

Pacific Ocean tuna - longline (Fue Shin) Three-Year Audit Report

Version 1.2, September 2021

FIP Information

Target species scientific name(s) and common name(s) [state target stock(s), if relevant]	Albacore Tuna <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> ; North and South Pacific stocks Bigeye Tuna <i>Thunnus obesus</i> ; Western and Central Pacific and Eastern Pacific stocks Yellowfin Tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> ; Western and Central Pacific and Eastern Pacific stocks Skipjack Tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> ; Western and Central Pacific and Eastern Pacific stocks
Fishery location	Pacific Ocean: Area 61 (Pacific, Northwest) Area 67 (Pacific, Northeast) Area 71 (Pacific, Western Central) Area 77 (Pacific, Eastern Central) Area 81 (Pacific, Southwest) Area 87 (Pacific, Southeast)
Gear type(s)	Longline
Estimated FIP Landings (weight in tons)	2,541 metric tons (December 2021)
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Large longline
Number of vessels	27
Management authority	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) Taiwan
Auditor name(s)	Dr. Johanna Pierre

Auditor Organization/Affiliation	Johanna Pierre Environmental Consulting Ltd
Date of report completion	23/04/2023

Stakeholder Consultation & Meetings

Name	Affiliation	Date and Subjects Discussed
Charles Horsnell	Key Traceability (KT)	<p style="text-align: right;"><u>17 January 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of FIP and KT's role in it • Development of the endangered, threatened and protected species (ETP) management policy • Engagement with the Taiwan Fisheries Agency • Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO) engagement • Implementation of no shark-finning policy • Implementation of ETP management measures • Challenges with at-sea fishery monitoring
Kathryn Read Ho-Tu Chiang	Ocean Outcomes (O2)	<p style="text-align: right;"><u>18 January 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of FIP and O2's role in it • Process for onboarding new vessels into the FIP • Skipper training workshops (focused on shark and ETP management measures) • Monitoring the fishery and the implementation of management measures • Progress with social policy development
Albert Tsu-Kang Wen Joy Hsiang-Yi Yu Wei-Yang Liu	Taiwan Fisheries Agency (TFA) Taiwan Fisheries Agency Overseas Fisheries Development Council	<p style="text-align: right;"><u>20 April 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishery-specific management • RFMO engagement • Approach to observer monitoring • Compliance and enforcement • Update on Taiwan's Action Plan for Fisheries and Human Rights

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The number of vessels in the FIP has increased by seven since the March 2022 update. There are now 27 participating vessels, almost three times the number initially included in the FIP. FIP participant actions have been focused in three areas:

- advocacy for improvements in target stock management
- ETP management, and,
- collection of information to better support scoring of PIs.

COVID-19 impacts on the FIP have included difficulties with in-person holding meetings, and disruptions at the RFMO level.

In the three-year period that is the focus of this audit, RFMO activities have enabled stock status scores of Principle 1 species to improve, such that Eastern Pacific Ocean yellowfin and bigeye no longer trigger the rebuilding requirements of the MSC standard. This results from new stock assessment findings being adopted by RFMOs. The ability of the FIP to deliver on actions around harvest strategies and harvest control rules remains constrained by the pace of progress by RFMOs, and the advocacy efforts of the fishery client are the focus of action in that area.

This audit report shows decreases in scores for primary and secondary species, compared to the pre-assessments undertaken for the FIP. This does not reflect negative progress in the fishery. Instead, it highlights that the FIP pre-assessments focused on information on bait from other assessed fisheries. For this audit, bait species were identified for the focal fishery, while there was no information available on the quantity of bait used. Source stocks could also not be identified for most bait species. These scoring reductions should be readily addressable when information is available on bait quantity and source stocks.

The level of at-sea monitoring by fisheries observers has varied from 1.2 – 13.7% of hooks set by FIP participant vessels per year (2019-2022). On average, at-sea monitoring covered 7.9% of the hooks set by FIP vessels annually in that period. Observer information provided for the audit included catch composition, fate and life status. There was no evidence of shark-finning or retention of ETP species. Some logbook information was also available for the audit. Higher levels of at-sea monitoring may enable higher scores, e.g. around shark-finning, for which “good external validation” is required to confirm the likelihood of shark finning not occurring (“good external validation” should be understood to indicate a validation level equivalent to a nominal observer coverage of 20% of effort; MSC standard v2.01, GSA2.4.5 – GSA 2.4.7).

