

ISSUES OF POTENTIAL NON-COMPLIANCE REPORTED BY
 OBSERVERS UNDER THE ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMMES

Farms and traps

CPC	Date reported	Request No.	PNC	PNC confirmed by CPC (yes/no)	Response/Explanation/Action taken
EU-Malta	25/09/2015	001EU0294	<p>The Tunisian farm sent two BFT cages to the Maltese farm "XXXX". The first step of this inter-farm transfer has been carried out the first week of September on the Tunisian farm between the towing vessel "XXX", cage EU-MLT-00XXX and the farm cages. Once the cage arrived to the farm the 24/09/2015, they started the second step of the process from the towing cage to the farm cage. However, the transfer has been too long (more than two hours), and the divers were not prepared for that. Therefore, at the beginning of the video you cannot see the board with the farm name, cage number, date, etc. The video starts directly with an open door (you cannot see how they opened the door). There are some moments in the video where the diver is filming only the upper part of the door, so you could see less than half of the door, and BFT are passing at the same moment (more than one during the whole video). After an hour and a half of video, the diver is run out of air, so he was going up and up to the surface, so you couldn't see the whole door in the video. The recommendation [14-04] does not detail precisely the process of an inter-farm transfer, however the observer is not able to confirm the real quantity of BFT caged during this last transfer.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>Maltese authorities have recorded the caging 'MLT-2015-AUT-0XX' (Catching vessel "XXX") with the stereoscopic camera and have no issues with this footage. The transfer door was always within the Stereoscopic camera's field of view, the board with the caging details is fully visible within the stereoscopic camera footage, the stereoscopic camera recording starts before the transfer gate is open and the entire transfer from the opening to the closing of the transfer gate was successfully recorded by the stereoscopic camera. The full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged was finalised and sent to the respective flag state of the catching vessel for their perusal and any necessary follow up. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for these particular cagings, considers this PNC to be closed and thus no further action is required. Reply will be provided as soon as possible.</p>

EU-Spain	11/09/2015	001EU0272	The observer has reported that on 20/07/2015, during a release (caging), the number of fish released was lower than the number of fish requested by the Spanish authorities. Release order was for 125 fish, observer estimated 102 fish were released. The observer misread the release order during the deployment, and realised the mistake during debriefing.	left blank by CPC	The release order was of 18,9 tons. The number of fish to be released depends on the weight of each fish released. According to the analysis of the video records of the release operation, the inspection services stated that the quantity of fish released was accurate to the release order.
EU-Spain	04/02/2016	001EU0305	On 27/01/2016: 17 tuna, weighing a total of 1,942kg, were harvested from cage ESP0XX. The farm allocated these to BCD ES-15-00000X-X-X which is actually contained in ESP0YY. On 28/01/2016: 34 tuna weighing a total of 6,777kg, were harvested from cage ESP0XX. The farm allocated these to BCD ES-15-00000Y-Y-Y which is actually contained in ESP0YY. 49 tuna, weighing a total of 8,280kg, were harvested from cage ESP0XX. The farm allocated these to BCD ES-15-00000Z-Z which is actually contained in ESP0ZZ. The observer signed the BCDs: ES-15-00000X-X-X; ES-15-00000Y-Y-Y; and ES-15-00000Z-Z.	left blank by CPC	The BCD includes the information of the cage were the fish was initially caged, but after internal movements of the fish inside the farm, it happens that the BCD cover different cages from the one stated in the caging section.
EU-Spain	04/02/2016	001EU0305	With respect to the PNC issued on 01/02 (related to the harvest on 28/01/2016), the observer has reported that the BCD ES-15-00000X-X has been cancelled by the farm. These tuna are now assigned to ES-15-00000Y-Y. The harvest took place in cage ESP0XX. However, ES-15-00000Y-Y is contained in ESP0XX. As such, a harvest has been carried out whereby harvested tuna were allocated to BCD contained in another cage. The observer has not signed the reproduction ES-15-00000Y-Y. The original signed BCD ES-15-00000X-X has been handed over to the fisheries inspector.	left blank by CPC	The BCD includes the information of the cage were the fish was initially caged, but after internal movements of the fish inside the farm, it happens that the BCD cover different cages from the one stated in the caging section.

