC requested that the Secretariat further explore this recommendation and provide additional information to SCIC in 2026.	104
5.1	Unidentified gear workplan	SCIC considered the update provided by the Secretariat on the workplan to address unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area. SCIC acknowledged the progress made in this area and endorsed the extension of the workplan for 2026-2027.	148
6	Fishing notifications High priority	SCIC requests assurances from Ecuador that they will exercise their Flag State responsibilities through implementation of the appropriate monitoring and control measures of the vessel, that the master, charterer, owner, and any beneficial owners have no association with IUU fishing, and that <i>Altar 45</i> will not carry gillnets while operating within the Convention Area. SCIC tasked the Secretariat to contact Ecuador in this regard	183