Compliance of Taiwanese fishing operations with international requirements, and Taiwan’s management systems and processes for surveillance and enforcement, have received significant international attention over time (e.g. the issue of a “yellow card” by the EU in 2015, that was lifted in 2019). Most recently in 2021, NOAA identified Taiwan in its report on international fisheries management issues. It is understood that discussions between TFA and US government agencies have taken place since the publication of that report. TFA anticipates that updated reporting by NOAA will close out concerns that were identified; such resolution is expected to support increased scoring of relevant MSC scoring issues if no additional issues are identified.

Recommendations for next steps of the FIP follow:

- Compile information on bait source stocks, and quantities used by the vessels participating in the FIP, such that scores for primary and secondary species can be revisited.
- Continue work on ETP management, including the collection of evidence that required management measures are being implemented onboard FIP vessels.
- Increase the level of at-sea monitoring to increase confidence in information available from the fishery (e.g. catch composition and ETP management) and also facilitate the transition to MSC assessment under version 3.0 of the Standard.

Summary of MSC Performance Indicator Scores

Principle	Component	Performance Indicator (PI)	Previous Score Year 2 2022	Current Score Year 3 2023	Rationale or Key Points	
1	Outcome	1.1.1	Stock status	60-79	60-79	No stocks trigger MSC's rebuilding requirements, following model updates supporting the reevaluation of stock status for EPO bigeye and EPO yellowfin (IATTC 2022a, 2022b). Therefore, PI 1.1.2 is no longer assessed.
		1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	60-79	Not applicable	
	Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	60-79	60-79	
		1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	60-79	60-79	
		1.2.3	Information and monitoring	80+	80+	
	1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	80+	80+		
2	Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome	80+	60-79	Scoring of this PI is amended on consideration of bait used in the fishery. The pre-assessments supporting this FIP identified Pacific saury (<i>Cololabis saira</i>) as a primary main species, as well as chub mackerel (<i>Scomber japonicus</i>), Argentine squid (<i>Illex argentinus</i>), and other species, based on usage in other assessed fisheries.

					<p>For this audit, information was available on species used as bait in the fishery, while not the quantity used, or the source stock in most cases. Bait used in the fishery includes saury, mackerel, squid, milkfish (<i>Chanos chanos</i>) and other species. It is unknown, based on currently available information, whether these bait species would require assessment as main or minor species. Saury, mackerel and squid are considered primary species, noting that this will require confirmation when the source stocks of mackerel and squid are known.</p> <p>Pacific saury stock status is assessed as below B_{MSY} (median $B/B_{MSY} = 0.361$, 80% CI=0.218-0.587; NPFC Scientific Committee 2022). Status information for the relevant squid and mackerel stocks is required. Given the number of bait sources used and scale of bait fisheries, the UoA is unlikely to hinder recovery and rebuilding (if stocks are below PRI).</p> <p>Taking a precautionary approach while information on bait source stocks is not available for all species, the score for this PI is reduced to 60-79. Without additional information, it cannot be concluded that SG80 is met for all bait species.</p>	
		2.1.2	Management strategy	80+	60-79	<p>This PI score is reduced while bait information is compiled. The scale of the assessed fishery, amount of catch from the possible source stocks, and range of bait species used are expected to contribute to the SG60 level being met for this PI. However, it is not evident that there is an effective strategy implemented, or whether one is necessary, to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of the main primary species at/to levels which are highly likely to be above the PRI.</p> <p>Taking a precautionary approach while information on bait becomes available, the score for this PI is reduced to 60-79. Without additional information on bait use, it cannot be concluded that SG80 is met.</p>
		2.1.3	Information	80+	60-79	<p>This PI score is reduced while bait information is consolidated. Some qualitative, but no quantitative, information is available on bait use. The</p>