EU-Spain	04/02/2016	001EU0305	The observer has reported that on 01/02/2016, a harvest was carried out whereby harvested tuna were allocated to BCD contained in another cage. The details are: 10 tuna, weighing a total of 1,212kg, were harvested from cage ESP0XX. The farm allocated these to BCD ES-15-00000X-X which is actually contained in ESP0YY. 56 tuna, weighing a total of 8,705kg, were harvested from cage ESP0XX. The farm allocated these to BCD ES-15-00000Y-Y which is actually contained in ESP0YY. The observer has not signed any of these BCDs.	left blank by CPC	The BCD includes the information of the cage were the fish was initially caged, but after internal movements of the fish inside the farm, it happens that the BCD cover different cages from the one stated in the caging section.
EU-Spain	09/03/2016	001EU0316	BFT harvested on 03/03/16 and 07/03/2016 were commercialized with BCDs not signed by the observer (the observer was at sea at this time - monitoring the harvest operations). The farm has indicated that the signature of the national inspector can cover these operations	left blank by CPC	The ROP was present during the harvesting, but once the documents were ready for validation the RO was at sea during the harvesting and processing on board the reef. Since the operator was in a hurry to send the fish to the buyer and since the RO had been effectively present during the harvest, the inspectors validated the BCD and allowed the trade.
EU-Spain	25/04/2016	001EU0318	On 22/04/2016, a transfer of BFT between the cage ESP00XX and a cage without number has been carried out. The towing vessel involved named "XXX" has no ICCAT number and had left the farm with the BFT transferred. The transfer operation has been recorded by video (stereoscopic camera from Spanish fisheries inspectors) but no video record of the transfer has been given to the observer. The farm operator indicated to the Regional observer that this transferred tunas are dedicated to a scientific project of the Spanish Institute of Oceanography.	left blank by CPC	The placement of the fish in the farm "XXXX" was provisional. Its final destination was within a scientific project of the Spanish Institute of Oceanography. At that time of the year, no authorized tug vessel was available. Being under pressure to proceed with the transfer and release operation, the Spanish Administration exceptionally authorized a non ICCAT vessel to tow the fish to the scientific installations. Every movement was supervised by national inspectors.

Morocco	17/05/2016	001MA0323	<p>On 16 May 2016, a transfer from the pool of the trap and the MAR-0XX cage, dated XX was carried out. An independent estimate of the observer of the amount transferred was not possible because of the poor visibility of the water. The observer did not sign the ITD.</p>	No	<p>The issue of potential non-compliance (PNC) raised by the transfer operation of live bluefin tuna, carried out on 16 May 2016 from the trap "XXX" towards the towing cage "MAR-00X". This first operation was carried out pursuant to Authorisation No. MAR-2016/AUT/0XX, issued by the Fisheries delegation of Larache on 16 May 2016.</p> <p>Following the observation of the transfer video by the ICCAT regional observer, it was shown that the video recording carried out to estimate the number of fish transferred, was of insufficient quality to allow the regional observer to estimate the number of fish transferred. This was due to the lack of water transparency of the site where the transfer operation took place.</p> <p>In accordance with the provisions of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04, Article 76, in particular, and its Annex 8, the operator was authorised by this Department to carry out a new transfer operation near the fattening farm to an empty cage, in order to carry out a new video recording for the ICCAT observer to recount the bluefin tuna transferred.</p> <p>This new verification transfer avoided a second difficult towing operation with all the risks that involves as regards to mortality and loss of tunas held in captivity and towed in bad weather conditions. The recount operation and estimation of number of fish was carried out successfully through a video recording of better quality which permitted the observer to sign the ITD.</p>
---------	------------	-----------	--	----	---

