

Report of the Sixth Meeting of the  
Compliance Committee of the  
Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement  
(SIOFA)

Hotel le Récif, Saint-Gilles les Bains, la  
Réunion / Videoconference

29 June – 1 July 2022

## Table of Contents

<b>Agenda item 1 – Opening of the session .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Agenda item 1.1 Opening statements .....	4
Agenda item 1.2 Admission of observers .....	4
<b>Agenda item 2 – Administrative arrangements.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Agenda item 2.1 Adoption of the agenda.....	4
Agenda item 2.2 Confirmation of meeting documents .....	4
Agenda item 2.3 Appointment of rapporteurs .....	4
<b>Agenda item 3 – SIOFA Compliance Monitoring Scheme .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Agenda item 3.1. Consideration of the Draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR) .....	4
Agenda item 3.2. Development and adoption of the Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR) .....	6
Agenda item 3.3. Discussion on the CCR template update process .....	7
<b>Agenda item 4 – New or Amended Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) 7</b>	<b>7</b>
Agenda item 4.1 Proposals for amendments to Conservation and Management Measures .....	7
Agenda item 4.2 Proposals for new Conservation and Management Measures .....	8
Agenda item 4.3 Discussion on the implementation of current CMMs .....	8
<b>Agenda item 5 – Listing of IUU Vessels .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Agenda item 5.1 Examination of the Draft SIOFA IUU Vessel List .....	10
Agenda item 5.3. Adoption of the provisional SIOFA IUU Vessel List.....	12
<b>Agenda item 6 – Sightings of vessels without nationality reported to the Secretariat 12</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Agenda item 7 – Monitoring, Control and Surveillance.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Agenda item 7.1. Port inspections reports (CMM 2020/08 Port Inspection).....	12
Agenda item 7.2. Entry/Exit reports (CMM 2019/10 Monitoring).....	13
Agenda item 7.3. Transshipment and transfer reports (CMM 2019/10 Monitoring).....	13
<b>Agenda item 8 – Review of the status of Cooperating Non Contracting Parties (CNCP) 14</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Agenda item 9 – Election of a future Chairperson and vice Chairperson .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Agenda item 10 – Any other business.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Agenda item 11 – Adoption of the report .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Agenda item 12 – Close of meeting .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## List of Annexes

Annex A	Opening statement from the Executive Secretary
Annex B	List of meeting participants
Annex C	Agenda
Annex D	Table of agenda items and related papers
Annex E	Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report
Annex F	CMM 2021/02 Data Standards amendments
Annex G	CMM 2018/06 IUU Vessel List amendment
Annex H	CMM 2018/09 Control amendment
Annex I	CMM 2020/11 Compliance Monitoring Scheme amendment
Annex J	CMM 2019/12 Sharks amendment
Annex K	CMM 2019/13 Seabirds amendments
Annex L	CMM 2019/07 Vessel authorisation amendments
Annex M	Provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list
Annex N	Comoros letter for renewing its CNCP status
Annex O	India application for CNCP status

## **Agenda item 1 – Opening of the session**

### **Agenda item 1.1 Opening statements**

1. The Chair, Mr. Johnny Louys, opened the meeting at 04:00 UTC and welcomed all delegates. The meeting was held in a hybrid format, with delegates attending in-person in Saint-Gilles les Bains, la Réunion, at the Hotel le Récif, or via videoconference.
2. The Executive Secretary made an opening statement welcoming the delegates to the meeting and outlining the meeting arrangements. The opening statement is available in Annex A.
3. The Chair opened the floor for delegation introductions. The list of participants is available in Annex B.

### **Agenda item 1.2 Admission of observers**

4. The Chairperson welcomed Comoros as a CNCP and observers from the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC), South Africa, and the Southern Indian Ocean Deepsea Fishers Association (SIODFA).
5. The Compliance Committee recalled that observer status for neighbouring states is automatic and does not require an application nor MoP approval.

## **Agenda item 2 – Administrative arrangements**

### **Agenda item 2.1 Adoption of the agenda**

6. The Secretariat presented the revised provisional agenda. The Compliance Committee provided comments, based on which the Secretariat finalised the agenda. The agenda was adopted by the Compliance Committee (Annex C).