					<p>RBF could be used at scoring issue (a), assuming bait species could be identified. Additional information is needed to assess scoring issue (c).</p> <p>When some quantitative information becomes available on bait use from identified stocks, it is expected that SG80 could be met for this PI.</p>
Secondary species	2.2.1	Outcome	80+	60-79	<p>Scoring of this PI is amended on consideration of bait used in the fishery. Milkfish and other (unidentified) bait species that may include secondary species are used in the fishery. Given the number of bait sources used in the focal fishery, and typical scale of bait fisheries, the UoA is considered unlikely to hinder recovery and rebuilding (if stocks are below biologically base limits).</p> <p>Taking a precautionary approach while information on bait becomes available, the score for this PI is reduced to 60-79. Without additional information, it cannot be concluded that SG80 is met for secondary bait species.</p>
	2.2.2	Management strategy	80+	60-79	<p>Observer data did not include any records of finning events for any shark species, and such external validation is required to ensure shark finning is not occurring. At SG60, MSC guidance is that the requirement for “<i>some external validation</i>” <i>should be understood to indicate a validation level equivalent to a nominal observer coverage of 5% of effort</i>. At SG80, “<i>good external validation</i>” is required, and this “<i>should be understood to indicate a validation level equivalent to a nominal observer coverage of 20% of effort</i>” (GSA2.4.5 – GSA2.4.7 of the MSC Fisheries Standard, v2.01). Among vessels operating in the focal fishery, 1.2 – 13.7% of hooks set were observed each year 2019-2022, with an average across years of 7.9%. Port-based inspections also occur in Taiwan (inspectors target 10% of vessels for these inspections). Overall, this level of validation is adequate to meet SG60, but not SG80.</p> <p>Bait also requires consideration for this PI, when fishery-specific information is available.</p>
	2.2.3	Information	80+	60-79	<p>This PI score is reduced while bait information is consolidated. Qualitative, but no quantitative, information is available on bait use.</p>

						<p>The RBF could be used at scoring issue (a) if needed. Additional information is needed to assess scoring issue (c).</p> <p>When some quantitative information becomes available on bait use from identified stocks, it is expected that SG80 could be met for this PI.</p>
	ETP species	2.3.1	Outcome	<60	60-79	<p>Observer information was available for this audit, provided by TFA to the fishery client (and subsequently to the auditor). Some logbook information was also provided by the fishery client. The level of at-sea monitoring by fisheries observers has varied from 1.2 – 13.7% of hooks set by FIP participant vessels per year (2019-2022; annual average across years of 7.9%). This provides some information to assess known direct effects of the fishery on ETP. There were no records of ETP retention occurring. Information is insufficient to conclude direct effects are highly likely to not hinder ETP recovery, while SG60 is now met.</p>
		2.3.2	Management strategy	60-79	60-79	
		2.3.3	Information	<60	60-79	<p>While at-sea monitoring occurs at low levels in some years, the average proportion of hooks observed is above 5% annually for vessels participating in the FIP, for the years 2019-2022. Considering information available from the FIP, other Pacific longline fisheries, and on ETP species and their management, the score for this PI is considered to meet SG60. SG80 is not considered to be met, given current levels of at-sea monitoring in place.</p>
	Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome	80+	80+	
		2.4.2	Management strategy	80+	80+	
		2.4.3	Information	80+	80+	
	Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome	80+	80+	
		2.5.2	Management strategy	80+	80+	
		2.5.3	Information	80+	80+	
3	Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	80+	80+	
		3.1.2	Consultation, roles and responsibilities	80+	80+	
		3.1.3	Long term objectives	80+	80+	

Fishery specific management system	3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	80+	80+	
	3.2.2	Decision making processes	80+	60-79	FisheryProgress narrative describing the current score identifies that for scoring issue (b), “SG60 is met, and the score for SG80 is uncertain”. On that basis, the score at this three-year audit is consistent in remaining at 60-79 for this PI. There is some evidence that decision-making processes respond to issues in the manner required, e.g. following the issue of the EU yellow card in 2015 and subsequent lifting of that in 2019. More recently, NOAA Fisheries (2021) identified issues with Taiwanese fisheries management. Evidence was required by NOAA that Taiwan had taken steps to investigate the violations described, and also that corrective actions were taken to address any substantiated violations (NOAA Fisheries 2021). Taiwanese and US government officials have undertaken discussions about the issues raised. TFA anticipates the concerns raised will be closed out in NOAA’s next report. On that basis, it is expected that the score for this PI could increase in the near future, provided no other issues emerge.
	3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	80+	80+	
	3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	60-79	80+	<p>This PI includes both national and international components. At the RFMO level, both WCPFC and IATTC have mechanisms in place to evaluate their management systems, e.g. subsidiary bodies and working groups. Review functions are specified in the conventions defining the activities of these RFMOs. WCPFC has been reviewed externally (Review Team 2012), and independent reviews of its Compliance Monitoring Scheme have been conducted (Koehler 2021; MacKay et al. 2018). IATTC was reviewed in 2016 (Moss-Adams 2016).</p> <p>For Taiwan (Chinese Taipei), internal and external reviews have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions culminating in passing the Distant Water Fisheries Act 2016, as well as amendments to the Fisheries Act and the Ordinance to Govern Investment in the Operation of Foreign Flag Fishing Vessels, tightening regulations and increasing fines for illegal