EU-Spain	06/06/2016	001EU0321	No estimation was possible due to poor visibility. The transfer was concluded at 23:30. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	The inspection services confirmed the poor visibility. In accordance with annex 8 of ICCAT REC. 14-04, the caging operation was repeated on 21st of June, when the water was clear enough. The video produced was of sufficient quality.
EU-Spain	16/06/2016	001EU0325	The ITD number was shown on the video instead of the authorisation number; for the same operation on the 13th, and for some previous operations, the towing cage number and the Farm cage number are the same. A difference of greater than 10% was recorded by the observer, but there was a split of the catch into two cages, so the missing / surplus of the number of the BFT might be at the other cage which has not transferred to the farm cage yet.	left blank by CPC	1) The farm state issues the caging authorisation numbered by the reference date: ddmmyyyy. In addition the identification of the tug vessel, the ITD and the transport cage were shown. Hence, ESP considers every caging operation to be identifiable in the video record. 2) Art. 71 ICCAT recommendations 14-04 foresees a unique number for every transport cage. However nothing in the Rec prevents having the same number in a transport cage and in a farm cage. 3) ESP confirms that the discrepancy in this caging operation exceeded the 5% and took this into account at the final calculation at the end of the caging for the JFO concerned.
EU-Spain	20/06/2016	001EU0325	In the video ITD is displayed with one number but on 17/06/2016 the cage was divided to two cages "so that transfers" ITD is written differently. The towing cage number and the Farm cage number are the same.	left blank by CPC	In our EU records, we do not have a "separate" record of this notification. It seems it is the same as above and/or below (EU Spain - farm "XXXX", 16/06 and 22/06). Unless more clarification from your side, we suggest to delete this column from the list.
EU-Spain	22/06/2016	001EU0325	In the video ITD one number is displayed but on 17/06/2016 the catch was divided to two cages so that transfers' ITD must be written as EU-FRA-2016/XXXX/ITD/X. Transfer Authorisation: ICCAT caging authorisation number is not displayed in the video; Cage Numbers: The cage ESP-0XX is used as a blank cage for COP1, COP2, COP4; 8 June 9 June and 15 June 2016, respectively. In this operation "code" is used for towing and also caging.	left blank by CPC	ITD: ESP confirms the error of the ITD, Transfer Authorisation: The farm state issues the caging authorisation numbered by the reference date: ddmmyyyy. In addition the identification of the tug vessel, the ITD and the transport cage were shown. ESP considers therefore every caging operation to be identifiable in the video record. cage numbers: Art. 71, ICCAT recommendations 14-04 foresees a unique number for every transport cage. However nothing in the regulation prevents having the same number in a transport cage and in a farm cage.

EU-Spain	24/06/2016	001EU0322	For all the 4 cagings carried out during this deployment, the reference number of the caging authorisation provided by the national authorities is different from the reference number reported in the ICD. 2) A paper BCD has been used to register the last caging operation (from XX to the cage n°X) carried out after the 26 May 2016 (27/05/2016). The transfer from the trap to the XX had been made the 25/05/2016.	left blank by CPC	The last caging operation was conducted on 25th, when the fish passed from the trap to the XX. The following movements are considered as internal movements recorded under the same authorisation number indicated on the bottom of the page. It is identical with the ICD. Maybe the RO refers to the reference number on top of the page of the same document.
EU-Spain	27/06/2016	001EU0325	It was not possible to estimate the number of fish due to the water and video quality. A control caging was performed the following day.	left blank by CPC	Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly
EU-Italy	22/05/2016	002EU0009	The PTN for the above mentioned transfer is lacking the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities. The ITD is missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage and therefore the ITD was not signed by the regional observer. The receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the present time, will come to collect the cage. No BCD nor eBCD reference number provided to the observer. The observer provided an estimate in number of the quantity transferred (1,336 fish) and the trap reported 1,215 fish. The difference between the two estimates is within the 10% limit.	left blank by CPC	This is a specific type of operation implemented at this ITA trap, which is related to the distance to the farm ("another EU-MS"). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions.

EU-Italy	26/05/2016	002EU0009	<p>The PTN for the above mentioned transfer is missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities. ITD is also missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage and therefore the ITD was not signed by the regional observer. The receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the present time, will come to collect the cage. No BCD nor eBCD reference number provided to the observer. The observer provided an estimate in number of the quantity transferred (564 fish) and the trap reported 541 fish. The difference between the two estimates is within the 10% limit.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>This is a specific type of operation implemented at this Italian trap, which is related to the distance to the farm ("another EU-MS"). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions.</p>
EU-Italy	17/06/2016	002EU0009	<p>The PTN for the above mentioned transfer is missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities. ITD is also missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage and therefore the ITD was not signed by the regional observer. The receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the present time, will come to collect the cage. No BCD nor eBCD reference number provided to the observer. The observer provided an estimate in number of the quantity</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>This is a specific type of operation implemented at this Italian trap, which is related to the distance to the farm ("another EU-MS"). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions.</p>

