



3rd MEETING OF CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP

FSM-China Gymnasium, Palikir,
Pohnpei, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

16-17 September 2016

UPDATE ON MASS BALANCE RECONCILIATION TRIAL

WCPFC-2016-CDSIWG03-04

24 August 2016

Paper by the Secretariat

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to provide an update on the Mass Balance Reconciliation trials and seek guidance on way forward for the trials.

Background

2. The Commission accepted TCC11's recommendations with the Secretariat's proposed modifications to the 2016 Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) tasking and adopted the report of the CDS-IWG (WCPFC12-2015-19c) and the 2016 CDS-IWG work plan (WCPFC12 Summary Report Attachment T). A copy of the WCPFC12 decision is annexed here as **Annex 1**.
3. In 2016, CCMs were encouraged to the extent possible to include in Annual Report Part 1 submitted in 2016, in standardized format the information outlined in CDS-IWG02-DP03 Table 1 and Table 2 for the 2013 calendar year.

Secretariat response to MBR Trial tasking from WCPFC12

4. The Secretariat has reviewed the thirty (30) 2016 Annual Report Part 1 submissions which were received as at 23 August 2016. Eight (8) reports received included reference to the Mass Balance Reconciliation Trial or CDS reporting. Three (3) of the eight (8) reports confirmed that the CCM was unable to provide a report at this time or that the report was not applicable.
5. Five CCM annual reports included tabular information related to the disposal of the species, and this has been compiled into **Table 1** below.¹ Only one CCM annual report included information on receipt and redistribution of species (imports), and this has been compiled into **Table 2** below.

¹ One of the reports was in French, and another report related to the 2015 calendar year.

Recommendation

6. CDS-IWG03 is invited to:

- a. note that the Secretariat has provided in this paper Tables that are prepared in response to the WCPFC12 MBR trial tasking; and
- b. discuss and consider the next steps for the MBR trial, including whether the engagement of an expert consultant to undertake MBR calculation analyses is still necessary.

Table 1 – Summary of disposal of species in 2013 and 2015 (na = not available)

Flag CCM	Harvest Year	Catch Location	Destination	Gear	Species	Net Weight (kg)	Estimated whole weight (kg)
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Japan	Longline	albacore	14120	15532
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Samoa (American)	Longline	albacore	71420	78364
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Spain	Longline	albacore	97766	10753
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Thailand	Longline	albacore	32893	36182
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	USA	Longline	albacore	29830	32813
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Japan	Longline	Bigeye tuna	325450	357995
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Korea	Longline	Bigeye tuna	44	48
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Spain	Longline	Bigeye tuna	92432	101675
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	USA	Longline	Bigeye tuna	7889	8678
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Spain	Longline	Skipjack	579	869
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Hong Kong	Longline	swordfish	30	45
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Japan	Longline	swordfish	150288	225432
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	New Zealand	Longline	swordfish	300	450
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	USA	Longline	swordfish	181569	272204
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Hong Kong	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	118	130
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Japan	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	162971	179209
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Korea	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	315	347
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Macau	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	84	92
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	USA	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	100059	110065
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Domestic	Longline	Albacore	na	502566
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Domestic	Longline	Bigeye tuna	na	20604
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Domestic	Longline	Skipjack	na	2460
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Domestic	Longline	Swordfish	na	563870
Australia	2013	Australia EEZ	Domestic	Longline	Yellowfin tuna	na	1051158
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Am Samoa	Longline	Albacore	470,520	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Local market	Longline	Albacore	29,420	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	New Zealand	Longline	Albacore	3,450	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	USA	Longline	Albacore	23,000	

