

Original: English

POTENTIAL NON-COMPLIANCES AND RESPONSES - BFT VESSELS

Date reported	CPC	Request No.	Vessel	PNC	confirmed by CPC (yes/no)	Response
30/05/2016	Algeria	000DZ116		On 29/05/2016, during a vessel control visit of the Maltese marine, the controllers noted that the VMS of the vessel "XXX" had not been functioning for two days. Due to this, the Maltese Marine was unable to position the vessel according to an "EU member officer". A rapid repair of the VMS was requested before going back out to sea	Yes	There is indeed a small problem of the VMS, however it is currently functional.
9/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ094		1) The transfer was conducted smoothly. The video recording is consistent and the observer is able to sign the ITD. 2) During the transfer, a dead fish was returned on-board the vessel and reported in the vessel logbook. 3) The observer was unable to consult the eBCD document due to technical limitations of the vessel (this does not constitute a PNC): However, the following Potential Non-Compliance (PNC) were noted: Around twenty dead fish (meshed in the vessel net) were discarded at sea by divers during the transfer operation. These fish were discarded directly from the purse seine of the vessel and are not recorded in the vessel logbook. The observer took pictures of this event. These photos shall be attached to the final report. As indicated above, the observer had no access to the eBCD document regarding the transfer. The observer will notify the port. If this document indicates that during the transfer the dead fish was not recorded in accordance with recommendation [14-04] Annex 11, a new PNC report shall be submitted. Since yesterday, the observer wished to inform of this event to the coordinator of the programme, however he was refused access to the vessel's communication tools. This could be considered as an obstruction to the work of the regional observer.	No	According to the interview carried with the controller of the administration embarked on board the tuna vessel, he confirmed that there were only dead fish on the deck, as stated in the eBCD. The administration controller stated that among the other fish mentioned by the ROP observer as dead and discarded into the sea, there were tunas that were entangled and released in the seine live. As regards the eBCD, a copy of the eBCD was submitted to the ROP observer from the moment the vessel entered the port.

13/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ120		To date, no input was provided on this transfer in the vessel logbook.	Yes	There was a delay in the transcription of information of the transfer in the logbook of the vessel "XXX" due to communication constraints among vessels (distance of vessels). Provisions will be developed next year to improve the transmission of information among vessels.
12/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ120		The transfer of 08/06/2016 was recorded on 09/06/2016 in logbook page 08/06/2016; The transfer of 10/06/2016 was recorded on 11/06/2016 in logbook page 11/06/2016. The captain informed the observer to record the information as soon as he was aware of it.	Yes	It should be noted that in the 2016 fishing campaign, Algeria implemented a new logbook model. A training course was carried out to make the captains and the controllers of the fisheries administration familiar with the use of the new logbooks. However, it was noted that there are still errors in the recording of information on the logbook. In this respect, measures will be taken next year to remedy this problem by organizing additional training courses with the fishing captains on the use of logbooks. Furthermore, as already noted that there had been problems to transmit information among vessels (VHF reporting issues), measures will be taken to assist in the reporting of information among vessels.
14/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ115		1. PNC linked to the completion of the logbook of its support vessel: a) Catching vessel "XXX" carried out a successful fishing operation where the transfer to the cage took place on 08/06/2016. Information regarding this fishing operation was only recorded on 09/06/2016 at 15h in the logbook of vessel "YYY". 2. The catching vessel "ZZZ" carried out a fishing operation on 08/06/2016 at 19:05 hrs, the transfer took place on 10/06/2016 yet the information concerning this fishing operation in the logbook of vessel "YYY" was only recorded on 12/06/2016 at 12hrs. 3. The catching vessel "XXX" carried out a fishing operation on 11/06/2016 at 10:21 hrs. The transfer into the cage took place the same day at 16hrs, yet the information concerning this operation has not yet been recorded in the logbook of vessel "YYY".	Yes	It should be noted that in the 2016 fishing campaign, Algeria implemented a new logbook model. A training course was carried out to make the captains and the controllers of the fisheries administration familiar with the use of the new logbooks. However, it was noted that there are still errors in the recording of information on the logbook. In this respect, measures will be taken next year to remedy this problem by organizing additional training courses with the fishing captains on the use of logbooks. Furthermore, as already noted that there had been problems to transmit information among vessels (VHF reporting issues), measures will be taken to assist in the reporting of information among vessels.

14/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ116		PNC linked to the completion of the logbook of its support vessel: Following the transfer operation carried out by the vessel "XXX" on 08/06/2016, the logbook of the vessel of the observer does not mention any transfer to date (volume discounted mainly from quota). The observer returned to port and was able to cross check the information with other observers of the joint fishing group.	Yes	Measures will be taken next year to comply with requirements regarding logbook completion (revision of the regulatory framework governing tuna fishing).
14/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ122		PNC linked to the completion of the logbook: 1. On 07/06/2016 the vessel "XXX" carried out a fishing operation and the transfer took place on 08/06/2016. Following this operation, the logbook (Table 2) was completed on 10/06/2016 in page 08/06/2016. (return backwards in the logbook) 2. On 07/06/2016 the vessel "XXX" carried out a fishing operation and the transfer took place on 08/06/2016. Following this operation, the information regarding this transfer was notified in the logbook on 10/06/2016 (2 to 3 day delay); 3. On 08/06/2016 the vessel of the observer carried out a fishing operation and the transfer took place on 10/06/2016. Following this operation, it was noted that in the logbook (Table 3) information regarding the transfer (live weight, number of fish caught, volume of catches deducted from quota) were recorded in the vessel logbook on 10/06/2016 in page 08/06/2016 (return backwards in the logbook).	Yes	It should be noted that in the 2016 fishing campaign, Algeria implemented a new logbook model. A training course was carried out to familiarize the captains and the controllers of the fisheries administration with the use of the new logbooks. However, it was noted that there are still errors in the recording of information on the logbook. In this respect, measures will be taken next year to remedy this problem by organizing additional training courses with fishing captains on the use of logbooks. Furthermore, as already noted that there had been problems to report information among vessels (VHF reporting issues), measures will be taken to assist in the reporting of information among vessels.
14/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ094		Report sent by the regional observer on board another vessel present on site during the operation subject to this PNC. Tuna vessel "XXX" carried out a successful fishing operation on 11/06/2016. The transfer took place in the afternoon of the same day. The vessel "YYY" was just beside when the transfer was being prepared with the following coordinates: 35°03.863 N, 14°01.662 E. It seems that a vessel flying a flag of "another CPC" participated in the operation providing a skiff to assist the tuna vessel "XXX" during this operation. Photos were taken by the observer to prove this situation.	No	Following information collected by the controller of the fisheries administration on board the vessel and the captain of the vessel "XXX", we were confirmed that the skiffs used belonged to the vessels of the joint fishing group and that no skiff of "another CPC" took part in the fishing operation. Moreover, it is important to note that the position pointed out by the ROP observer is an area of great movement of bluefin tuna fishing vessels where it is difficult to spot the movements of vessels and skiffs.

15/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ094		In logbook page 17 on 09/06/2016, Section 3 should not be completed until the fishing activity has occurred by the vessel "XXX"; In logbook page 18 on 10/06/2016, Section 3 and 5 include catching vessel "XXX" information. It was also mentioned that the catch was carried out on 09/06, whereas it was carried out on 08/06; In the eBCD, the cage number mentioned is not the same as that observed at sea; In the eBCD, the number of the cage mentioned is not the same as that observed at sea.	Yes	Training will be organised for an improved use of the logbook.
16/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ095		PNC related to transshipments at sea of dead fish and related to the participation of a catching vessel of another CPC to the fishing operation. After the transfer operation on 08/06/2016, the annex of the vessel of the observer included 4 tunas specimens caught by another catching vessel, then it transshipped 2 of these fish towards a third vessel and 2 were landed on board the vessel of the observer (photos attached to the Word document). A vessel of "another CPC" participated in the fishing operation carried out by the vessel "XXX" on 07/06/2016 providing its annex to assist the group annexes to maintain the seine.	Yes	Indeed two fish were transferred from the vessel "XXX" towards the vessel "YYY" but only for the crew of the vessel "YYY" to eat. To strengthen monitoring and control of this fishery and to avoid these practices later, a new regulatory framework will be implemented for an improved framework of this activity and stronger sanctions.
17/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ116		The regional observer deployed on the vessel "XXX" transmitted a PNC report related to a transshipment at sea on 08/06/2016. This report is directly related to the PNC report No. 2 transmitted by the observer of the vessel "YYY", member of the same OPC and reported on 16/06/2016. At 14:00 hrs on 08/06/2016 transfer day of vessel "ZZZ", the observer surprised two crew cutting two pieces of tuna on the deck of the vessel. The observer could not report this information before his return due to technical problems (his computer fell in the water). The observer deployed on vessel "ZZZ" has not yet returned to port. He will be interviewed as soon as possible to confirm this information.	Yes	Indeed two pieces were transferred from the vessel "XXX" towards the vessel "YYY" but only for the crew of the vessel "YYY" to eat. To strengthen monitoring and control of this fishery and to avoid these practices later, a new regulatory framework will be implemented for an improved framework of this activity.