			transferred (385 fish) and the trap reported 390 fish. The difference between the two estimates is within the 10% limit.		
EU-Italy	22/06/2016	002EU010	The PTN for the above mentioned transfer is missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities. ITD is also missing the towing vessel details because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage and therefore the ITD was not signed by the regional observer. The receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the present time, will come to collect the cage. No BCD nor eBCD reference number provided to the observer. The observer has made an estimate but she is waiting for the operator number. It seems that the transfer has exceeded the remaining quota and therefore an official release could be carried out.	left blank by CPC	This is a specific type of operation implemented at this Italian trap, which is related to the distance to the farm ("another EU-MS"). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions. Regarding the estimation (number), an internal investigation was carried out by carefully analysing the concerned transfer video. On the basis of this analysis (conducted 3 times by 3 different persons), excess of the Italian trap quota was found. Copies of all relevant documents can be provided: final ITD (summarizing the results of all the partial transfers into the same TRANSPORT CAGE) and eBCD.
EU-Spain	28/06/2016	001EU0325	1) During a caging conducted on 08/06/2016, the observer estimated 15.18% fewer BFT than were indicated on the BCD; 2) During a caging conducted on 09/06/2016, the observer estimated 21.44% fewer BFT than were indicated on the BCD.	left blank by CPC	In both cases the ESP fisheries inspection services found a discrepancy in the total weight caged in this operation within the 5%.
EU-Spain	04/07/2016	001EU0325B	The observer has reported a vessel, which is not on the ICCAT register, to be moored alongside the farm. This vessel appears to be engaged in farm support.	left blank by CPC	The vessel is owned by farm "XXXX" but its activity is not related to BFT operations. The vessel works as surveillance of the farm installations.

EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0325B	<p>1) Following the caging operation conducted on 30/06/2016, no caging authorisation number was shown at the start and/or end of the video. The observer also noted that no caging authorisation number was issued by the Spanish authorities. Instead the date, operation type, towing vessel name, towing cage number and ITD number was displayed 2) Following the caging operation described above, a control transfer was ordered by the Spanish authorities due to a technical issue with the stereoscopic camera recording. This involved transferring the tuna back into the towing cage (not videoed), and then carrying out a control transfer from the towing cage into the same farm cage again. The video footage did not include the entire opening of the net. In addition, the observer was not able to estimate the amount of tuna transferred due to poor video quality and a high number of tuna passing at the same time. The observer had not been presented with an ITD or BCD at the time of reporting.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>1) The farm state issues the caging authorisation numbered by the reference date: ddmmyyyy. In addition the identification of the tug vessel, the ITD and the transport cage were shown. ESP considers therefore every caging operation to be identifiable in the video record. 2) The ESP fisheries inspection services checked that the operation was properly recorded in the stereoscopic camera footage and estimated the quantities of fish on that basis. The documents were provided to the RO after the time of the reporting.</p>
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	<p>For a caging operation (COP4) conducted on the 13th of June, no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. Two subsequent control transfers (COP4_1 and COP4_2) were carried out with no further PNCs being observed.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly.</p>
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	<p>For a caging operation (COP5) conducted on the 13 June no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. Three subsequent control transfers (COP5_1, COP5_2 and COP5_3) were carried out resulting in further PNCs. COP5_1: The observer was not able to estimate the amount of tuna transferred during the control transfer due to poor video quality. COP5_2 on 21 June. The video showed the incorrect towing</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly. with regard to COP5_2, ESP confirms the mistake. The correct towing vessel name and number is shown at the beginning of the stereoscopic camera record. This modification is not shown in the conventional video provided to the observer, but in the stereoscopic video records of which a print screen can be provided.</p>

			vessel name and cage number at the start of the video; COP5_3 on 21 of June no PNCs were observed.		
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	For a caging operation (COP6) conducted on the 13 June no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. A subsequent control transfer (COP6_1) was carried out with no further PNCs observed. No eBCDs or ITDs for these operations had been presented to the observer to verify and sign at the time of reporting.	left blank by CPC	Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly. The documents were provided to the RO after the time of the reporting.
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	For a caging operation (COP8) conducted on the 14 June, no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. A subsequent control transfer (COP8_1) was carried out. The observer was not able to estimate the amount of tuna transferred due to poor video quality. No further control transfers were carried out. No eBCDs or ITDs for these operations had been presented to the observer to verify and sign at the time of reporting.	left blank by CPC	Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly. The ESP fisheries inspectors were able to estimate the number and weight of the fish caged, which was within the 5% tolerance. The documents were provided to the RO after the time of the reporting.
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	For a caging operation (COP10) conducted on the 15 June, no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. A subsequent control transfer (COP10_1) was carried out and no further PNCs were observed. No eBCDs or ITDs for these operations had been presented to the observer to verify and sign at the time of reporting.	left blank by CPC	Annex 8 ICCAT Rec 14-04 provides a clear procedure on how to proceed in this case and ESP reacted accordingly. The documents were provided to the RO after the time of the reporting.
EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	For a caging operation (COP11) conducted on the 17 June, no estimation was possible due to poor video quality. No control transfer has been carried out. No eBCDs or ITDs for these operations had been presented to the observer to verify and sign at the time of reporting.	left blank by CPC	ESP inspection services were able to make an estimation based on the video record and therefore no control transfer has been carried out. The documents were provided to the RO after the time of the reporting.