### **Agenda item 2.2 Confirmation of meeting documents**

7. The Chair advised that meeting documents are available on the website and that the list of meeting documents is presented in CC-06-ADM-04-rev10 and CC-06-ADM-05-rev10 (Annex D).

### **Agenda item 2.3 Appointment of rapporteurs**

8. The Executive Secretary proposed Mr Alexander Meyer (Urban Connections, Tokyo) as rapporteur for this meeting.
9. The Compliance Committee agreed to appoint Mr Alexander Meyer as rapporteur.

## **Agenda item 3 – SIOFA Compliance Monitoring Scheme**

### **Agenda item 3.1. Consideration of the Draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR)**

10. The Secretariat presented the draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR) outlined in CC-06-04 which is formatted to match the current provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR) template. The Compliance Committee reviewed the dSCR and assigned the compliance status and relevant follow-up actions in accordance with the provisions of

Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) 2020/11 (Compliance Monitoring Scheme).

11. The Secretariat explained that Mauritius has submitted a compliance report for its activities in 2022 but that the dSCR covers activities in 2021, for which Mauritius has not submitted a report. Mauritius explained that it had faced an issue that prevented it from submitting compliance reports in 2020 and 2021 (covering its activities in 2019 and 2020). This issue has now been resolved and Mauritius has submitted a compliance report in 2022, covering its 2021 activities. It will also submit compliance reports for its activities in 2019 and 2020, as well as any other required information, as soon as possible. The Compliance Committee welcomed Mauritius' submission of a compliance report in 2022 and looked forward to receiving the missing reports and other required information.
12. Thailand pointed out that the naming of the compliance report may have caused some confusion as it is called the 2022 report but covers activities in 2021. The Compliance Committee agreed to discuss this matter further under agenda item 3.3.
13. With regard to the assessment of the status of Japan's compliance with the obligation stipulated in paragraph 10(1)(a) of CMM 2020/01 (Interim management of bottom fishing), Japan explained that 'bottom fishing' means fishing using any gear type likely to come in contact with the seafloor or benthic organisms during the normal course of operations. Japan clarified that what it defines as mid water trawls are trawls that have no contact whatsoever with the seafloor and explained that in 2021 only mid water operations have been undertaken. The Cook Islands noted that the most important thing is to ensure that the benthopelagic fishery is managed.
14. With regard to the assessment of the status of Japan's compliance with the reporting requirements on seabirds' abundance stipulated in paragraph 15 of CMM 2021/02 (Data Standards), the Compliance Committee noted that such reporting is not mandatory since the reporting is qualified by "as much as possible".
15. When reviewing Mauritius's compliance against CMM 2019/02 (Data Standards), the Compliance Committee noted the challenges of collecting haul-by-haul data for handline fisheries in the Agreement Area, which is required under the measure. The Compliance Committee also noted that these challenges were considered in 2021 and addressed in the adoption of CMM 2021/02, and that the Secretariat has proposed further changes to the CMM to provide greater clarity as outlined in CC-06-03, which would be discussed under Agenda Item 4.1.2.
16. The Compliance Committee also discussed the applicability of CMM 2020/01 (interim bottom fishing measures) for the handline fishing activities of Comoros and Mauritius. The Compliance Committee agreed that these activities are not bottom fishing and therefore that the monitoring by on-board observers would not be mandatory.
17. The Compliance Committee noted that in CMM 2018/06 (IUU fishing), paragraph 31 states that CCPs should provide contact points for cooperation around vessels and activities information, but this provision is not mandatory. Therefore a non-compliant status is not an appropriate assessment and the item should be removed from the pSCR. However, the Compliance Committee proposed to review that paragraph.
18. The Compliance Committee discussed the applicability of lost gear retrieval requirements for handline fisheries where a lost line cannot be retrieved, and that paragraph 7a of CMM 2018/09 (Control) should be reviewed accordingly.
19. The Compliance Committee discussed the applicability of CMM 2021/14 (High Seas Boarding and Inspection Procedures) to vessels only on the IOTC authorised vessel list but could not reach a consensus. Some CCPs were of the view that the measure applies to all CCPs' vessels engaged or suspected to be engaged in fishing activities

in the SIOFA Area, while others were of the view that the measure only applies to those vessels targeting species under SIOFA's competence in the SIOFA Area and to those registered on the SIOFA authorised vessels list.