20/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ114		The information recorded in pages 08/06/2016 and 12/06/2016 were modified on 19/06/2016. These modifications concern Table 5, Table 2 and 3, of this document, respectively. The captain pointed out to the observer that the aim was to have similar information to other vessels.	Yes	It should be noted that in the 2016 fishing campaign, Algeria implemented a new logbook model. A training course was carried out to familiarize the captains and the controllers of the fisheries administration with the use of the new logbooks. However, it was noted that there are still errors in the recording of information on the logbook. In this respect, as already noted, measures will be taken next year to remedy this problem by organizing additional training courses on the use of logbooks with the fishing captains.
21/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ096		Two cases of transshipment at sea were reported by two vessels. Each vessel caught 2 tuna fish. The observer could not report this information earlier due to the lack of reporting equipment on board the vessel.	Yes	Indeed the vessel "XXX" returned two pieces of tuna to vessel "YYY" and "ZZZ" two tunas to each vessel for the crew to eat. To strengthen monitoring and control of this fishery and to avoid these practices later, a new regulatory framework will be implemented for an improved framework of this activity.
26/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ122		On 08/06/2016 the support vessel carried out a fishing operation. In Table 3, the information regarding live weight amounted to 92,000 kg. On 17/06/2016 this amount was modified on page 08/06/2016 to 92,560 kg (corresponding to live weight + dead weight). This modification was subject of a signature, stamp and mention corrected by the national Algerian observer.	Yes	Indeed, there were errors as regards the completion of the logbook. Training will be organised for an improved use and transcription of information in the logbook.
27/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ096		PNC linked to the completion of the logbook after a fishing operation followed by a transfer: 1. The total quantity of live catch is not mentioned in the logbook; 2. The volume of catches discounted from the individual quota of the catching vessel is not mentioned in the logbook either. The tables that include this information in the logbook are Tables 2 and 3. However, they are not fully completed within the framework of these operations.	Yes	Indeed, there were errors as regards the completion of logbook. Training will be organised for an improved use and transcription of information in the logbook.

30/06/2016	Algeria	000DZ094		On page 31 of the logbook, the vessel master has not included in the corresponding box the name and ICCAT number of the vessel that carried out the fishing. On page 19 of the logbook, the vessel master has not included in the corresponding box the name and ICCAT number of the vessel that carried out the fishing; in eBCD Section 4, the cage number is incorrect.	Yes	Training will be organised for an improved use and transcription of information in the logbook.
01/07/2016	Algeria	000DZ122		The name of the catching vessel that assigned some of its quota is not mentioned (nor its ICCAT number). A mistake was made in Section 4, ICCAT transfer declaration No., in the BCD regarding the fishing operation on 23/10/2016 and transferred to the observer on landing in Algiers. The towing vessel number was recorded in the box instead of the ITD number.	Yes	Indeed, there were errors as regards the completion of logbook. Training will be organised for an improved use and transcription of information in the logbook.
04/06/2016	Libya	000LY062		Transfer conducted in two cages at the same time: The quality of the video for the transfer from the seine to the 1 st cage is not good. The observer cannot count the fish. The observer did not sign the ITD	Yes	We are informed by the master of the vessel that the transfer was not done in two cages at the same time. We have ordered a control transfer so that the observer can verify the quantity of fish in the video. The control transfer was done on the 7th June, 2016 and the observer signed the ITD.
04/06/2016	Libya	000LY124		Due to the bad video quality, the observer cannot provide an estimate of the number of fish transferred. The observer did not sign the ITD. A control transfer was foreseen today but due to bad weather conditions the operation was postponed.	no response despite the reminder	A Control Transfer took place on the 07th June 2016 The ITD was signed by the Observer

09/06/2016	Libya	000LY092		1. No comfortable bed allocated to the observer. The observer sleeps in the vessel's kitchen. The only bedroom is overcrowded without air conditioning or ventilation. 2. The observer is sick and is requesting a medical consultation. The captain did not try to find one. The observer informed the captain that he will not accept to leave the port before consulting a doctor. We are mobilising our medical insurance to have diagnosis. If the observer cannot performed his mission we will replace him. 3) The logbook is not filled on a daily basis	no response despite the reminder	The vessel "XXX" has been inspected and certified by the qualified inspectors ,further more the observer (MR. X) has inspected the vessel at Mehdiia/Tunis and did not make any complain regarding accommodations . On 6/6/2016 the vessel sailed to Crete Island and sheltering in Sitia port waiting for owner instructions, in the day next observer was complaining for medical problem (kidney problem) while the owner and captain asked him if he need any medicine? he said No . after all the one of the crew has been informed by observer that has kidney problem in "another CPC" before season start and he had decided not to tell the captain to make any arrangement !the new observer (Mr. X) has inspected the same vessel without any complains.
12/06/2016	Libya	000LY086		The quality of the video for the transfer to the seine to the cage is not good. Only 50% of the door is filmed. The observer did not sign the ITD. A control transfer has been carried out the later and the observer has signed the ITD.	no response despite the reminder	The control transfer (LBY- 2016/AUT CONTROL/ALXXX) replaced the previous one (LBY- 2016/AUT/YYY). The quality of the video of the second operation of transfer was good and 100% of the door were filmed. The observer signed the ITD numbered LBY-2016/YYY/ITD
13/06/2016	Libya	000LY124		The figures in the eBCD relative to the transfer carried out the 03/06/2016 are not in accordance with Annex 11 of the recommendation [14-04],i.e. Section 2 = Section 3 + Section 4 which is not the case here.	no response despite the reminder	BCD LY169000X was eventually amended in terms of Annex 11 of the recommendation [14-04] and is now in order

20/06/2016	Libya	000LY124		A support vessel has been used to keep the seine of the catching vessel open. An annex of the catching vessel other JFO and CPC has been used to keep the seine of the catching vessel open. A support vessel took the towing cage from the official towing vessel and conducted it to the seine. A towing vessel has been used to keep the seine of the catching vessel open.	no response despite the reminder	A few hours after the catch bad weather came up rendering the keeping of the net very difficult and it was in the interest of all parties to make their best efforts to ensure the catch was not lost and the fish not damaged. A skiff and two zodiacs of the "XXX" developed mechanical problems – the assistance was necessary due to break down not any other reason. The offering of assistance at sea in a time of crisis is mandatory on all navigators and fishermen so the deployment of the annex of "YYY" in such a circumstance is not to be considered in any way in breach of regulations – the annexe does not form part of the fishing gear of the vessel (net/winch etc.) and could have also been rented out if necessary. No fishing gear from the vessel "YYY" was utilised. The vessels "ZZZ", "AAA" and "BBB" are all registered as BFT-other vessels and are operated by the same operator/farm "XXXXXXX / ATEU1MLT0000x" to whom the fish of this catch were to be transferred; the fact that the vessels assisted in the operation falls within their justified remit. A fault would have arisen were any of these vessels to tow the cage with live blue fin tuna inside it that was not assigned to it after the signing of the ITD.
21/06/2016	Libya	000LY092		The Captain of the vessel (following the receipt of an email) has reported on the page of the 18/06/2016 the allocated catch from another vessel of the group.	no response despite the reminder	Due to the mistake that the captain has reported the mentioned Email in his log book in wrong page also because of his weak English language.

26/06/2016	Libya	000LY124		Today (25/06/2016), the eBCD copy has been provided to the observer. This eBCD is relative to the transfer carried out the 18/06/2016 and he noted the following PNC: Section 2 indicates a total catch of 1 754 pieces for 180 698,13 kg. Section 3 indicates a transfer of 1 754 pieces for 108 698,13 kg. Section 4 indicates 2 dead fish during the transfer for 206,04 kg. According to the Annex 11 of the recommendation [14-04], Section 2 = Section 3 + Section 4 which is not the case here. The difference in weight is: 72 204,04 kg.	no response despite the reminder	BCD LY16900XX was eventually amended in terms of Annex 11 of the recommendation [14-04] and is now in order
26/06/2016	Libya	000LY128		The eBCD number is missing in the ITD issued after the transfer carried out the 22/06/2016. The observer signed the ITD as the captain informed him that it was due to a problem with national authorities in issuing the document and that he will provide the eBCD document later in port. In port the document has not been provided to the observer	no response despite the reminder	The problem due to the issuing date of the eBCD which was done after the transfer operation due to blocking of the access on the system database, this was supported by the email send by the electronic BCD team confirming this problem
28/06/2016	Libya	000LY087		In two instances, the ITD number issued uses the Country code of another CPC (Turkey instead of Libya. In one case the BCD number reported in the ITD is incorrect (LBY instead of "LY").	no response despite the reminder	The operator has created a new e-ITD for his/her own use this year. With this electronic ITD system the letters of the ITD and AUT appear automatically and the numbers received from the relevant authorities is entered by the operator (ample: LBY/2016/AUT/...). Since this was the first year of electronic ITD use by the operator the system gave all the numbers as TUR/2016/.../... and both the observer and the operator did not realise it until the end of the season. This is an honest mistake about the country codes, but the operator has received the correct ITD and AUT numbers given by the Libyan authorities and only the country codes are mistaken.
28/06/2016	Libya	000LY128		The quantity of fish transferred (Number of individuals) is missing in the ITD "LBY-2016-XXX-ITD" issued after the transfer carried out the 22/06/2016.	no response despite the reminder	The missing number of individuals on the ITD LBY-2016-XXX-ITD, that was only in the duplicate paper because of carbon paper wasn't putted correctly, however in the original paper it was properly written.