EU-Spain	05/07/2016	001EU0321	This PNC covers all of the caging operations (including 12 caging operations and 13 control transfers) carried out during the deployment. No authorisation number is displayed at the start and/or end of the caging/control transfer videos. Instead, the authorisation issued by the farm state authorities is displayed (as per the computer screen shot shown below). The farm state authorisation does not include an authorization number. The date, name of the towing vessel, and the donor and receiving cages are displayed on a separate card. At the time of reporting, only one eBCD and no ITDs have been presented to the observer (for caging operation 1). The observer signed this BCD as it had no other PNCs associated with it, and the observer has noted that no authorisation number is issued by the farm flag state authorities.	left blank by CPC	The farm state issues the caging authorisation numbered by the reference date: ddmmyyyy. In addition the identification of the tug vessel, the ITD and the transport cage were shown. ESP considers therefore every caging operation to be identifiable in the video record.
EU-Malta	06/07/2016	001EU0327	For an operation conducted on the 1 July no estimate was possible due to video quality, in addition the closing of the door was also not shown. For an operation conducted on the 3 July on farm "XXXX". The video did not show 100% of the transfer. The observer has not signed the ITD for either operation.	left blank by CPC	For both cases, the stereoscopic camera footage produced by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	06/07/2016	001EU0328	For a caging operation conducted on the 4 July the observer's estimate was greater than 10% different to that of the farms; Estimation made in ITD n° XXXX; Observer estimation 2187; Difference of 12.34%.	left blank by CPC	Maltese authorities have conducted the analysis of the reference caging operation with the stereoscopic camera software and issued a full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged. Relevant reports were sent to the flag state of the catching vessel and the EU Commission. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has finalised the required stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular caging, it considers the case be closed and no further action required.

EU-Spain	08/07/2016	001EU0321	<p>For a caging operation (COP12) conducted on the 22nd of June, no ITD or BCD has been presented to the observer for verification following the transfer. Instead the observer was shown the Logbook (<i>Cuaderno de Registro</i>) which showed the details of the transfer. This listed the towing vessels ICCAT number incorrectly. This also listed the amount of tuna transferred as 193 pieces. The observer estimated a total of 273 tuna transferred, a difference of 41%. The observer has not been asked to verify either the logbook or any BCD and has not signed any associated documents. The farm communicated to the observer that the towing cage had tuna from 2015 in it, which were transferred into it from the Operator - Company "XXXXX" before the fishing season, for scientific purposes.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>This caging operation refer to BFT caged in 2015 and take place within a scientific project under the ESP Fisheries Administration. The following procedures are applied by the ESP authorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An internal authorization for this particular operation is provided to the operator. 2. BCDs issued in 2015 are covering the BFT transferred. 3. Video records of the transfer of BFT from the farm to the scientific cage and back to the farm are required. 4. Spanish Control Authorities are present during the transfers at all times. <p>Since BFT involved in this scientific program originates from fish caged in previous years, having complied with all the legal obligations (conventional video and SC recordings, BCDs, ITDs, etc.), ESP considers that its origins are fully transparent and that the procedures applied ensure sufficiently the control of those operations.</p>
EU-Spain	08/07/2016	001EU0321	<p>A number of incidental mortalities (IM) harvested between 07/06/2016 and 28/06/2016, have instead been declared as harvested on 04/07/2016 in the eBCD. As the eBCD did not have the correct date of the harvest in it, the observer did not sign the eBCD. The farm communicated to the observer that the eBCD system does not allow them to input the correct date and as such the dead fish had to be associated with the harvest carried out on 04/07/2016.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>The dead fish was found while the fisheries inspectors were analysing the stereoscopical video, so the caging was not validated yet. ESP authorities gave instructions to the operator to freeze the fish until the validation of the eBCD. The farm followed the instructions, however made a mistake when encoding the fish in the eBCD system. It should have selected the “natural dead” option.</p>