Flag CCM	Harvest Year	Catch Location	Destination	Gear	Species	Net Weight (kg)	Estimated whole weight (kg)
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Not stated	Longline	Albacore	97,305	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Am Samoa	Longline	Bigeeye	89,260	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Local market	Longline	Bigeeye	5,489	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	New Zealand	Longline	Bigeeye	1,755	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	USA	Longline	Bigeeye	1,748	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Not stated	Longline	Bigeeye	13,321	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Am Samoa	Longline	Yellowfin	157,356	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Local market	Longline	Yellowfin	8,424	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	New Zealand	Longline	Yellowfin	1,518	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	USA	Longline	Yellowfin	2,080	
Cook Islands	2013	Cook Islands EEZ	Not stated	Longline	Yellowfin	23,589	
Fiji	2013	Fiji's EEZ, HS and other CCMs EEZ	Multiple markets	Longline		11,735	
French Polynesia	2015		export	longline		1,755	
New Caledonia		New Caledonia EEZ	domestic	longline	Tuna		1,853
New Caledonia		New Caledonia EEZ	export	longline	Tuna		651
New Caledonia		New Caledonia EEZ	domestic	longline	Billfish		140
New Caledonia		New Caledonia EEZ	domestic	longline	Other fish		186

Table 2 – Summary of receipt and redistribution of species in 2013 (na = not available)

Export year	Export CCM or domestic	Import CCM	Harvest year	Gear	Species	Net Weight (kg)	Estimated whole weight (kg)
2013	New Zealand	Australia	na	na	Albacore	4286	4715
2013	Fiji	Australia	na	na	Bigeye tuna	186	205
2013	Indonesia	Australia	na	na	Bigeye tuna	2985	3284
2013	New Zealand	Australia	na	na	Bigeye tuna	793	872
2013	Vanuatu	Australia	na	na	Bigeye tuna	102	112
2013	New Zealand	Australia	na	na	Skipjack	1008	1512
2013	Thailand	Australia	na	na	Skipjack	221624	332436
2013	Bangladesh	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	1506	2259
2013	Fiji	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	731	1828
2013	Indonesia	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	50949	113223
2013	New Zealand	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	112251	169571
2013	Seychelles	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	3239	4859
2013	Sri Lanka	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	2922	7305
2013	Vietnam	Australia	na	na	Swordfish	5700	14250
2013	Fiji	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	3954	4349
2013	French Polynesia	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	666	733
2013	Indonesia	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	43286	47615
2013	Maldives	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	61118	67230
2013	New Zealand	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	105	116
2013	Seychelles	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	936	1030
2013	Solomon Islands	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	4206	4627
2013	Sri Lanka	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	4005	4406
2013	Vanuatu	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	20416	22458
2013	Vietnam	Australia	na	na	Yellowfin tuna	8500	9350
2013	New Zealand	Australia (re-import)	na	na	swordfish	200	300

Annex 1: Excerpt from WCPFC12 Summary Report Attachment T

Notes on the Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) Trial for 2016 – covering 2013 activities

1. At the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting, FFA Secretariat presented a paper “Mass Balance Reconciliation” (WCPFC-2015-CDSIWG02-DP03). The paper introduced the concept of Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR), and noted the following key points:

- “MBR is essentially a comparison of declared catch with declared imports, exports and domestic consumption at different points in the commodity chain”
- “A MBR calculation can be used to identify areas where significant anomalies in catch or trade are occurring, acting as a trigger to investigate points where IUU product may be entering or leaving the commodity chain, as well as the sources of that product.”
- “A MBR calculation generates a MBR ratio between declared catch and declared exports, imports, and domestic consumption. This ratio is indicative of how well existing catch and trade data collections systems are. It can be used as a Key Performance Indicator to gauge the effectiveness of WCPFCs’ CDS development, implementation and management.”
- In terms of the WCPFC an MBR may be used as comparison ratio of declared catch to declared trade data for particular species, where one would expect the ratio to be 1:1. Any difference and areas of uncertainty can serve as a trigger to identify and investigate where product disappearance or creation is occurring. MBR for a species would involve:

$$\text{Total WCPFC Landing} = \text{Total Exports} + \text{Total Domestic Consumption}$$