29/06/2016	Libya	000LY129		The observer confirms that he did not receive a copy of the eBCD issued following the transfer operation carried out the 22/06/2016. A copy of an email sent by Tragsa relative to a problem with the eBCD system has been provided to the observer (attached) however this problem is not mentioned on the ICCAT website http://www.iccat.int/en/eBCDprog.asp	no response despite the reminder	The problem was also due to the issuing date of the eBCD which was done after the transfer operation due to blocking of the access on the system database, this was supported by the email send by the electronic BCD team confirming this problem, however the announcement of this problem, due to local communication problem.
01/07/2016	Libya	000LY088		The observer deployed should not have made an estimate as the overall video quality is not satisfactory. Fish have passed through the parts of the door out of shot. The video is really confusing with many fish coming in and out of the cage. Having reviewed the ITD issued, the eBCD number and the towing vessel captain signature are missing on the ITD. The eBCD number has been provided later to the observer and the observer received by mail a copy of the document after the end of his mission (28/06/2016).	no response despite the reminder	The observer wasn't reporting a problem of fish estimation or counting problem, the confusing numbers in and out from the cage is a normal practice especially when the number is high, and always the estimation take into consideration in plus or in minus the net entering number according to the direction of the fish movement. The observer signed the ITD after realizing that the captain declaration number is fitted within the marge of the allowed tolerance. The missing number of the eBCD during transfer period was due to system access problem both in the database level as well as for some technical local problem (interrupted power supply, logistical issues due to general socio-political reasons), therefore, the establishment of the eBCD was done after the time of the transfer.
04/07/2016	Libya	000LY086		The name and ICCAT number of the towing vessel involved in the control transfer is not reported in the fishing logbook (page 1217). The BCD issued after the control transfer, the information reported are linked to the transfer operation (date, towing vessel, cage number) and not the information relative to the control transfer.	no response despite the reminder	logbook there is In the page 1217 of the only one case for tugboat, the captain used to tugboat "XXX" of the information fill the is right since because he thought that this this tugboat is also involved on the operation transfer. The captain and the of control regional observer on board were not sure how to fill in the logbook in this about the articular case. But they did not know if had to be also "YYY" name of the tugboat .logbook written in the

06/07/2016	Libya	000LY060		The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°5 of the catching vessel is registered the 21/06/2016 (page 1289) instead of the 22/06/2016 (page 1290) the date of the transfer. The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°3 of the catching vessel is registered two times in the logbook: the 03/06/2016 (page 1269) the day of the transfer and the 07/06/2016 (page 1274) the day of the control transfer. Furthermore, the name of the catching vessel is missing on the page 1274.	no response despite the reminder	1. The allocated catch for transfer operation No 5 was registered on the 21st June, 2016 instead of the 22nd June, 2016 since the actual catch was made on the 21st June in the evening and therefore the catch registered on the catching day. The transfer took place on the 22nd of June in the morning but no catching was done on the 22nd June. 2. The transfer operation no 3 was first registered on 3rd June 2016 being that this was the actual catching date. On the 7th of June no catches were made however the observer of the vessel "XXX" suggested on registering the details of the control transfer similar to the details of the catch. The captain followed the recommendation of the observer. With regards to the name of the vessel "YYY" being missing, this is an omission from the captain of the vessel and we apologise on his behalf.
06/07/2016	Libya	000LY061		The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°5 of the catching vessel is registered the 21/06/2016 (page 00268) instead of the 22/06/2016 (page 00269) the date of the transfer. The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°3 of the catching vessel is registered two times in the logbook: the 03/06/2016 (page 00249) the day of the transfer and the 07/06/2016 (page 00254) the day of the control transfer. The name of the catching vessel is missing for all the allocated catches (pages 00247, 00248, 00249, 00250, 00254, 00268). In the page 00265 (18/06/2016) the name of the fishing vessel registered is incorrectly.	no response despite the reminder	The allocated catch for transfer operation No 5 was registered on the 21st June, 2016 instead of the 22nd June, 2016 since the actual catch was made on the 21st June in the evening and therefore the catch registered on the catching day. The transfer took place on the 22nd of June in the morning but no catching was done on the 22nd June. The transfer operation no 3 was first registered on 3rd June 2016 being that this was the actual catching date. On the 7th of June no catches were made however the observer of the vessel suggested on registering the details of the control transfer similar to the details of the catch. The captain followed the recommendation of the observer. With regards to the name of the vessel "XXX" being missing, this is an omission from the captain of the vessel and we apologise on his behalf. The captain of the vessel "YYY" was given a serious warning

						about such omissions and we will not tolerate such mistakes in the future. The names have now been filled up and we will take care all the necessary details so that such issue will be prevented.
06/07/2016	Libya	000LY063		The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°5 of the catching vessel is registered the 21/06/2016 (page 1408) instead of the 22/06/2016 (page 1409) the date of the transfer. Furthermore, the name of the catching vessel is missing on the page 1408. The allocated catch relative to the transfer operation n°3 of the catching vessel is registered two times in the logbook: the 03/06/2016 (page 1389) the day of the transfer and the 07/06/2016 (page 1394) the day of the control transfer.	no response despite the reminder	The allocated catch for transfer operation No 5 was registered on the 21st June, 2016 instead of the 22nd June, 2016 since the actual catch was made on the 21st June in the evening and therefore the catch registered on the catching day. The transfer took place on the 22nd of June in the morning but no catching was done on the 22nd June. The transfer operation no 3 was first registered on 3rd June 2016 being that this was the actual catching date. On the 7th of June no catches were made however the observer of the vessel "XXX" suggested on registering the details of the control transfer similar to the details of the catch. The captain followed the recommendation of the observer. With regards to the name of the vessel "YYY" being missing, this is an omission from the captain of the vessel and we apologise on his behalf.

06/07/2016	Libya	000LY088		The allocated catches from the BCDs (fish dead during the first transfers carried out the 03/06/2016 and 18/06/2016 by another vessel are not reported in the fishing logbook. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCDs and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook.	no response despite the reminder	The Captain confirmed that up to the time of the second transfer made by the vessel "XXX" on 18/06/2016, there was no communication with the other JFO vessel in order to record the dead fish in his logbook. However, and after contact was established with the other vessel called "YYY" in the JFO 2016-0XX.
07/07/2016	Libya	000LY064		The allocated catches from the BCDs (fish dead during the first transfers carried out the 03/06/2016 and 18/06/2016 by another vessel are not reported in the fishing logbook. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCDs and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook. The two dead fish during the fishing operation carried out by the vessel the 09/06/2016 and with an estimated weight of 100kg are shared per vessels in the logbook but this allocation is not reported in the fishing logbook of the other vessels of the JFO. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCDs and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook of the vessel.	no response despite the reminder	This error has been brought to the attention of the captain of the vessel; however one is also to take note of the fact that the ROP did not draw attention to this fact at the time. This error has been brought to the attention of the captains of the vessels in the JFO; once again we are surprised that the ROP of the vessel did not draw the captain's attention to this fact or to his colleague on "XXX" which spent several days in port alongside "YYY". The captain reported in his log book the information passed to him by the catching vessel at the time of the catch/transfer – being that communication was over satellite phones not mails or faxes it is highly probable that misunderstandings took place.
07/07/2016	Libya	000LY125		The allocated catches from the BCDs (fish dead during the first transfers carried out the 03/06/2016 and 18/06/2016 by another vessel are not reported in the fishing logbook. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCDs and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook of the vessel.	no response despite the reminder	This error has been brought to the attention of the captain of the vessel; however one is also to take note of the fact that the ROP did not draw attention to this fact at the time. The captain reported in his log book the information passed to him by the catching vessel at the time of the catch/transfer – being that communication was over satellite phones not mails or faxes it is highly probable that misunderstandings took place.