20. The Compliance Committee was unable to reach consensus on the assessment of the status of Chinese Taipei's compliance with the obligations stipulated in paragraphs 14 and 16 of CMM 2019/10 (Monitoring).
21. Regarding paragraph 14, the Compliance Committee agreed that the anomalies in Chinese Taipei's entry/exit notifications were due to a technical issue caused by the service provider for the automatic notification system used by Chinese Taipei's vessels. Some CCPs were of the view that the responsibility for the issue lay with the service provider and that Chinese Taipei was only made aware of the anomalies much later, so it was unable to provide the problematic entry/exit notifications via an alternative method. Other CCPs were of the view that a flag CCP is responsible for ensuring that any issues with its service provider do not prevent it from complying with its obligations and that Chinese Taipei had other means of fulfilling the obligation in question, even if there were issues with the automatic notification system. The Compliance Committee agreed that Chinese Taipei has since made every effort to address the issue and that the issue is now resolved.
22. Regarding paragraph 16, Chinese Taipei explained that, when its longline fishing vessels operating in the Indian Ocean conduct at-sea transshipment with carrier vessels, there are Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) observers onboard the carrier vessels, the observers submit their report to the IOTC Secretariat, and the IOTC Secretariat then distributes them to the flag CCPs concerned, which means it takes longer than 15 days to submit observer reports to the SIOFA Secretariat. Chinese Taipei further explained that it has proposed amendments to CMM 2019/10 to seek to address this issue. The Compliance Committee agreed that Chinese Taipei has been non-compliant with this obligation for consecutive years. Although this would normally warrant a status of 'critically non-compliant', some CCPs believed that the special circumstances faced by Chinese Taipei and the efforts it has made to resolve the issue should be taken into account.
23. The Secretariat presented CC-06-Info-01-Rev2, which provided information to the Compliance Committee about the Secretariat's compliance checks regarding Paragraph 10 of CMM2020/01 (Interim management of bottom fishing), particularly whether the Secretariat holds the necessary information received from the CCPs regarding their implementation of that provision to draft a SIOFA dSCR.
24. The Compliance Committee noted the information paper (CC-06-Info-01-Rev2).
25. The Compliance Committee discussed assessing the general status of compliance of SIOFA and requested the Secretariat to summarise the status of compliance for each CMM and present it at MoP9.

### **Agenda item 3.2. Development and adoption of the Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR)**

26. **The Compliance Committee adopted the provisional Compliance Report (pSCR) outlined in Annex E and agreed to forward it to the Meeting of the Parties (MoP) for its consideration, noting there were two issues on which the Compliance Committee could not reach consensus.**
27. Based on its review of the dSCR, the Compliance Committee identified potential improvements to a number of existing CMMs and developed proposals to that end. **The Compliance Committee agreed to forward the proposals to amend CMM 2021/02 (Annex F, paragraph 8), CMM 2018/06 (Annex G), CMM 2018/09 (Annex H), CMM 2020/11 (Annex I), and CMM 2019/12 (Annex J) and to recommend them to the MoP for adoption.**

### **Agenda item 3.3. Discussion on the CCR template update process**

28. The Executive Secretary explained that, based on feedback received from CCPs during the compliance assessment procedure and in recognition of the limitations of the current system, the Secretariat is in the process of developing a new template. The Executive Secretary presented CC-06-09-rev2, an example of an updated template for assessing CCPs' compliance against CMM 2020/01 (Interim management of bottom fishing), requested the Compliance Committee's feedback on the template, and recommended that the MoP recruit a short-term compliance expert to develop a new template that incorporates the feedback and covers all the relevant CMMs.
29. The Compliance Committee agreed that a new template be developed during the intersessional period for use in the 2023 Compliance Report. The Compliance Committee offered the following suggestions to guide such work:
  - a. The new template should provide simplification and improved ease of use while maintaining the current level of rigor, such as by:
    - i. removing questions that concern historical obligations that have already been satisfied.
    - ii. allowing certain information to be presented as tables, rather than multiple questions and answers.
  - b. Including an option for 'not applicable' in question responses.
  - c. The templates used by other regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) should be used as reference.
  - d. The capacity of the Secretariat could be increased through the hiring of a compliance officer or a short-term consultancy.
  - e. The new template should make it very clear which year's information is being requested.
  - f. CCPs' self-assessments should be supported by clear statements of implementation and, where relevant, some evidence or documentation.
30. The Executive Secretary thanked the Compliance Committee for its support and welcomed any further input that CCPs may have, particularly in developing a Terms of Reference if the MoP decides to engage a short-term consultancy.