EU-Malta	12/07/2016	001EU0328	1) For a caging operation conducted on the 6 July the observer's estimate was greater than 10% different to that of the farms; estimation made in ITD n° XXXX; Observer estimation 2830; Difference of 23.1%. The ITD was not signed for this operation. 2) For a caging operation conducted on the 8 July the video did not show the closing of the door at the end of the transfer.	left blank by CPC	1) Maltese authorities have conducted the analysis of the reference caging operation with the stereoscopic camera software and issued a full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged. Relevant reports were sent to the flag state of the catching vessel and the EU Commission. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has finalised the required stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular caging, it considers the case to be closed and no further action required. 2) the stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	12/07/2016	001EU0327	For a caging operation conducted on the 30 June the video did not show 100% of the transfer, with a gap of approximately 30 seconds. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	12/07/2016	001EU0327	For a caging operation conducted on the 9 July an estimation was not possible due to video quality. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.

Tunisia	13/07/2016	001TN0332	The farm carried out a caging operation on 10 July 2016. However, the observer was unable to make an estimation as regards to the quantity of fish passing in front of the camera at the same time. Therefore, the observer was unable to sign the documents regarding this operation. A control caging operation was carried out on 11/07/2016 inside the farm. The observer provided an estimation included in the authorised 10% and thus signed the documents regarding this operation.	yes	A control transfer was carried out on 11 July 2016 from cage XX to cage YY of the XXX farm, under authorisation number TUN2016-AUT0XX. The validated Caging Declaration (ICD) corresponding to this caging is TUN2016-S,XXXYY/ICD.
EU-Malta	14/07/2016	001EU0328	For a caging operation conducted on the 11 July the observer's estimate was greater than 10% different to that of the farms; estimation made in ITD n° XXX; Observer estimation 1107; Difference of 58.4%. The ITD was not signed for this operation. For a caging operation conducted on the 13 July the observer's estimate was greater than 10% different to that of the farms; Estimation made in ITD n° YYYY; Observer estimation 500; Difference of 59.2%. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	Maltese authorities have conducted the analysis of the reference caging operation with the stereoscopic camera software and issued a full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged. Relevant reports were sent to the flag state of the catching vessel and the EU Commission. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has finalised the required stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular caging, it considers the case be closed and no further action required.
EU-Spain	18/07/2016	001EU0321	The observer has reported that on 18/07/2016 between 08:00 and 08:20, a Spanish flagged longliner appeared to be fishing for tuna using handlines near, and within the farm facilities.	left blank by CPC	The owner of vessel "XXX" is the Company "XXXXX" and it is authorized to fish actively for BFT (ATEU0ESP0XXXX). Its quota is over 70 tones. The vessel is registered as a long liner but is also authorised to use hand lines.
Turkey	20/07/2016	001TR0330	PNC 1: During a caging operation on 13/07/2016, the observer has reported that it was not possible to estimate the number of fish due to poor water visibility. An estimate was able to be made during a subsequent control caging. PNC 2: During another caging operation, also on 13/07/2016, the observer has reported that, because of poor weather conditions the operation took longer than anticipated, and the cameras therefore provided incomplete footage	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.

			and the video quality was too poor to enable a count. In addition, there was a two minute interruption in the footage.		
EU-Malta	22/07/2016	001EU0327	1: the observer has reported (17/07/2016) that for a caging operation conducted on the 12 th July the video record did not provide 100% coverage of the door for the whole caging period. In addition the contents of the cage were not recorded by the video at either the beginning or the end of the caging operation. 2: the observer has reported (17/07/2016) that for a caging operation conducted on the 13 th July the video record did not provide 100% coverage of the door for the whole caging period, and in addition the general visibility during the video was poor. The contents of the cage were not recorded by the video at either the beginning or the end of the caging operation	left blank by CPC	For both cases, the stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	22/07/2016	001EU0327	PNC 1 the observer has reported (17/07/2016) that for a caging operation conducted on the 13 th July that it was impossible to estimate the number of tuna due to technical problems with the video. Specifically, during the video record the screen froze between 08:50'33" and 08:55'00". PNC 2 the observer has reported (19/07/2016) that for a caging operation conducted on the 14 th July that it was impossible to estimate the number of tuna due to technical problems with the video. Specifically, during the video record the screen froze between 12:00'13" and 12:10'00".	left blank by CPC	For both cases, the stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.