08/07/2016	Libya	000LY092		The allocated catches from the BCDs (fish dead during the first transfers carried out the 03/06/2016 and 18/06/2016 by another vessel are not reported in the fishing logbook. The allocated catches from the transfer carried out the 23/06/2016 by the catching vessel is not reported in the fishing logbook. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCDs and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook of the vessel	no response despite the reminder	There was some delay for reporting in log book ,but it has been done after ,the observer noted discrepancy in weight at BCDs and log book that means there is reports at log book . Regarding the discrepancy in weight between BCDs and Logbook always appear and explained to many reasons i.e. unclearance of vide, misestimation, etc.
08/07/2016	Libya	000LY124		The ITD number reported in the ITD declaration and BCD is wrong. In the BCD, the transfer reported in Section 3 is the first transfer carried out the 03/06/2016 and not the control transfer carried out the 07/06/2016. Therefore the Section 4 does not reflect the control transfer with the transfer of the fish to the second cage. The issued 18/06/2016 is reported in the BCD with a different number. For both transfer operation BCD for dead fish have been produced but are not reported in the fishing logbook nor shared between all the vessels of the JFO. Both Pre-transfer notification sent to Libyan authorities mentioned a number of pieces only. No reference to the estimated quantity of fish to be transferred in weight. A discrepancy in weight has been found between the allocated catches in the BCD and the quantity reported in the fishing logbook of the vessel.	no response despite the reminder	BCD LY169000X was eventually amended in terms of Annex 11 of the recommendation [14-04] and is now in order.

02/07/2016	Libya	000LY062	<p>Transfer operation 1: The fishing logbook number written in the ITD is wrong. The total catch quantity is not written in the fishing logbook. Transfer operation 2: The fishing logbook number is missing in the ITD. Control transfer operation 1: In the fishing logbook the vessel declared 8 dead fish taken on board for a total weight of 1120kg. The observer confirms that no dead fish came on board during this operation. The authorisation provided for the control transfer is "another CPC" authorisation number and not a Libyan one. The receiving cage number is missing in section 3 "Further transfers" of the ITD. The template used by the vessel is different of the Annex 4 of the Recommendation [14-04]. The BCD issued following this control transfer operation does not mention the control transfer. Section 3 the day of the transfer is wrong. Section 4, the cage number recorded is a cage which was not used during the operation. The quantity of fish transferred after this control transfer are reported the same way in two fishing logbook pages. Transfer operation 4: The authorisation number is not readable at the beginning and at the end of the transfer video. The observer hold a paper with this number written on it from the deck of the vessel and the diver films it from the sea surface. However the low quality of the video makes the number unreadable (at the beginning and at the end). Transfer operation 5: In the fishing logbook, the catch is declared the day of the fishing operation instead of the day of the transfer operation.</p>	no response despite the reminder	<p>The Fishing Logbook number should have read # 607. This was a genuine mistake by the master of the vessel and was later rectified. The total catch quantity was later written on the fishing log book after being notified by the RO. This was a genuine mistake by the master of the vessel as it was written on all the other documents. This was later written on the ITD after being notified by the RO. The dead fish were discarded therefore nothing was taken on board. The control transfer was performed between 2 "Flag CPC"-flagged towing vessels therefore the farm operator have asked an authorisation to the flag state of the towing vessels. The observer of the Libyan catching vessel "XXX" was present for the control transfer. On the BCD there is no section to mention the control transfer. The control transfer was mentioned on the log book of the vessel and on the ITD. The transfer from catching vessel to cage was in fact done on the 3rd June and not 7th June and hence the date of the 3rd June. The cage declared in section for should have read EU.MLT.00X.XXX instead of EU.MLT.00XX.XXX. This was later modified prior to the validation of the BCD by the Libyan Authorities. The fish counted on the 7th June, 2016 was the same fish which was caught in 3rd June 2016 and for this reason it is the same. The paper is being held by the observer and might not be visible but the paper is done at the discretion of the farm operator. Libya has authorised the transfer to be carried out and the authorisation was sent to the vessel prior to the start of the transfer. That's the reason why the ITD was signed. The catch was done on the 21st June and therefore was declared on the day it was caught. The transfer was done on the 22nd June but on the 22nd June no fish was caught by the "XXX".</p>
------------	-------	----------	---	---	--

02/07/2016	Libya	000LY092		The transfer operation carried out by the vessel in the JFO 2016-0XX on the 23/06/2016 is not mentioned in the vessel logbook. Therefore the allocated catch is not reported	no response despite the reminder	The Fishing Logbook number should have read # 607. This was a genuine mistake by the master of the vessel and was later rectified. The total catch quantity was later written on the fishing log book after being notified by the RO. This was a genuine error.
07/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN040		The vessel carried out a transfer from the seine to two transport cages simultaneously. However, according to the information reported by the regional observer on board (with the use of a satellite telephone of the vessel), the battery of the camera filming the transfer between the seine and the cage stopped working before the end of the transfer. Due to this, the video does not cover the entire transfer. In addition, the two cages were attached together but the captain indicated to the observer that door between the two cages was not open. The observer can not confirm this information. The captain indicated that a control transfer should take place shortly. An ICCAT inspector is present on site since the start of the operation.	Yes	A control transfer was carried out. After the camera stopped working, the transfer was carried out into one cage only. Section LT01 of the eBCD TN1690000X shows that the second cage (EU.MLT-0XX-MB) did not receive any fish.
12/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN033		The captain recorded a dead fish in the logbook in page 000016, dated 10/06/2016 (date of transfer) and recorded 2 pieces (100 Kg) as the quantity taken on board. However, no fish was taken on board. Fish were caught in the net and the captain recorded them in the eBCD. Thus, it seems that this situation is derived from the logbook model which doesn't allow to record dead fish in the seine. -Reporting of quantities taken on board (4 pieces) on page 000017 dated 11/06/2016, while no dead fish were taken on board the vessel. The observer was not in a position to transmit this information before his return.	Yes	The logbook model does not allow to record dead fish in the seine.
12/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN059		The captain only reported one fishing operation in the logbook. On 12/06/2016, he included the catches of the second fishing operation the same day	No	The fishing group JFO 2016-00X only carried out one fishing operation on 09/06/2016.

12/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN041		During the transfer operation, the catching vessel released the dead fish which were not recorded in the vessel logbook, back into the water. The observer took photos and videos of these discarded fish. These photos shall be attached to the final report of the observer.	No	According to the person responsible of the vessel, the fish released by the divers were alive.
14/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN053		The eBCD number mentioned in the ITD signed by the observer was different to the eBCD that he was transmitted when he returned back to port.	Yes	The eBCD TN1690000X was deleted due to a careless mistake (catch date: 7 instead of 8) that could not be modified. After consultation with the eBCD team and ICCAT, we have proceeded to remove this eBCD and developed a new TN1690000XX (with the same catch, sale and transfer data.
17/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN041		The fishing operation carried out the 08/06/2016 is not recorded in the logbook on the correct date (page: 00014) ; The BCD developed following the transfer of the vessel mentions a transfer data of the 08/06/2016 (Section 3), however the transfer was carried out on 09/06/2016; The fish that died during the transfer operation of the 09/06/2016 is reported in the logbook (page 00015), indicating only the number and not the weight. The weight of the dead fish is only mentioned in the BCD. The observer did not notice these elements before debriefing. In addition, as regards to the PNC - No. 1, reported on 12/06/2016, the film viewing recorded by the observer confirms that 8 dead fish were taken out from the seine by the divers and were not reported by the captain.	Yes	The catch estimation on 08/06/2016 was not carried out by the divers of the farm until the following day (09/06/2016). The quantity and the number of dead fish are reported, but only slightly after the end of the transfer operation.
17/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN042		The name of the catching vessel that carried out the transfer on 11/06/2016 is not registered in the logbook of the vessel (Table 3 of page 00017). The information regarding quota deduction are correctly indicated.	Yes	All the information required were completed just after the control of the observer.