## **Agenda item 4 – New or Amended Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs)**

### **Agenda item 4.1 Proposals for amendments to Conservation and Management Measures**

#### **4.1.1. Amendment to CMM 2019/10 (Monitoring) proposed by Chinese Taipei**

31. Chinese Taipei presented CC-06-10, which proposed amending CMM 2019/10 (Monitoring) to promote harmonisation and compatibility between the management measures of SIOFA and the IOTC for vessels listed on both the SIOFA record of authorised vessels and IOTC record of authorised vessels, while preventing any undermining of the efficacy of CMM 2019/10, nor interfering with the current practice that has been in place for demersal fisheries.
32. The Compliance Committee reviewed the proposed amendments. Some delegations expressed concern that the proposed amendments would weaken the monitoring and control of transshipments in the Area. Recognising the limited time available in the

meeting and that several concerns had been raised by CCPs, Chinese Taipei withdrew the proposal and indicated that it would continue to work with other CCPs to resolve the remaining issues.

#### **4.1.2. Amendment to CMM 2021/02 (Data Standards) paragraph 5**

33. The Secretariat presented CC-06-03, which proposed an amendment to paragraph 5 of CMM 2021/02 (Data Standards). Mauritius explained that a handline fishing operation is conducted by a main vessel, which is stationed and using a number of small dories in which fishermen catch fish and perform several line lifts every hour. It is therefore very challenging for a vessel captain to record every single haul, with its position, its start and end times, its depth, etc., as currently required by CMM 2021/02. The proposed change would enable CCPs that have handline fisheries to be compliant with the requirement of paragraph 5, when it is impossible to record the fishing activity on a haul-by-haul basis.
34. The Compliance Committee reviewed and further revised the proposed amendments. **The Compliance Committee agreed to forward the proposal outlined in Annex F, paragraph 5 and to recommend that the MoP continues work on the proposal.**

#### **4.1.3. Amendment to CMM 2019/13 (Mitigation of Seabirds bycatch) proposed by France-OT**

35. France Territories presented CC-06-06, which proposed amending CMM 2019/13 (Mitigation of Seabirds Bycatch) to reflect the recommendation made by the SC (SC7 Report, para 141) that “pelagic longliners operating in the SIOFA Area follow IOTC Resolution 12/06 on reducing the incidental bycatch of seabirds in longline fisheries”. France Territories also noted that the holding of a workshop to consider how seabird bycatch mitigation measures may be progressed further, as recommended by SC7 (para 148), should not prevent the MoP from adopting the required precautionary mitigation measures in the meantime.
36. The Compliance Committee reviewed and further revised the proposed amendments. **The Compliance Committee agreed to forward the proposal outlined in CC-06-06 rev4 (Annex K) and to recommend it to the MoP for adoption.**
37. The Compliance Committee agreed that the revised CMM would also apply to pelagic longline vessels targeting SIOFA fishery resources as defined in Article 1(f) of the Agreement, but not those targeting IOTC fishery resources.

#### **4.1.4. Amendment to CMM 2019/07 (Vessel authorisation) proposed by Korea**

38. Korea presented CC-06-05, which proposed amending CMM 2019/07 (Vessel Authorisation) to clarify that vessels that are eligible for an International Maritime Organization (IMO) number are required to obtain one, while those that are not able to receive an IMO number despite following appropriate IMO procedures shall inform the Secretariat for the consideration of the MoP.
39. The Compliance Committee reviewed and further revised the proposed amendments. **The Compliance Committee agreed to forward the proposal outlined in CC-06-05 (Annex L) and to recommend that the MoP continues work on the proposal.**

#### **Agenda item 4.2 Proposals for new Conservation and Management Measures**

40. No proposals for new CMMs were received.

#### **Agenda item 4.3 Discussion on the implementation of current CMMs**

##### **4.3.1. CMM 2021/14 (High seas boarding and inspection procedures)**

41. **The Compliance Committee noted CC-06-Info-04, which outlined 3 high seas boarding inspection (HSBI) reports from France Territories.**