					<p>fishing and other significant violations. Changes resulted in the yellow card issued by the EU in 2015 being lifted in 2019 (https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_19_3397).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Taiwan’s monitoring, control and surveillance of fisheries (Pramod 2017). • US government review of IUU fishing, and matters relating to protected species bycatch and shark catch (NOAA Fisheries 2021). <p>TFA also informally reviews aspects of the management system as relevant to new proposals for RFMO management measures, and in response to issues that may arise in bilateral discussions with other nations.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Environmental Workplan Results

Result	Related Action on Fishery Progress	Related MSC Performance Indicator	Explanation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock status of EPO bigeye and yellowfin updated based on new assessment method. 	<p>Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna</p>	<p>1.1.1 1.1.2</p>	<p><u>EPO bigeye:</u> In 2022, IATTC followed a new approach to evaluate stock status of EPO bigeye. A benchmark assessment was used as the basis of a risk analysis. The analysis included 44 different models, covering a wide range of plausible hypotheses about biology as well as different data sets and assumptions. It was concluded that stock status is highly likely to be above PRI, and at or around a level consistent with MSY.</p> <p><u>EPO yellowfin:</u> In 2020, a benchmark assessment was conducted that served as basis for a risk analysis. This analysis included 48 models that cover different hypothesis on EPO yellowfin tuna biology, datasets and assumptions. This new approach gave considerably different results in comparison to the 2019 assessment. It was concluded that stock status is highly likely to be above PRI, and at or around a level consistent with MSY.</p>

			<p>The newly assessed status of both EPO bigeye and yellowfin stocks means rebuilding is no longer considered at PI 1.1.2 (IATTC 2022a, 2022b).</p> <p>The FIP’s work did not directly contribute to these results, but the FIP coordinator provided position statements prior to WCPFC and IATTC meetings to TFA as the national management agency. Position statements set out matters of relevance to FIP actions and objectives, and results are aligned with FIP objectives (WCPFC position statements: 2020, 2021; IATTC position statements: 2020, 2021, 2022). FSF also endorsed the collective position statement to WCPFC issued by tuna supply chain companies, in 2022 (available here).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An interim non-binding management procedure was adopted for WCPO skipjack. 	<p>Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species</p> <p>Develop harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna</p>	<p>1.2.1</p> <p>1.2.2</p>	<p>The FIP coordinator provided position statements prior to WCPFC and IATTC meetings to TFA as the national management agency. Position statements set out matters of relevance to FIP actions and objectives, and results are aligned with FIP objectives (WCPFC position statements: 2020, 2021; IATTC position statements: 2020, 2021, 2022). FSF also endorsed the collective position statement to WCPFC issued by tuna supply chain companies, in 2022 (available here).</p> <p>TFA confirmed that management strategy evaluation remains a priority for the agency’s RFMO engagement. After not attending the first or second workshops, TFA attended the third IATTC Tropical Tuna MSE Workshop in December 2022.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observer and logbook information contributes to an understanding of the catch profile of the fishery. Some ETP species are identified in the catch. A shark, turtle and seabird policy and an ETP management 	<p>ETP species outcome, management and information</p>	<p>2.3.1</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>2.3.3</p>	<p>Logbook data for all 27 vessels involved in the FIP in 2022 were provided by the fishery client (Additional logbook information from previous years has been presented on FisheryProgress). Logbook data included whether catch was retained or discarded. Observer data (2019-2022) were also available for the audit, provided by TFA to the client, together with details of hooks set and hooks observed. Observer data included 12 vessels. Observer data included fate codes, life status information and whether catch was retained/discarded. ETP species recorded in the catch included giant manta (<i>Manta birostris</i>), oceanic whitetip (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) and silky sharks (<i>C. falciformis</i>), and olive ridley turtles (<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>). Among observer data, there were no records of shark finning or ETP retention. Observer coverage among</p>