18/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN040		An error was observed in the ITD. The vessel carried out a control of transfer on 07/06/2016 from cage "XXX" to cage "YYY". This control transfer is correctly recorded in Section 3 of the ITD (other transfers). However, the model used by the vessel is not identical to the ITD of Annex 4 of [Rec. 14-04]. This official model requires the registration of the cage number receiving the fish after the transfer which is not the case included in the model used by the vessel. As a result, the information on the receiving cage is not mentioned. Moreover, the name of the captain of the receiving vessel is not indicated. This missing information were not indicated by the observer who signed the ITD. The BCD that was edited indicates the two cages in the operation for information purposes.	Yes	The ITD model is issued by the Tunisian authority. The captain forgot to mention his name.
21/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN035		It was noted that a towing vessel involved in the transfer carried out by the vessel recorded the name on the hull in a different way to the ICCAT list.	Yes	The correct name of the vessel is "XXX". A "c" is missing. The captain was notified to correct the name according to the ICCAT register.
22/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN035		The eBCD number is missing on the ITD drafted and signed following the transfer on 09/06/2016. The ITD number filled out in the section "document number" of the transfer carried out on 11/06/2016 is correct.	Yes	The captain was unable to report the number of the corresponding eBCD with the shore staff on time.
26/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN037		Difference in weight and in number is noted between the total catch recorded in Section 2 and the sum of Section 3 (transferred catch) and Section 4 (dead fish during the transfer). In accordance with Annex 11 of Recommendation 14-04, this difference should not appear. 100 kg (Section 2 = 256 fish - 25,600kg ; Section 3 = 256 fish - 25,600kg ; Section 4 = 1 fish - 100 kg)	Yes	The difference noted is imaginary and is only included concerning eBCD compliance. 100 kg (one fish) was taken out of the cage straight after the transfer of the seine to the towed cage.

28/06/2016	Tunisia	000TN039		<p>The observer did not receive the transfer video from the transfer carried out on 23/06/2016. According to the operator, the diver making the video lost the camera at the end of the recording due to the presence of two sharks in the cage. An ITD was produced but not signed by the observer. Then, the operator decided to record the control transfer on a fresh ITD and to send a new prior notice. The control transfer was carried out on the same day (23/06/2016) between two cages. The ITD was communicated to the observer who verified and signed it. However, since the initial ITD had not been used to record this control transfer (under the heading “Other transfers”) in relation to this vessel the new ITD produced did not include mention of the initial transfer from the vessel seine to the cage. On reading, the ITD gives the impression that the transfer was carried out directly from the vessel seine to the second cage, which is not the case. In relation to the 3 BCDs produced during the observer’s deployment and in accordance with Annex II of Recommendation 14-04: 1) A difference in weight and in number is observed between the total catch recorded in Section 2 and the sum of Section 3 (transferred catch) and Section 4 (fish died during transfer) – Difference = 850 kg. 2) A difference in weight and in number is observed between the total catch in Section 2 and the sum of Section 3 (transferred catch) and Section 4 (fish died during transfer) – Difference = 210 kg. 3) A difference in weight and in number is observed between the total catch recorded in Section 2 and the sum of Section 3 (transferred catch) and Section 4 (fish died during transfer) – Difference = 900 kg. For each of the 3 BCDs the correct amount of transferred fish is only included in the box “Cage No.” in Section 4.</p>	Yes	<p>The control transfer was carried out under the number TUN2016-AUTOXX with the development of a new eBCD and ITD. The captain paid little attention to the first transfer seeing that the operation was totally repeated</p>
------------	---------	----------	--	---	-----	--

24/06/2016	Turkey	000TR070		Two unsuccessful fishing operations were conducted that were not recorded in the fishing logbook	No	The necessary investigation launched by Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. The vessel owner declared that inadvertently those operations have not been recorded in the vessel's logbook. The related documents have been examined. The operator and the master of the vessel have been warned and informed about the existing rules.
28/06/2016	Turkey	000TR082		The closing of the door has not been fully shown. Following a signal from a diver that there are no fish remaining in the purse seine the cameraman moves towards the door at which point the entirety of the door is out of shot for a number of seconds. Given the specifics of this transfer it does not seem likely that fish passed through while the door is out of camera view.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.
28/06/2016	Turkey	000TR072		For the transfer conducted (27/05/2016), the video did not show the entirety of the door during either the opening or the closing of the door. In addition, the door was not fully shown at times during the transfer. For the transfer conducted on 12/06/2016, the video did not show the entirety of the door whilst the door was being closed. As the door was being closed, the cameraman moved towards the door, and a full view of the door was not maintained. Given the specifics of this transfer, it does not seem likely that any tuna passed through the door whilst the door was out of view. For the transfer conducted on 21/06/2016 the video was of too poor quality to make an estimate. At times, the video was too dark and pixelated to discern the presence or otherwise of any tuna.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.

29/06/2016	Turkey	000TR081		1) On the 13/06/2016 two unsuccessful fishing operations were conducted in the same day but only one record was kept in the vessel's logbook. 2) The observer has reported (29/06/2016) that on 23/06/2016 two operations which caught bycatch only were conducted in the same day, but only one record aggregating the catch from both operations was recorded in the logbook	No	The necessary investigation launched by Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. The vessel owner declared that inadvertently those operations have not been recorded in the vessel's logbook. The related documents have been examined. The operator and the master of the vessel have been warned and informed about the existing rules.
13/07/2016	Turkey	000TR077		The opening of the door was not fully shown on the video. Due to frequent movement of the camera and low video / water quality and light levels, it was not possible to see the opening of the door.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.
13/07/2016	Turkey	000TR085		PNC 1: The closing of the cage door was not fully shown on the video. The camera did not show the door for 64 seconds. From deck observations, the observer considers that no fish were transferred whilst the camera did not cover the door. PNC 2: the camera did not cover the door during the operation for a total of 40 seconds. From deck observations, the observer considers that no fish were transferred whilst the camera did not cover the door.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.
14/07/2016	Turkey	000TR069		PNC 1: Transfer on 02/06/2016. For several seconds the camera was pointed away from the door and the video was extremely blurry, making it impossible to determine if any tuna were being transferred. PNC 2: Transfer on 12/06/2016. For several seconds only 30% of the door was shown in the video during transfer. PNC 3: Transfer on 13/06/2016. For several seconds only 20% of the door was shown in the video during transfer. PNC 4: Transfer on 23/06/2016. For several seconds the door was not completely shown in the video during transfer.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.

14/07/2016	Turkey	000TR080		<p>PNC 1: The camera was turned away from the door after the diver signaled the transfer was complete but before the cage door was closed. It seems likely that no fish were missed on the video and the observer therefore considered he was able to make an estimate. PNC 2: The camera was not held on the door throughout the opening and closing of the door. It seems likely that no fish were missed on the video and the observer therefore considered he was able to make an estimate. PNC 3: The camera was not held on the door throughout the closing of the door. It seems likely that no fish were missed on the video and the observer therefore considered he was able to make an estimate. PNC 4: The camera was not held on the door throughout the closing of the door. It seems likely that no fish were missed on the video and the observer therefore considered he was able to make an estimate. PNC 5: The camera was not held on the door throughout the closing of the door. It seems likely that no fish were missed on the video and the observer therefore considered he was able to make an estimate.</p>	No	<p>Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.</p>
14/07/2016	Turkey	000TR085		<p>One swordfish was caught as bycatch and retained by the vessel. This fish was not recorded in the vessel's logbook.</p>	No	<p>The necessary investigation launched by Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. The vessel owner declared that inadvertently the swordfish has not been recorded in the vessel's logbook. The related documents have been examined. Although the amount of by-catch species is very low, the operator and the master of the vessel have been warned.</p>

15/07/2016	Turkey	000TR083		PNC1: The camera was not pointed at the door continuously during the transfer due to rough surface conditions. PNC 2: The camera was pointed away from the door just prior to the door being closed.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.
15/07/2016	Turkey	000TR068		The camera did not cover the entire door whilst a large number of fish were passing through, and it is therefore possible that some fish were not in view of the camera. In addition, immediately prior to closing the door, the cameraman moved towards the door so that the whole door was no longer visible whilst it was still open.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.
15/07/2016	Turkey	000TR085		PNC1: The opening of the door was not shown clearly due to poor light levels / video quality. In addition, for about one minute the camera is not pointed at the door. PNC 2: The camera was not pointed at the door at times during both opening and closing of the door. PNC 3: The opening of door could not be seen clearly due to low light levels / video quality. In addition, the camera was not pointed at the door for about one minute whilst the door was open.	No	Although the explained cases have not been confirmed as PNC, being the National Authority, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock launched an investigation. In this context the video footages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.