2. The outcomes from the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting on MBR were:

24. In relation to DP03, the CDS-IWG
- i. Thanked the FFA for their work on the Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) Concept as outlined in the paper;
 - ii. Supported in principle the importance of making a start on the collection of the data as set out in Table 1 and Table 2 in DP03;
 - iii. Noted that MBR is used by other RFMOs e.g. CCSBT, although it is not anticipated that WCPFC will have all possible data fields in this trial;
 - iv. Recognized that MBR is very complicated, which although desirable in the initial stages is likely to be a challenge for Members to gather and report the data and for the Secretariat to collate and reconcile information based on the member reports;
 - v. Agreed to implement MBR as a trial on a voluntary basis, which is to be reviewed annually, and noting that the reporting is not yet to be assessed under the Compliance Monitoring Scheme; and
 - vi. Noted that developing a CDS should be the primary objective of this IWG, and that a trial of the MBR should happen alongside progress continuing to be made on CDS.
25. The CDS-IWG agreed to
1. recommend that CCMs are encouraged to include in Annual Report Part 1, in standardized format, the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2. For the purposes of the trial, CCMs are encouraged where available to include these tables (the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2) related to the 2013 calendar year in their 2016 Annual Report Part 1 (so that there is at least one common year that can be the basis of the first trial MBR).
 2. task the Secretariat with the assistance of an appropriately qualified consultant to provide, to the extent practicable, an annual 2013 MBR calculation for the consideration of the CDS-IWG, TCC and the Commission in 2016.

3. For recommendation paragraph 25.1, provided below are the proposed templates of the two tables that the CDS-IWG recommendation is encouraging CCMs complete and include in their 2016 Annual Report part 1 for the 2013 calendar year.

Table 1 – Minimum requirements for Disposal of Species (Export and Domestic Market)

Requirement	
Flag CCM	
Catch Location (CCM EEZ or WCPFC HS area)	
Destination (Domestic or Country)	
Gear Code	
Net weight (processed) kg	
Estimated whole weight	

Table 2 - Receipt and Redistribution of Species (re-export and re-imports, transshipment activities to be considered as either export or import)

Requirement	
Export year	
Export CCM or Domestic	
Import CCM	
Harvest year	
Gear code	
Net weight (processed) kg	
Estimated whole weight	

4. In respect of CDS-IWG recommendation paragraph 25.2, during the CDS-IWG discussions some CCMs noted their concerns that they envisaged difficulties in being able to provide complete data for the MBR trial. Following TCC11, the Secretariat sought the informal views of a number of experts in Catch Documentation Scheme development and the FFA Secretariat, with a view to better understanding the likely requirements and potential workload for the Secretariat proposed task during 2016. The information that is annually published on the CCSBT website related to the annual summary Catch Documentation Scheme Harvest Report 2010 –2014 and Trade Information Scheme subset Annex 2 report were also reviewed (http://www.ccsbt.org/site/sbt_data.php).

6. From these consultations, the Secretariat feels that the proposed 2013 MBR calculation activity that was initially recommended for the Secretariat to undertake in 2016, continues to remain quite unclear as a task. It seems fairly certain from the discussions during the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting and as confirmed in the language of the recommendation (paragraph 25.1 of the 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report), that the information which CCMs will provide on 2013 calendar year data in the format of Table 1 and Table 2 (above) will likely be incomplete across fisheries and among CCMs. The experts that were consulted

expressed views to the Secretariat, which confirmed that even if all CCMs were able to submit complete data for 2013 calendar year, their expectation is that there would still not be sufficient information to undertake a reasonable 2013 MBR reconciliation. There will be core business tasks related to CMR, SC and TCC/CDS-IWG that will necessarily be priorities for the Secretariats time and resources during that time.

7. Given these points the Commission approved the Secretariats recommendation that the task in paragraph 25.2 of the 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report is clarified to be a tasking for the Secretariat to provide for the 2016 CDS-IWG meeting, two tables that collate the available information as submitted by CCMs in Annual Report Part 1 2016.

Summary Table 1 - minimum requirements for disposal of species in 2013

- Flag State / Fishing Entity
- Harvest Year
- Catch location
- Destination
- Gear
- Net Weight (kg)
- Estimated Whole Weight (kg) -calculated by applying conversion factors to the net weight

Summary Table 2 – receipt and redistribution of species in 2013

- Export year
- Export CCM or Domestic
- Import CCM
- Harvest Year
- Gear
- Net Weight (kg)

Estimated Whole Weight (kg) -calculated by applying conversion factors to the net weight

8. During the CDS-IWG 2016 meeting, it is further proposed that the CDS-IWG meeting could review the Secretariat prepared summary tables, and at that point take an informed decision on the next steps for the MBR trial, including if recommending whether the engagement of an expert consultant to undertake MBR calculation analyses should still occur.