Tunisia	22/07/2016	001TN0333	During the observer's deployment on the farm, 3 caging operations were carried out. However, the videos of these operations were not transmitted on specific physical media (DVDs, SD cards or other) to the observer who was therefore obliged to copy them onto his personal computer. The copies of the videos of these operations will be recorded by the Consortium.	yes	The videos were transmitted to the observer who was responsible of copying them by his own accord before replacing the USB support. The TFT farm now commits to provide videos with their supports without having to make copies.
Tunisia	30/07/2016	001TN0332	For the 4 inter-farm transfers: the 4 ITDs produced do not include the respective BCD numbers of the fish transferred. However, the observer has signed these ITDs.	yes	The eBCDs corresponding to ITDs of this PNC are as follows:(TUN2016/0XX/ITD -- TN169000XX) (TUN2016/0YY/ITD -- TN140000Y et TN140000ZZ) (TUN2016/0ZZ/ITD -- TN1690000A) (TUN2016/0AA/ITD -- TN1690000B)
Tunisia	21/07/2016	001TN0332	The farm carried out on 20/07/2016 the first stage of an inter-farm transfer: a transfer was carried out between farm cage No. 15 and towed cage "EU.MLT-00X-XXX". Following this operation, the observer viewed the transfer video. It appears, however, that the closing of the door is not visible on the film. Consequently, a control transfer must be carried out today (21/07/2016) between cage EU.MLT-00X-XXX and cage EU.MLT-00Y-XXX (which is empty). Therefore the observer has not been in a position to sign the ITD.	yes	A control transfer was carried out on 21/07/2016 from towed cage EU-MLT-00X-XXX to towing cage EU-MLT-00Y-XXX under authorisation number TUN2016-AUT0XX. The validated Caging Declaration (ICD) corresponding to this caging is TUN2016-S,ZZZ02/ICD.
Turkey	08/08/2016	001TR0334	PNC 1: On 14/07/2016 a part of the net door was not shown on the video for a brief period whilst the door was being closed. PNC 2: On 15/07/2016 a part of the net door was not shown on the video for a brief period whilst the door was being closed. PNC 3: On 16/07/2016 the closing of the net door was not visible on the video due to poor water quality.	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 videofootages and documents belonging the related transfers have been examined. Accordingly no PNC has been observed. Nevertheless the operator has been warned for future implementation.

			In all three cases the observer believes that no fish passed through during the periods when the door was not fully visible, and is therefore confident in the number estimations. The observer signed the ITD for all three operations.		
EU-Malta	12/08/2016	001EU0328	1: On 27/07/2016 the difference between the observer's estimation and the number of fish recorded on the ITD was greater than 10%. 2: On 28/07/2016 the difference between the observer's estimation and the number of fish recorded on the ITD was greater than 10%. 3: On 01/08/2016 the net door was not fully visible for a period of the video whilst fish were passing through, therefore the observer could not make an estimation. 4: On 04/08/2016 the net door was not fully visible for a period of the video whilst fish were passing through, therefore the observer could not make an estimation. 5: On 02/08/2016 the difference between the observer's estimation and the number of fish recorded on the ITD was greater than 10%. 6: On 05/08/2016 the observer could not make an estimation due to poor water visibility and excess brightness in the video. In all cases the observer did not sign the ITD.	left blank by CPC	Regarding cases 1), 2) & 5) Maltese authorities conducted the analysis with the stereoscopic camera software and issued a full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged. Relevant reports are sent to the flag state of the catching vessel and the EU Commission. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has finalised the required stereoscopic camera estimations for the cagings concerned, it considers the cases to be closed and no further action required. Regarding cases 3), 4) & 6) the stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers these cases to be closed and no further action required.

EU-Malta	19/08/2016	001EU0328	1: On 13/08/2016 the observer's estimation differed from the number of fish on the ITD by more than 10%. The observer did not sign the ITD. 2: On 14/08/2016 the observer was not able to make an estimation or see the net door due to poor water visibility and excessive brightness in the video. The observer did not sign the ITD. The observer has also been shown an ITD in which an Italian inspector signed in the place of the ICCAT observer.	left blank by CPC	1) Maltese authorities conducted the analysis with the stereoscopic camera software and issued a full stereoscopic camera report with the estimation of the total BFT biomass caged. Relevant reports are sent to the flag state of the catching vessel and the EU Commission. As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has finalised the required stereoscopic camera estimations for the cagings concerned, it considers the case to be closed and no further action required. 2) The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Authorities, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required. The ITD was signed by the Italian Inspector in accordance with Article 76 and Article 77 of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04.
EU-Malta	22/08/2016	001EU0327	On 18/08/2016 the observer reported that the video record of a release operation did not completely show the closing of the net door at the end of the operation.	left blank by CPC	The Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has recorded the footages of the relevant release operation and confirmed the release of the correct number of BFT. As the release operation is in conformity with the provisions of Annex 10 of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04, no further action is required.
EU-Malta	31/08/2016	001EU0327	On 26/08/2016 the observer reported that the transfer video did not show the time continuously between 17:17 and 17:22. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.