27/05/2016	EU-Spain	000EU028		<p>During a transfer operation conducted yesterday (26/05/2016) two potential non-compliance events occurred.</p> <p>1) The first related to the anticipated transfer between the vessel and the French flagged towing vessel with cage XXX003 following FOP1 on 26th May. This was initially authorised with transfer authorisation sent and verified. This was then cancelled as the ICCAT authorisation of the towing vessel had expired (on 25th of May) although no release order was sent. At this stage the towing vessel and cage were alongside. A new PTN and subsequent TA was sent with the same number involving the Spanish flagged towing vessel and cage XXX005. However, this involved the original cage being renumbered to 005, while the physical cage itself was in effect transferred from the first to the second towing vessel. Throughout the operation, two "EU-MS1" and one "EU-MS2" inspectors were present. They were aware of the cage number change as well as the transfer of the cage between two towing vessels. The transfer then went ahead on the above authorisation. As such the potential PNC relates to: the re numbering of the cage; and transfer of cages between one towing vessel and another. 2) The second related to the above transfer between the vessel and second towing vessel into cage 005. The closing of the net door was not shown to completion. The observer did not sign the ITD.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>1).- As per 71 of ICCAT REC 14-04, the Spanish administration provides a unique number for each cage that is going to be used during the season. The operation referred to was made in the presence of inspectors in order to avoid maneuvering empty cages and taking into account that the physical situation of the cages and the fish was exactly the same before and after the changes.</p> <p>2).- An investigation was conducted and the cage was blocked. As an outcome of the investigation no control transfer was needed. The transfer operation was inspected by the "EU-MS 1 & 2" inspection team. After checking the video provided by the operator, the inspectors estimated the number of fish and the quality of the video considered to be sufficient, as per ICCAT rec. 14-04.</p>
27/05/2016	EU-Spain	000EU027		<p>During a transfer operation conducted overnight a single potential non-compliance event occurred. The observer's estimation was greater than 10% different to the vessels recorded figures, BFT observed=364; BFT declared=412).</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>An investigation was conducted and the cage was blocked. As an outcome of the investigation no control transfer was needed. The transfer operation was inspected by the "EU-MS 1 & 2" inspection team. After checking the video provided by the operator, the inspectors estimated the number of fish (395, within the 10%) and the quality of the video considered to be sufficient, as per ICCAT rec. 14-04.</p>

29/05/2016	EU-Spain	000EU029		<p>The observer has reported (29/05/2016) that during a transfer operation conducted yesterday (28/05/2016, 07:55) a mistake was made regarding signing the ITD. The observer has signed an ITD with incorrect details for the transfer which took place between "XXXXX" and the towing vessel "YYYY" at 07:55 on 28/05. The ITD number is: UE-ESP/2016/XXX/ITD. The transfer authorisation includes an ITD number, ESP/2016/YYY/ITD, not the transfer authorisation number. This transfer took place after the original transfer authorisation was cancelled and a new prior transfer notification and TA was generated. The ITD in the original TA was ESP/2016/XXX/ITD. In the new TA the ITD was ESP/2016/YYY/ITD. As such the PNC relates to: - Incorrect ITD number being used (ESP/2016/XXX/ITD instead of ESP/2016/YYY/ITD). No transfer authorisation number in the ITD, with the ITD number ESP/2016/YYY/ITD used instead. The ITD was signed with the error being picked up afterwards.</p>	left blank by CPC	Before receiving the PNC we were already aware of the mistake and ordered the operator to modify it.
25/05/2016	EU-France	000EU022		No logbook entries are currently being made. The vessel has departed port on the 22 nd May and to date no entry has been made in any logbook	left blank by CPC	The messages have correctly been sent by the fishing vessel to the Flag Member State through electronic logbook
27/05/2016	EU-France	000EU111		For a transfer conducted this morning the video did not show 100% of the transfer. This was due to the movement of a diver near the start of the video which resulted in the door not being shown for a period.	left blank by CPC	Control authorities established after video viewing that this movement did not affect the counting of quantities of fish. Hence, no control transfer was issued. This is reported in RO report.
31/05/2016	EU-France	000EU102		For a transfer conducted (26/05/2016) there was a mistake in the ITD produced. The ITD shows the fishing logbook number differed from that shown in the fishing logbook number for that operation . All other details on the ITD were consistent and correct. The ITD was signed by the observer as he did not notice this inconsistency at the time.	left blank by CPC	Minor breach. No further action required
31/05/2016	EU-France	000EU104		For a transfer conducted yesterday the light was not adequate to complete an estimation of fish transferred. The transfer was completed at 21:34.	left blank by CPC	A control transfer has been ordered. Even the operator of the PS asked in the meantime for it due to bad quality of video.

31/05/2016	EU-France	000EU102		A recurrence of the previous PNC described below has occurred following a transfer made today, the logbook number recorded in ITD again differed from that shown in the logbook. The observer was advised by the Captain that this data field was automatically generated and could not be altered	left blank by CPC	Written notice addressed to the captain
31/05/2016	EU-France	000EU099		For a transfer conducted today (31/05/2016) the ITD was not signed as the video did not show the entire process of the closing of the door. In addition the contents of the receiving cage was not shown.	left blank by CPC	Written notice addressed to the captain
01/06/2016	EU-France	000EU099		A number of mortalities were associated with the fishing and transfer operation conducted yesterday. The observer counted 45 individuals. These mortalities were discarded at sea not declared in the fishing logbook. The Captain stated that these fish entangled in the outside of the net while waiting for transfer and therefore were not his responsibility to record	left blank by CPC	Administrative penalty in process.
29/06/2016	EU-France	000EU113		The logbook was not completed from the 23 rd -25 th May while the vessel was in port in "EU-MS CPC".	left blank by CPC	The captain was not obliged to complete and send logbook information every day (§66 Re14.04) because this transmission has only to be done during authorized fishing period
27/05/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU018		The VMS and elogbook is no longer functional due to a technical fault. The operators are proposing to complete the logbook on land as a solution. There is no resolution to the VMS proposed at this point. The vessel is currently at sea.	left blank by CPC	According HRV administration, the VMS of that vessel is functional. It is also important to note that the observer has no possibility to determine functionality of VMS on board. There were indeed some difficulties with e-logbook since but our FMC is immediately working on such errors in cooperation with operator and master. In the meantime all data are transmitted according to procedure from art. 39 of EU Regulation No 404/2011.

05/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU022		The opening of the net door was not shown on the video. The observer has not signed the ITD for that operation	left blank by CPC	Inspection by national control authorities was performed at "XX XXXXXXXX" (05/06/2016 at 11:00 a.m.) before the information from RO was received. Operator informed control authorities of non-valid video footage. Results of inspection: - Investigation is launched by national authorities. Control transfer operation from towing cage No."EU.XXX-00X" to the new empty receiving cage was requested by control authorities and was performed in presence of RO and national fishery inspector on 07/06/2016 on farm "XXX / ATEU1HRV0000X".
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU015		1) On 25th June 2016 the observer was not able to make an independent estimation of the number of tuna due to the poor quality of the video and large quantity of tuna passing the camera. 2) In the same video as discussed above, the observer noted a diver disposing of dead tuna underwater. Furthermore there were a large number of dead tuna visible following the fishing and transfer operations. At the time of the observer's disembarkation from the vessel at 11:30am on 25th June, the dead tuna were not recorded in the fishing logbook. 3) On the 4th, 6th and 8th June 2016 the vessel performed fishing operations with no catch which were not recorded in the fishing logbook.	left blank by CPC	1) following the operators alert, the cage was blocked, investigation launched and control transfer conducted. 2) in the logbook related to this catch a record of 1100 kg of dead fish was noted. 3) the "Flag CPC" confirms the case. Action was taken by fishery inspection and case is still pending .
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU013		The captain did not complete the logbook on the following days: 10 th , 13 th , 16 th ,17 th & 20 th June. In addition fishing operations undertaken on 30 th May and 6 th June were not recorded in the logbook.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities. In addition, vessel "XXX" was inspected by fishery inspectors in catching area on 25.06.2016 (after all dates listed in PNC). According to inspection report and statement of RO in same report, there were no non-compliances related to "XXX" till the date of inspection.

29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU014		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 10 th , 13 th , 20 th & 22 nd June 2016.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU015		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 10 th , 11 th , 13 th , 16 th , 17 th , 20 th & 22 nd June.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU017		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 5 th June 2016	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU020		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 29 th May, 10 th , 16 th & 22 nd June 2016	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU021		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 29 th May, 10 th & 16 th June 2016	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU022		The captain did not complete the logbook while the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 15 th -18 th June 2016.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU023		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 29 th May, 10 th , 16 th & 20 th June 2016.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU024		The captain did not complete the logbook whilst the vessel was on standby in port during the following days: 10 th , 16 th , 17 th & 22 nd June 2016	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities.