42. The Compliance Committee thanked France Territories for the reports, recognising the importance of undertaking HSBI and the contribution this makes to SIOFA's MCS.
43. The Executive Secretary informed the Compliance Committee that Chinese Taipei has notified the Secretariat of its intention to carry out HSBI and has provided relevant information as required by CMM 2021/14 (High Seas Boarding and Inspection Procedures).
44. The Compliance Committee agreed that HSBI notifications should be circulated to CCPs by SIOFA Circular.
45. The Compliance Committee held further discussions on the applicability of CMM 2021/14.
46. The European Union expressed its position that all CCPs' fishing vessels operating in the SIOFA Area are subject to HSBI pursuant to CMM 2021/14. That includes not only vessels targeting SIOFA species but also those targeting other species, including those under the mandate of the IOTC that may catch SIOFA species as bycatch. This position is based on paragraphs 5 and 11 of the measure. Paragraph 5 states "Each Contracting Party may, subject to these procedures, carry out boarding and inspection in the Agreement Area of fishing vessels flying the flag of a CCP that is engaged in or suspected to have engaged in fishing as defined in Article 1(g) of the Agreement for fishery resources". Paragraph 11, which defines the priorities for boarding and inspection, includes other vessels as well, including vessels not targeting SIOFA species.
47. Australia, France Territories, and the Cook Islands expressed their support for the intervention made by the European Union and its interpretation of the scope and applicability of CMM 2021/14. Australia further noted that a narrower interpretation would undermine the purpose of the scheme.
48. Chinese Taipei expressed the view that vessels registered solely to the IOTC should fall outside the scope of the CMM, as they fish for tuna and tuna-like species and have no intention to fish for SIOFA resources. Chinese Taipei elaborated that CMM 2021/14 only applies to fishing vessels engaged in fishing with the intention to fish for SIOFA fishery resources, and the wording "for fishery resources" in paragraph 5 of CMM 2021/14 has its own meaning for the purpose of excluding bycatch constructed under Article 1(g). Chinese Taipei further expressed that the application of SIOFA measures to vessels registered solely to the IOTC would also create practical issues and could cause confusion for those vessels.
49. Japan stated that CMM 2021/14 stipulates in paragraph 5 that "Each Contracting Party may...carry out boarding and inspection in the Agreement Area of fishing vessels flying the flag of a CCP that is engaged in or suspected to have engaged in fishing as defined in Article 1(g) of the Agreement for fishery resources." The SIOFA Agreement defines in Article 1(f) "fisheries resources" which exclude highly migratory species listed in Annex 1 of the 1982 Convention. Therefore, it is abundantly clear that CMM 2021/14 does not and cannot apply to tuna vessels targeting tuna which are listed on the IOTC vessel registry and operating within the framework of IOTC. Trying to apply the SIOFA HSBI of such tuna vessels not only exceeds SIOFA's authority, but also undermines or at least intervenes in the IOTC authority, unless and until IOTC allows such an intervention from SIOFA. The mere suspicion of such a vessel taking some SIOFA species cannot justify the application of the SIOFA HSBI scheme to the IOTC tuna vessels.
50. The Seychelles and Thailand expressed their support for the interventions made by Chinese Taipei and Japan.

51. Japan stated that it understood the concern of some CCPs about the magnitude of bycatch of SIOFA species taken by tuna vessels, which may affect not only SIOFA CMMs but also the ratio of the budgetary contribution of each CCP. Japan indicated its willingness to discuss how to address the issue and reach satisfactory arrangements in a spirit of cooperation.
52. Japan noted that at the IOTC, discussion is underway to develop IOTC's own HSBI scheme, and Japan intends to participate in the discussion constructively.
53. Australia pointed out that Article XV of the IOTC Agreement states that "Nothing in this Agreement shall prejudice the rights and responsibilities of other intergovernmental organizations or institutions dealing with tuna or a species of tuna in the Area or the validity of any measures adopted by such organization or institution", and noted that both the IOTC and SIOFA have competence over certain species (including longtail tuna). Australia further noted that while it understood there are overlapping competencies between the IOTC and SIOFA, CCPs are obliged to comply with the obligations of all RFMOs they belong to. Any specific arrangements to reduce overlapping competencies must be expressly agreed to by Members.
54. **The Compliance Committee noted the divergent views on the applicability of CMM 2021/14 and agreed to request the guidance of the MoP on this matter.**

#### **4.3.2. CMM 2020/01 (Interim management of bottom fishing)**

55. The Compliance Committee discussed the implementation of CMM 2020/01 as part of the consideration of CC-06-INFO-01-rev2 under agenda item 3.1.