<p>strategy have been developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of shark finning or retention of ETP species (noting relatively low levels of monitoring in place). • Training sessions on implementing ETP management measures have occurred. 			<p>FIP vessels covered more than 5% of hooks on average for the period 2019-2022, while varying from 1.2 – 13.7% of hooks annually.</p> <p>A shark and turtle conservation policy was developed by the FIP and then updated to also include seabirds (2020). Photographic evidence of this being present on vessels was initially sought. An ETP management strategy has also been developed (2021). At future audits, observer reports would provide a valuable source of information on the implementation of management measures.</p> <p>All new vessels entering the FIP have been taken through an induction process led by FSF. The FIP Coordinator initiated port-based skipper training and FSF has since connected with some skippers and discussed ETP management, including species identification, RFMO management requirements, and bycatch mitigation measures. With vessels being at sea for long periods, training has been difficult to conduct. There are no current plans for additional training. FSF records document in-person workshops and phone discussions with representatives from 27 vessels involved in the FIP, held in 2021 and 2022.</p> <p>FIP participants have engaged with TFA on several occasions during the audit period, to introduce and discuss the FIP, and cover related issues (e.g. at-sea monitoring to support it). TFA advised during the remote site visit that the observer deployment strategy and capacity are not expected to change in the short to medium term. TFA continues its investigation of electronic monitoring as an alternative approach to meeting RFMO requirements for at-sea monitoring by human observers. TFA considered commercially available EM systems from two international providers, but concluded those systems did not meet the agency's needs. The EM work continues in collaboration with Taiwan Ocean University. Cost effectiveness of EM is a key consideration for TFA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of responses to serious issues by the fishery- 	Decision-making processes for Taiwan	3.2.2	National and international management systems require consideration as part of the fishery-specific management system relevant to this PI. Information from other MSC assessments has been used to assign scores for the focal

<p>specific management system, e.g. changes to management of Taiwan's distant water fisheries following the issuing of the EU yellow card in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 2021 NOAA report identified issues following the 2019 lifting of the yellow card. TFA reports that these concerns have been resolved through discussions with US authorities and awaits updated reporting from NOAA in due course. 			<p>fishery. Relevant to scoring issue (b), there is some evidence that decision-making processes respond to issues in the manner required, e.g. following the issue of the EU yellow card (issued 2015, lifted 2019). Issues were again identified by NOAA (2021) and TFA has been working with the US government officials to provide information to resolve the points raised, e.g. on Taiwan's process for conducting investigations. At the site visit, TFA advised that to their knowledge, NOAA considers the issues raised in the 2021 report are resolved.</p> <p>The score for (b) remains as per the narrative provided on FisheryProgress, i.e. SG60 is met while SG80 is not yet. However, it is anticipated that SG80 would be met based on NOAA reporting closing out the issues identified in 2021. Publication of the updated NOAA report is expected in 2023.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national control and inspection plan is in place. • The Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) system includes at-sea observers, port-based inspections, at-sea boardings, and various catch reporting requirements. • Infringements and sanctions are 	<p>Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan</p>	<p>3.2.3</p>	<p>TFA continues to implement monitoring, control and surveillance in the fishery, and conduct compliance and enforcement activities.</p> <p>Observer monitoring occurred at a rate of 7.9% on average across FIP vessels 2019-2022 (noting annual coverage varied from 1.2-13.7% of hooks). Port-based inspections are conducted on 10% of vessels in Taiwan (including not just fishing vessels, but also carrier vessels), and 5% of vessels in ports outside Taiwan. Taiwanese nationals may be dispatched to conduct inspections in overseas ports, or independent third-party inspectors may be contracted.</p> <p>At-sea boardings are conducted both in Taiwanese waters and on the high seas. In the high seas in 2020, three voyages took place for this purpose. Each year in 2021 and 2022, two voyages occurred in the high seas. These voyages</p>