01/07/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU022		Following the vessels first fishing operation on 27/05/2016 at 12:35 local time, the vessel did not record the position in latitude and longitude of the operation in the logbook, instead only "FAO 37.2.1 Adriatic". The observer recorded the position of the fishing operation as 42 deg 52.604 min North; 15 deg 10.227 min East.	left blank by CPC	All EU vessels over 12 metres are equipped with an E-logbook. In case of Croatia, it is connected with VMS and Croatian FMC has real-time data on all vessel activities. Vessel "XXX" was inspected by fishery inspectors in catching area on 07.06.2016 (after the date 27.05.2016 which is listed in PNC). According to inspection report and statement of RO in same report, there were no other problems related to "XXX" till the date of inspection except the one related to control transfer for catch on 05.06.2016. The conclusion of inspectors was that no non-compliances have been found.
29/06/2016	EU-Croatia	000EU022		During debriefing the observer has highlighted the following potential non-compliance event on 30/05/2016 relating to the ITD. After a transfer the divers came onboard and showed an empty ITD to the observer, and the observer was asked repeatedly to agree the number of BFT to be written on the ITD. The observer explained the ICCAT Recommendation on this subject and asked the divers to fill out the ITD. The ITD was then completed and the observer signed the ITD because the difference in estimations after watching the transfer video was less than 10%.	left blank by CPC	Croatian Inspection services requested operator to comment this event. Operator has confirmed that divers have tried to communicate with RO on the issue of the total number. RO refused to discuss this issue and insisted that captain should put the number of fish in the ITD. After that RO signed the ITD confirming that he agreed that the number was within 10%. We do not consider this as a PNC however as a good example that the RO did his job.

27/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU011		<p>PNCs linked to the transfer n°1 from seine to cage carried out on the 27/05/2016: Video record of the transfer not good enough to provide an estimation of the Bluefin tunas number transferred. As explained by the observers by phone, several problems have been encountered with the video : the door was not visible at 100% for the whole duration of the transfer, the video file is subdivided in three parts which doesn't play continuously on the video reading software used by the observer. For your information, an additional video record has been provided to the observer (video made by the farm scuba diver present on the vessel). This video is not confirmed to the Rec [14-04] and can be used by the observer neither. According to these elements, the observer was not able to provide an estimate in number of the quantity transferred and didn't sign the ITD. For your comprehension the information were given by the observer using the vessel satellite phone.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>An investigation has been carried out through a technical comparison between the video as provided by the FV diver and the one provided by the concerned Farm diver; On that basis, the part of transfer door not continuously displayed on the FV diver video is very small; As a result of the investigation, the video was considered to be of sufficient quality to estimate the number of fish and therefore no control transfer was ordered.</p>
27/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU001		<p>Two dead BFT were brought by skiff at 16:00 from [another vessel] onto the observer vessel. The observer informed the captain that even if these two vessels are in the same JFO this is against ICCAT Recommendation [14-04]. Captain agreed and said he did not have anything to do with the mentioned fish and told the person who brought it to take it back. Later, at 19:40, when that person was leaving the vessel, dead BFT was taken back to [the other vessel]. What happened to the fish afterwards is beyond observer knowledge. Photos and the video of the incident (fish arriving and leaving) are in possession of the observer. Furthermore we have a serious concern regarding the [other vessel] and the observer deployed on that vessel. From a first information received the observer deployed on that vessel would have left the board of the vessel to join the vessel this vessel in order to finalise her video estimate.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>Following the RO alert, ITA started an investigation with the following outcome: - during the concerned transfer operation 7 dead BFT samples were reported and all of them destined for crew consumption (eBCD screenshot can be provided);- on the basis of the information collected from both captains, the transfer of some of these samples was necessary because of a temporary failure of the freezing cells on board the concerned catching vessel;- in any case, in line with the observations as pointed out by the concerned R.O., both captains agreed to return back (immediately and definitively) the concerned BFT samples (2 pcs.) to the concerned catching vessel. An immediate submission of the RO "evidences" (photos/videos) would have been helpful.</p>

28/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU002		On the video record at the beginning and at the end of the transfer video, the ITD number is displayed instead of the ICCAT transfer authorisation number (this authorisation number is not displayed at all). Before the transfer, the captain asked to the observer the number to report at the at the beginning and at the end of the video. The observer made a mistake and indicated the ITD number. All the other elements on the video are conformed and the observer signed the ITD. The observer as only realised his mistake this morning (28/05/2016) after a review of his observer manual.	left blank by CPC	There was a clear communication problem between the R.O. and the captain. We consider however that the alpha-numeric code of the ITD is sufficient to identify the transfer concerned.
28/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU004		Date and time are not displaying on the camera used for filming the transfer. This is also the case on the video record provided to the observer. The captain indicated that he will provide later on to the observer a DVD with date and time without more precision. All the other aspects of the video are correct and an accurate estimate can be provided. The observer did not sign the ITD.	No	CANCELLED BY COFREPECHE by E-mail of 8/6

28/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU002		<p>The divers gave two videos to the observer. The first one is impossible to use as the opening of the door is not filmed. The second one is conformed to the Annex 8 of the recommendation 14-04 but during the passage of the fish only 50% to 60% of the door is visible on the video. Therefore it was not possible for the observer to provide an accurate number of tunas transferred. The observer did not sign the ITD.</p>	<p>left blank by CPC</p>	<p>For the purposes of our investigation, we collected 3 videos and proceeded with a combined evaluation of them:</p> <p>a) 2 videos were provided by the operator of the concerned catching vessel: 1. the first one was filmed through a primary camera and should correspond to the same first video as analysed by the R.O.; 2. the second one was filmed through a secondary (emergency) camera and it should correspond to the same second video as analysed by the R.O.</p> <p>b) 1 video was provided by the operator of the concerned destination farm: - this video seems to be compliant with the current provisions and, in particular, the whole transfer door is correctly and continuously displayed (screenshot can be provided); - according to the operator, this video was given to the R.O. too.</p> <p>Through a combined analysis of video in point a.2) and video in point b), we have been able to estimate the number of BFTs transferred.</p>
------------	----------	----------	--	--	------------------------------	---

31/05/2016	EU-Italy	000EU003		<p>Following the transfer the diver with the camera went directly to his vessel (YYY, ATEU0MLT000XX) with the camera instead of the catching vessel to provide the video the observer. Therefore the observer did not receive the video. Instead of reporting this PNC the observer decided to join the diver vessel to see the video directly on board. Following this first event, the observer has had a problem with her laptop to watch the video and the vessel did not provide an alternative solution. Therefore in order to fix the problem, the observer decided to go to the vessel "ZZZ / ATEU0ITA000XX" in order to request the assistance of the regional observer deployed on that vessel.</p> <p>- The boat used for the transfer of the regional observer from the "XXX" to "ZZZ" had already on board two dead tunas (they informed the observer that these fish will be shared with the vessel "ZZZ". Arrived to the vessel "ZZZ" the regional observer on the vessel strongly insisted not to embark these dead tunas. Therefore the fish did not embark. Couple of hours later, when the observer travelled back these dead fish were not on board and the captain informed the observer of the discard at sea of these two dead tunas. Finally the observer sampled 5 dead fish (declared in the fishing logbook). The observer signed the ITD. We would like to apology for the delay in the transmission of these information. The observer committed several important mistakes and violations of our protocol. It is strongly prohibited for the observers to leave their allocated vessels during the fishing season especially at sea and during a transfer operation. According to the ICCAT Secretariat instruction this observer will be closely monitored until the end of her deployment and will stay on board in order not to penalise the vessel.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>With regard to the two dead BFT please see the ITA reply under case: 000EU001 of 27/05/2016 Furthermore, the vessels were inspected upon their return into port. With regard to the other elements, it is important to note that since the alert came 5-6 days after the concerned catching operation and since the R.O. provided its signature on the relevant ITD, a duly validated eBCD was issued and ITA was not in a position to stop the concerned commercial process. You already pointed out the important delay of information and the serious mistakes committed by the RO during the operation.</p>
------------	----------	----------	--	---	----------------------	--

03/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU004		PNCs linked to the fishing operation n°2 without catch carried out the 02/06/2016: the position of the fishing operation is not reported in the logbook. Captain just writes midday position and 0 catch.	left blank by CPC	With reference to the PNC in subject, the e-logsheets related to the concerned vessel is duly compliant with the current EU and ICCAT provisions including the concerned catch-transfer positions (copy can be provided). Maybe, the concerned R.O. refers to paper logbook that, according to our internal rules is only to be used in case of failure of the e-system, which is compulsory.
03/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU009		Due to the poor light conditions and health condition of the video diver, the footage didn't follow the requirements of the Rec. 14-04 Annex 8 – Didn't show continuously 100% of the door; the light didn't allow to get a clear view of the fish passing through the door, the diver position didn't allow him to get 100% view of the door during all footage. The video was not provided to the observer just after the transfer. The observer did not sign the ITD.	left blank by CPC	a control transfer was launched upon request of the concerned operator himself, because of the bad quality of the first video.
05/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU004		The position of the 3 missed fishing operations carried out by the vessel are not recording accordingly in the fishing logbook (fishing operation 1 – 27/05/2016, fishing operation 2 – 02/06/2016 and fishing operation 3 – 02/06/2016).	left blank by CPC	It is important to note that the concerned vessel has carried out its fishing season in the context of the authorized JFO Nr 2016-0XX, without concluding any catch operation. Maybe the concerned R.O. refers to "fishing attempts". According to ITA, the concerned vessel has duly completed its e-logbook during the whole season (starting from 25/06/2016 - departure day from the home-port, until 05/06/2016 - day of JFO quota consumption).