EU-Malta	19/08/2016	001EU0328	<p>1: On the 04/08/2016 the observer was shown an ITD (LBY-2016/XXX/ITD) in which the number of fish transferred was not recorded. However the number of fish was recorded in the BCD LY-169000XX. 2: On the 27/07/2016 the ITD (ITA-2016/YYY/ITD) shown to the observer had not been signed. 3: On 30/07/2016 the closing of the net door was not recorded by the control transfer video. The observer did not sign the ITD.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>1) The reference ITD should have been checked by the RO onboard the catching vessel prior to signing the relevant ITD. The department of Fisheries and Aquaculture has received confirmation and authorisation from Libyan authorities before authorising the caging concerned. In any case, the BFT in the cage was accompanied by a validated e-BCD stipulating and confirming the legality of the BFT caught. In this regard no further action was considered necessary by Maltese authorities. 2) The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.3) This control transfer was ordered by Maltese authorities in order to confirm the number of BFT. The presence of the RO was requested by Maltese authorities for the sake of utmost transparency in the control procedures implemented by the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture. The footages obtained by the Diving Inspectors show both, the closing of the door net and inside the donor cage after completion of the transfer of fish.</p>
EU-Malta	02/08/2016	001EU0328	<p>For a caging conducted on the 02/08/2016 the ITD (ITA-2016-XXX-ITD) was not signed by regional observer but instead is signed by Italian inspection.</p>	left blank by CPC	<p>The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required. The ITD was signed by the Italian Inspector in accordance with Article 76 and Article 77 of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04.</p>

EU-Malta	13/08/2016	001EU0328	For a caging conducted on the 13/08/2016 the ITD (ITA-2016-XXX-ITD) was not signed by regional observer but instead is signed by Italian inspection.	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required. The ITD was signed by the Italian Inspector in accordance with Article 76 and Article 77 of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04.
EU-Malta	19/09/2016	001EU0341	The 17/09/2016, a transfer operation between farm "XXXX" and farm "YYYY" was carried out. The observer was present only at the caging stage of the transfer. The Video record provided to the observer did not show the closing of the doors (Video shows transfer of 33 BFT).	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging operation by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	17/06/2016	001EU0327	The observer has reported (16/06/2016) that for a caging operation conducted on the 15 th of June no estimation was possible due to poor visibility due to water turbidity. The ITD was not signed for this operation.	left blank by CPC	The stereoscopic camera footage produced for this caging by the Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and no difficulties to estimate the quantities were faced. It therefore considers the case to be closed and no further action required.
EU-Malta	04/10/2016	001EU0340	(03/10/2016) a release operation was carried out from cage EU.MLT-0XX-MB. On the film provided to the observer, only 70 % of the door is visible and at the end of the video the closure of the door is not recorded.	left blank by CPC	The Maltese Authorities recorded the footages of the relevant release operation and confirmed the release of the correct number of BFT. As the release operation is in conformity with the provisions of Annex 10 of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04, no further action is required.

<p>EU-Croatia</p>	<p>20/07/2016</p>	<p>001EU0324</p>	<p>An inter farm transfer was processed during the observer deployment. This operation was carried out in two steps: From the Farm "XXX" with a transfer to the towing cage "HRV0XX" the 11/07/2016 (ITD HRV-2016/XXX/ITD), and From the towing cage "HRV0XX" with a caging to the "YYY" the 12/07/2016. The observer monitored both operations and received the videos. However due to the eBCD system limitation it appears that the regional observer could not signed electronically the BCD issued for these operations "HR16-000YY" even after receipt of the farm operator email asking for his signature through the official eBCD system. Therefore, as all the information reported were correct, the observer signed a paper version of this BCD.</p>	<p>left blank by CPC</p>	<p>Croatia confirms that there was a problem with RO's access to the eBCD system and he wasn't able to sign the farming section in eBCD, but he signed printed version instead. Without RO's signature in eBCD, the eBCD was blocked and couldn't be validated. The ICCAT Secretariat was contacted by EU and the issue could be solved with its support on 24th August.</p>
-------------------	-------------------	------------------	--	--------------------------	--