<p>published annually online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance in the fishery. 			<p>focus on Taiwanese fishing vessels, but vessels flagged to other nations may also be boarded, as appropriate, if encountered.</p> <p>Taiwan’s approach to MCS includes baseline monitoring, and risk-based prioritization and allocation of MCS effort, e.g. based on vessel history, activity in fisheries where quotas apply, and any information suggesting a vessel may be involved with illegal activities.</p> <p>Infringements and sanctions of the Distant Water Fisheries Act (DWFA) are published online. No DWFA infringements or sanctions were recorded for vessels in the FIP in 2022 and 2023. In 2021, two FIP participant vessels received sanctions, for exceedance of bigeye quota (Man Fu Tsai No. 168) and misreporting albacore catch (Chao Yi No. 188) (https://en.fa.gov.tw/list.php?theme=Combating_IUU&subtheme=).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information available at the three-year audit enables the relevant PI to be scored at SG80 level. 	<p>Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan</p>	<p>3.2.4</p>	<p>Collection of relevant information to score this PI was reported to be difficult to date, due to COVID-19 and information not being available. Information considered at this audit demonstrates that SG80 can be considered to be met. Information that is newly considered at the three-year audit did not emerge from the workplan per se, however auditor knowledge of reviews that were not previously considered supports an increase in the PI score. (See the summary table of MSC PI scores above).</p>

Sitemap Home 中文版 Kids Bilingual Glossary RSS Sitemap

FA COA

you are here :home > Combating IUU

Combating IUU

Last Update: 2022-05-12
Click: 128

The Statistics of Infringements and Sanctions of the DWFA(2022)

The Statistics of Infringements and Sanctions of the DWFA(2022) Up to May 9, 2022

Vessel Name	CT Number	Contextual elements	Date of the Sanction	Measures Taken		
				Sanction	Object of Sanction	Amount of Fine(NTD)
MAAN FWU NO.168	CT7-0088	This fishing vessel was found the catch of shark not fully utilized.	20 Jan, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
				Confiscate the catching		0.646kg
JIN CHINQ FUH NO.62	CT4-1930	This fishing vessel was found violating provisions on fin-to-carcass ratio for blue shark, and not processing shark catch in accordance with the regulations.	16 Feb, 2022	Fine	Operator	2,500,000
				Suspend fishing license		16 months
JIN CHINQ FUH NO.62	CT4-1930	This fishing vessel was found violating provisions on fin-to-carcass ratio for blue shark, and not processing shark catch in accordance with the regulations.	16 Feb, 2022	Fine	Employee	500,000
				Suspending Fishing Vessel Crew Identification		16 months
JIN CHINQ FUH NO.66	CT4-1929	This fishing vessel was found violating provisions on fin-to-carcass ratio for blue shark, and not processing shark catch in accordance with the regulations.	21 Feb, 2022	Fine	Operator	2,500,000
				Suspend fishing license		10 months
JIN CHINQ FUH NO.66	CT4-1929	This fishing vessel was found violating provisions on fin-to-carcass ratio for blue shark, and not processing shark catch in accordance with the regulations.	21 Feb, 2022	Fine	Employee	500,000
				Suspending Fishing Vessel Crew Identification		10 months
AN FONG NO.111	CT8-0111	The fishing vessel was found not release salmon when caught alive or discarded dead, and misreported in E-Logbooks.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
AN FONG NO.111	CT8-0111	The fishing vessel was found not release salmon when caught alive or discarded dead, and misreported in E-Logbooks.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Employee	100,000
RYH CHUN NO.101	CT7-0077	The fishing vessel was found not release salmon when caught alive or discarded dead, and misreported in E-Logbooks.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
RYH CHUN NO.101	CT7-0077	The fishing vessel was found not release salmon when caught alive or discarded dead, and misreported in E-Logbooks.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Employee	100,000
TAH YUAN NO.11	CT7-0210	This vessel was found retaining salmon.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Operator	6,000,000
				Suspend fishing license		1 month
TAH YUAN NO.11	CT7-0210	This vessel was found retaining salmon.	25 Feb, 2022	Fine	Employee	1,200,000
				Suspending Fishing Vessel Crew Identification		1 month
TE HUNG FA	CT4-2246	The vessel was operating in Exclusive Economic Zones of Philippines Republic without permission.	2 Mar, 2022	Fine	Operator	3,000,000
				Suspend fishing license		3 months
				Suspending Fishing Vessel Crew Identification		3 months
TE HUNG FA	CT4-2246	The vessel was operating in Exclusive Economic Zones of Philippines Republic without permission.	2 Mar, 2022	Fine	Operator	3,030,000
				Suspend fishing license		3 months
				Suspending Fishing Vessel Crew Identification		3 months
HUNG SENG	CT7-0560	This fishing vessel was found the catch of shark not fully utilized.	15 Mar, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
HUNG SENG	CT7-0560	This fishing vessel was found the catch of shark not fully utilized.	15 Mar, 2022	Fine	Employee	100,000
MAAN SHIAN NO.12	CT7-0143	The IRCS of this vessel was found not being placed the on the superstructure.	12 Apr, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
MAAN SHIAN NO.12	CT7-0143	The IRCS of this vessel was found not being placed the on the superstructure.	12 Apr, 2022	Fine	Employee	100,000
HUNG WEN NO.322	CT6-1518	This fishing vessel was found the catch of shark not fully utilized.	15 Apr, 2022	Fine	Operator	500,000
HUNG WEN NO.322	CT6-1518	This fishing vessel was found the catch of shark not fully utilized.	15 Apr, 2022	Fine	Employee	100,000