05/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU003		<p>Around 30 dead BFT were thrown at sea during the transfer and were not recorded in the logbook. 9 dead fish – sampled by the observer – were thrown at sea from the deck of the vessel before the arrival of ICCAT inspector on board. These dead fish were not recorded in the logbook. The video record of the transfer was under the minimum standard of the recommendation 14-04. The observer cannot provide an estimate. The observer did not sign the ITD. An ICCAT inspector is currently on board the vessel. The inspector conducted an investigation and considered that the quantity transferred in weight exceed the remaining quota of the JFO. Therefore a control transfer and a release should be carried out soon.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>A) About the first question (not registered discard of 30 + 9 BFT samples, during the concerned transfer operation), it is regrettable that we did not receive immediately clear evidence by the RO (i.e. videos, photos, etc.). This evidence is very relevant for our investigation, taking into account that the transfer operation of the concerned vessel was followed by an inspection team of the EU joined deployment plan (JDP) (carried out by our Coast Guard JDP team) and the R.O. didn't draw their attention to the aforementioned discards. B) An estimate of the number was provided by both the concerned operator (2.000 pcs.) and the concerned inspection team (2.461 pcs.). A release order was issued (can be provided). At the end of the release operations, duly compliant with the provisions in force, the final figures (n. of pcs. and tot. weight) were also adjusted in line with the further evaluation of the release video, as carried out by the same inspection team.</p>
06/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU002		<p>Fishing logbook pages linked to ITDs not correct. The logbook page number is always the same and the captain added by hand a number "XX" on the right top corner of every page. The observer did not notice this information and signed two ITDs. The third was not signed due to a previously reported PNC</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>Most probably, there were some mistake in reporting the correct number of the log-sheets on the concerned ITDs. The signature of the R.O. was however duly provided for both ITA-2016/0XX/ITD and ITA-2016/0YY/ITD, with no issue highlighted at that moment. With reference to the PNC related to ITA-2016/0ZZ/ITD, the official reply has been provided under the case reported for the same vessel on 30/05/2016</p>

08/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU004		Following the end of the observer's debriefing, discrepancies between the catch allocations reported in the fishing logbook and in the eBCDs were noted. It appears that the differences are due to the non-recording of the dead fish during the transfer in the non-catching vessel logbook. The observer deployed on the vessel had no access to the eBCD information during his deployment.	left blank by CPC	The discrepancies highlighted by the ROP Service are due to the fact that the comparison has been wrongly carried out between the paper log-book and the eBCD. No discrepancy was found between the eBCD ELOG-BOOK (the only mandatory one) of which a copy can be provided.
08/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU011		The ITD relative to the first transfer carried out by the vessel the 27/05/2016 was not signed by the observer (ITA-2016/0XX/ITD). The non-signature is due to a problem with the video record. Only 20% to 30% of the door was visible during the transfer. - The captain provides a video copy of the transfer directly to the observer's laptop. No copy on physical support (DVD or other).	left blank by CPC	See reply provided under the case reported for the same vessel on 27/05/2016.
10/06/2016	Eu-Italy	000EU003		The date reported in the eBCD for the fishing operation and the transfer operation is the 01/06/2016. This date is not in concordance with the ITD issued, the fishing logbook, and the report of the observer. The correct date for these operations is 02/06/2016.	left blank by CPC	On this matter, the Italian administration was in contact with the TRAGSA help-desk (e-mail exchanges can be provided). the concerned discrepancy derived most probably from a bug in the system, which, in case of mistake, currently doesn't allow to change the eBCD date. The only possibility is to delete the concerned eBCD and to issue a new one which can be problematic, especially (as in the concerned case) where an ITD has been already issued, duly signed by the R.O. and taken on board by the concerned tug vessel. This issue should be addressed at ICCAT-TRAGSA level.

13/06/2016	Eu-Italy	not linked to a PS		5 small recreational and sport fishing vessels appeared in the fishing area while two registered purse seiners were following a school of tuna. Fishing operation was completed, and later there were 20 boats in the area of the two purse seiners. It was not possible to know any information about these vessels (neither registration number nor other information). These boats have no name written on them. They are fishing in an area of BFT and aiming clearly for them. According to master information, today it is expected to arrive plenty of these fishing boats. Photos were taken and in some of them is shown BFT (under minimum size) aboard these vessels	No	It is the ROs task to send alerts when irregularities or potential non compliances are observed. In this case however, it is important to clarify that: 1) the PNC indicated does not concern the PS that had embarked the RO but some other unknown vessels. 2) The information provided was imprecise and the photos were not transmitted along with the alert, which made it difficult for the ITA authorities to follow-up the case. We would however like to underline that, regarding recreational fishery, a lot of actions and discussions take currently place at EU level.
13/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU009		Following the transfer carried out the 03/06/2016 in the evening as mentioned in the PNC report n°1, the observer cannot provide an estimate and therefore did not sign the ITD provided. The vessel decided to perform a control transfer the day after. However instead of reporting this control transfer in the section 3 "Further transfers" of the first ITD issued, the master decided to request a new authorisation number and a new ITD number to register this control transfer. On this new ITD only the final cage of destination of the fish is reported and the previous cage is not mentioned. Therefore this ITD reports a transfer from the seine to the cage which never happened. Copies of all the documents have been provided to the observer and the eBCD issued mentions only a transfer from the catching vessel to the cage towed by the [second] vessel. All these operations are clearly stated in the fishing logbook.	left blank by CPC	The relevant ITD was completed with the correct TRANSPORT CAGE number and was duly signed by the concerned RO. There are ten days between the first transfer and the notification attached. Such delays are not in line with Annex 6 point 7a)i) of 14-04

14/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU012		Regarding the transfer operation n°1: the eBCD I mentions a fishing operation (Section 2) and a transfer operation (Section 3) the 02/06/2016 instead of the 01/06/2016 real date of the fishing operation and transfer. Regarding the transfer operation n°2: the eBCD mentions a different number of the ICCAT transfer declaration in Section 4 instead of the correct ITD number issued.	left blank by CPC	On this matter, the Italian administration was in contact with the TRAGSA help-desk (e-mail exchanges can be provided). the concerned discrepancy derived most probably from a bug in the system, which, in case of mistake, currently doesn't allow to change the eBCD date. The only possibility is to delete the concerned eBCD and to issue a new one. This can be problematic, especially (as in the concerned case) where an ITD has been already issued, duly signed by the R.O. and taken on board by the concerned tug vessel. This issue should be addressed at ICCAT-TRAGSA level. Remark 2: the concerned eBCD has been corrected (copy can be provided)
14/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU008		1) There is a discrepancy between the catch allocation reported in the fishing logbook and in the eBCD relative to the transfer operation n°1 carried out by another vessel in the JFO on 01/06/2016, probably due to a problem in the recording of the dead fish. 2) The name of the catching vessel for two allocated catches is not reported in the fishing logbook, even though there were only two vessels in the JFO	left blank by CPC	If RO refers to the difference in the third decimal (39307,457 versus 39307,456) this it probably linked to a "rounding"-error. It corresponds to a difference of below 152 Kg, which the ITA authorities consider to be minor. Remark 2: The logbook duly completed with both of the names of the vessels belonging to the concerned JFO is in ITA possession and copies can be provided. .
19/06/2016	EU-Italy	from observer on other vessel		Sighted in the fishing area (33'01 Latitude and 014'22 Longitude) participate actively in a a fishing operation (as support vessel). Authorisation as catching vessel finished 11/06/2016. Not on EBFT Other Vessel list. No Regional Observer on board.	left blank by CPC	ITA sent a fax immediately to the owner of the vessel reminding him that his vessel is neither allowed to carry out fishing operation targeting BFT since its quota is exhausted nor acting as auxiliary vessel since it's not authorized. ITA launched an investigation. The vessel was stopped in the port of "another EU MS" port where is was inspected by an inspection team deployed on board ITA FPV CP 409 that arrived in "another EU MS" port the same day.

08/06/2016	EU-Italy	000EU007		Following the end of the observer's debriefing, we note discrepancies between the catch allocations reported in the fishing logbook and in the eBCDs. All these discrepancies are summarised in the table below. It appears that the differences are due to the way of reporting the dead fish during the transfer in the non-catching vessel logbook. The observer deployed on the vessel had no access to the eBCD information during her deployment.	left blank by CPC	The discrepancies highlighted by the RO are due to the fact that the proposed comparison has been wrongly carried out between the paper log-book and the eBCD. No discrepancies are found between the eBCD and the ELOG-BOOK (the only mandatory one) of which a copy can be provided.
------------	----------	----------	--	---	----------------------	--