## **Agenda item 5 – Listing of IUU Vessels**

### **Agenda item 5.1 Examination of the Draft SIOFA IUU Vessel List**

56. The Compliance Committee considered the draft SIOFA IUU vessel list, which included five vessels, the IMULA 1655 MTR (flag: Sri Lanka), the IMULA 1783 MTR (flag: Sri Lanka), the IMULA 1844 MTR (flag: Sri Lanka), the Mariam 1 (flag: Mauritius), and the El Shaddai (flag: South Africa), as outlined in CC-06-01-rev2.
57. In relation to the IMULA 1655 MTR and the IMULA 1783 MTR,
  - a. The Executive Secretary informed the Compliance Committee that Sri Lanka notified the Secretariat on the first day of the Compliance Committee meeting that the two vessels were targeting tuna and tuna-like species and have not engaged in other fisheries, and submitted the logbooks of the vessels. The Cook Islands noted that it was unclear whether the flag state had verified the logbook information.
  - b. The European Union noted that the logbook information for IMULA 1655 MTR submitted by Sri Lanka suggested that the vessel has violated IOTC regulations including in relation to mobulid rays.
  - c. The European Union noted that the logbook information for IMULA 1783 MTR submitted by Sri Lanka is not consistent with the AIS tracking that the European Union has provided to SIOFA and wished to receive information from Sri Lanka that would clarify this discrepancy.
  - d. The European Union and the Cook Islands noted that there was insufficient information to conclude that the vessels have not been targeting SIOFA species and recalled that it is the responsibility of the flag CCPs to confirm that no IUU fishing took place.

58. **The Compliance Committee noted that the IMULA 1655 MTR and the IMULA 1783 MTR are not on the SIOFA record of authorised vessels and were presumed to have engaged in fishing within the SIOFA Area. However, some CCPs considered that the matter falls in the IOTC jurisdiction and is outside the SIOFA responsibility. The Compliance Committee could not reach consensus to include the IMULA 1655 MTR and the IMULA 1783 MTR on the provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list.**
59. **The Compliance Committee agreed to retain the vessels on the draft SIOFA IUU vessel list for its consideration at its next meeting and requested Sri Lanka to provide further information such as observer data, port inspection reports, landing/sale notes, and transshipment declarations.**
60. **The Compliance Committee requested the Secretariat to inform the IOTC of the possibility that the IMULA 1655 MTR and the IMULA 1783 MTR have engaged in IUU fishing of IOTC resources.**
61. In relation to the IMULA 1844 MTR,
  - a. The Executive Secretary informed the Compliance Committee that Sri Lanka has notified the Secretariat that it is currently engaged in legal proceedings against the IMULA 1844 MTR and will inform the Secretariat of any disciplinary actions it takes against the vessel. The Executive Secretary explained that, due to the ongoing legal proceedings, Sri Lanka has not provided the vessel's logbook information.
  - b. The Cook Islands noted that, based on the AIS data, the vessel appears to have engaged in fishing activity on known SIOFA fishing grounds. Without the logbook information or other relevant information, it is not possible to rule out the vessel's engagement in IUU fishing for SIOFA resources.
62. **The Compliance Committee noted that the IMULA 1844 MTR, a Sri Lankan-flagged vessel, is not on the SIOFA record of authorised vessels and that it is suspected to have engaged in fishing in the SIOFA Area. The Compliance Committee agreed to include the IMULA 1844 MTR on the provisional IUU vessel (Annex M).**
63. In relation to the Mariam 1,
  - a. Mauritius explained that it previously claimed historical rights to the Saya de Malha Bank, where the Mariam 1 has engaged in fishing activities, and it therefore did not register the vessel on the SIOFA record of authorised vessels. However, Mauritius authorised and licensed the vessel to operate on the Saya de Malha Bank and ensured that it followed Mauritius' national legislation. Furthermore, Mauritius has since ceased its claim to historical rights (SIOFA Circular-2022-31) and will therefore register the Mariam 1 on the SIOFA record of authorised vessels before reinstating the vessel's license, which has been revoked for an unrelated matter.
64. **The Compliance Committee noted the explanation provided by Mauritius and that the vessel is currently not authorised to fish in the SIOFA Area. The Compliance Committee agreed to not include the Mariam 1 on the provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list and to remove the vessel from the draft SIOFA IUU vessel list.**
65. In relation to the El Shaddai,
  - a. South Africa provided further updates on the actions taken by the South African authorities, including charging the owners of the vessel criminally, conducting an ongoing criminal investigation, including with regard to the