網站導覽 - 開啟

About US | Emergency Contact Phone | Privacy Policy | Web Security
Address No. 1, Yugang N. 1st Rd., Qianzhen Dist., Kaohsiung City 80672, Taiwan (R.O.C.) Tel: +886-7-811-3288
Taipei Office: 6F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 10070, Taiwan (R.O.C.) Tel: +886-2-2383-5678

Last update: 2022-04-25 Page views: 216242
行政院農業委員會漁業署 2022 © 版權所有

Figure 1. Example of online posting of statistics and infringements of the Taiwanese Distant Water Fisheries Act. (Source: https://en.fa.gov.tw/list.php?theme=Combating_IUU&subtheme= Accessed 30 November 2022).

Supporting References

IATTC. 2022a. Document IATTC-100-01 report on the tuna fishery, stocks and ecosystem in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2021. IATTC 100th meeting, Phoenix, Arizona USA. 01-05 August 2022.

IATTC. 2022b. Stock assessment report 23. Status of the tuna and billfish stocks in 2021. La Jolla, California, 2022. Available at: https://www.iatcc.org/GetAttachment/84d7907b-d570-4861-a769-d9158d03dfb6/No-23-2022_Status-of-the-tuna-and-billfish-stocks-in-2021.pdf [Accessed 10 March 2022]

Koehler, H., 2021. Tuna RFMO Compliance Assessment Processes: A Comparative Analysis to Identify Best Practices. Available at: <https://www.iss-foundation.org/research-advocacyrecommendations/our-scientific-program/scientific-reports/download-info/issf-2022-05-tuna-rfmo-compliance-assessment-processes-a-comparative-analysis-to-identify-bestpractices/>.

MacKay, D., Wright, A. and Rogers, C., 2018. Review of the Commission's Compliance Monitoring Scheme. Available at: <https://www.wcpfc.int/doc/final-report-independent-panel-review-compliance-monitoring-scheme-0>.

Moss-Adams, LLP. 2016. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program. Performance Review June 20, 2016.

NOAA Fisheries. 2021. Report to Congress. Improving International Fisheries Management. August 2021. NOAA Fisheries. Available at: <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2021-08/2021ReporttoCongressonImprovingInternationalFisheriesManagement.pdf> [Accessed 10 March 2023]

NPFC Scientific Committee. 2022. 7th Meeting Report. NPFC-2022-SC07-Final Report. Available at: <https://www.npfc.int/sites/default/files/2023-02/SC07%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 10 March 2023]

Pramod, G. 2017. Taiwan – Country report. In: Policing the open seas: global assessment of fisheries monitoring control and surveillance in 84 countries. IUU Risk Intelligence – Policy Report No. 1, 814 pp. <https://iuriskintelligence.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Taiwan-country-Report-Global-Fisheries-MCS-Report-2017.pdf> [Accessed 10 March 2023]

Review Team. 2012. Review of the Performance of the WCPFC. 28 February 2012. WCPFC Commission Eighth Regular Session, Tumon, Guam, USA, 26-30 March 2012. WCPFC8-2011/12.