fishing master and the captain of the vessel, and tying up the vessel. South Africa requested that the Compliance Committee keep the vessel off the provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list and allow South Africa additional time to finalise its investigation and report the findings to the Compliance Committee intersessionally or at its next Meeting.

- b. The Compliance Committee noted that the EI Shaddai is on the cross-list of IUU vessels due to the fact that CCAMLR registered it on its own IUU list for activities relevant to CCAMLR. The Compliance Committee noted that it was still important for SIOFA to conduct its own assessment and IUU listing pertaining to activities in the SIOFA Area.
  - c. The Cook Islands pointed out that the EI Shaddai engaged in a clear case of IUU fishing, that South Africa has been investigating the case of the EI Shaddai for several years now, and that South Africa has yet to provide various information that the Compliance Committee has previously requested. The Cook Islands stated that the Compliance Committee needed to apply CMM 2018/06 and that on this basis, the EI Shaddai should be included on the provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list.
66. **The Compliance Committee noted that the EI Shaddai, a South African-flagged vessel, is not on the SIOFA record of authorised vessels and has engaged in fishing for fishery resources in the Agreement Area. The Compliance Committee agreed to include the EI Shaddai on the provisional SIOFA IUU vessel list (Annex M).**
67. Agenda item 5.2 Examination of the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List and intersessional cross listing of IUU vessels
68. **The Compliance Committee considered the current SIOFA IUU vessel list and the list of cross-listed IUU vessels from other RFMOs (CC-06-02) and did not make any recommendations to the MoP to remove any vessel from either list.**

#### **Agenda item 5.3. Adoption of the provisional SIOFA IUU Vessel List**

69. **The Compliance Committee endorsed the provisional SIOFA IUU Vessel List as outlined in Annex M and recommended that the MoP include the vessels on the provisional IUU vessel list on the new IUU vessel list.**

#### **Agenda item 6 – Sightings of vessels without nationality reported to the Secretariat**

70. **The Compliance Committee noted that there were no reports of sightings of vessels without nationality provided to the Secretariat since the 3rd Compliance Committee meeting (July 2019).**

#### **Agenda item 7 – Monitoring, Control and Surveillance**

##### **Agenda item 7.1. Port inspections reports (CMM 2020/08 Port Inspection)**

71. The Secretariat presented CC-06-INFO-03, which outlines 23 inspections from the European Union, covering the year 2021.

72. The Secretariat explained that no inspection reports were received from Mauritius. Mauritius explained that the inspection reports are available and that it will submit them to the Secretariat within 4 weeks of the end of the Compliance Committee meeting. Mauritius also informed the Compliance Committee that it has submitted a list of the inspections it has conducted in 2021 as part of its compliance report. The Compliance Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the information paper with the list of Mauritius's port inspections added.
73. **The Compliance Committee noted the revised port inspections summary, CC-06-INFO-03 rev1, which outlines 23 inspections from the European Union and lists 11 inspections conducted by Mauritius, covering the year 2021.**

#### **Agenda item 7.2. Entry/Exit reports (CMM 2019/10 Monitoring)**

74. The Secretariat presented the entry/exit notifications summary report, CC-06-INFO-02-rev1, which outlines the entry/exit notifications received at the Secretariat from May 2021 to April 2022. A total of 1486 entry-exit notifications were received. 72 notifications were received more than 24 hours after the entry or exit event. There were 71 reporting anomalies whereby 2 or more consecutive entries or exits were reported. All anomalies were with Chinese Taipei's notifications and these all occurred before August 2021 because of an issue with the service provider. Since August 2021, no anomalies have been recorded. All other notifications from Chinese Taipei have been consistent and received in a timely manner. 3 notifications from other CCPs were received late (>24 hours). Two of these were received one hour late and another one was due to an internet connection issue. No notifications for entry in the SIOFA Area or exit from the SIOFA Area were received from Mauritius.
75. Mauritius explained that information regarding its entry/exit notifications is available and that it will submit this to the Secretariat within 4 weeks of the end of the Compliance Committee meeting.
76. **The Compliance Committee noted the entry/exit notifications summary report (CC-06-INFO-02-rev1).**
77. **The Compliance Committee recommended that, going forward, the MoP adopt a reporting period for entry/exit notifications that is aligned with the compliance assessment period, i.e. based on the calendar year.**

#### **Agenda item 7.3. Transshipment and transfer reports (CMM 2019/10 Monitoring)**

78. **The Compliance Committee noted Thailand's at-sea transfers report, CC-06-07-rev1, which outlined 56 transfers in 2021, and 34 transfers in 2022 as of June 6, and Chinese-Taipei's at-sea transfers and transshipments report, CC-06-08, which outlined 166 transfers from June 2021 through May 2022 and 114 transshipments from June 2021 through April 2022.**
79. **The Compliance Committee recommended that, going forward, the reporting period for transshipment and at-sea transfers is aligned with the compliance assessment period, i.e. based on the calendar year.**
80. Thailand suggested that the Secretariat develop a standard template for transshipment and transfer reports. The Secretariat explained that it is working on developing an online interface that would allow CCPs to input the relevant information directly into the SIOFA website and invited input from Chinese Taipei, Thailand and any other interested parties.

## **Agenda item 8 – Review of the status of Cooperating Non Contracting Parties (CNCP)**

81. The Compliance Committee noted that Comoros submitted a request to renew its status as a cooperating non-Contracting Party. The statement from Comoros is available in Annex N.
82. **The Compliance Committee recommended that the MoP determines that Comoros qualifies to retain its CNCP status.**
83. The Compliance Committee requested Comoros to strengthen its efforts to fulfil the SIOFA reporting and other requirements.
84. The Compliance Committee noted that India submitted a request for status as a cooperating non-Contracting Party. The statement from India is available in Annex O.
85. The Compliance Committee noted that India did not participate in the meeting and could not respond to questions regarding its application. The Compliance Committee was therefore unable to assess the application. **The Compliance Committee requested the Secretariat to contact India and request its attendance at the MoP for further discussion of its application.**

## **Agenda item 9 – Election of a future Chairperson and vice Chairperson**

86. The Compliance Committee noted that the term of the current Chairperson, Mr Johnny Louys, will end following the 7<sup>th</sup> Compliance Committee meeting. As this is currently his second term, Mr Louys cannot be reelected for another term.
87. The Compliance Committee noted that the position of Vice Chairperson is currently vacant. No nominations were received.

## **Agenda item 10 – Any other business**

88. Mauritius outlined its Note Verbale provided in SIOFA Circular-2022-31 and stated that it will make every effort to fulfil its commitments to SIOFA.
89. The IOC informed the Compliance Committee that it has sent a letter of intent to the SIOFA Secretariat proposing cooperation between SIOFA and the IOC through the Ecofish programme (SIOFA Circular-2022-36). Through such cooperation, the IOC may be able to provide technical and financial assistance to support the work of SIOFA.
90. The Compliance Committee welcomed the intention expressed by the IOC and noted the potential benefits. Some CCPs cautioned that any potential collaboration in the area of enforcement would require further careful consideration and discussion. **The Compliance Committee requested more details regarding the proposed strategic plan and actions, and recommended that the MoP hold further discussions on potential collaboration between SIOFA and the IOC.**

## **Agenda item 11 – Adoption of the report**

91. The report of the 6th meeting of the SIOFA Compliance Committee was adopted at 11:15 a.m. UTC, 1 July 2022.

### **Agenda item 12 – Close of meeting**

92. The Compliance Committee thanked the Rapporteur, the Secretariat, the interpreters, and the Compliance Committee Chair for the organisation and conducting of the meeting.
93. The Compliance Committee Chair thanked CCPs for their cooperation and the Secretariat for its support.
94. The meeting was closed at 11:15 a.m. UTC, 1 July 2022.