

**REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON BLUEFIN TUNA
CONTROL AND TRACEABILITY MEASURES**
(Madrid, Spain, 2-4 March 2020)

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Working Group (WG) Mrs. Marta Moya Diaz, Deputy Head of Unit D4 “Fisheries Control and Inspections” of Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, European Commission.

The Chair started by explaining that the primary objective of this WG was to discuss possible improvements to ICCAT Recommendation 19-04 and other related provisions on control and traceability of bluefin tuna, particularly farmed bluefin tuna. The structure of the discussions for the three day meeting was as follows: (1) Presentations by farming Contracting Parties (hereinafter referred to as CPCs), Regional Observer Programme (ROP) Consortium and Japanese Delegation on Day 1 (morning); (2) Review of provisions of Rec. 19-04 and other relevant measures on Day 1 (afternoon), Day 2 and Day 3 (morning); and (3) Review and agreement on the list of Recommendations to be submitted by the WG to the Panel 2 Intersessional meeting on Day 3 (afternoon). The Chair also explained that the aim of the Group was to agree in principle on and find possible ways forward to tackle identified weaknesses regarding, relevant provisions. These findings would be reviewed during the meeting, but the Group would avoid entering into a drafting exercise as that should take place at a later stage, once Panel 2 Intersessional meeting endorses the recommendations. It was also clarified that this exercise should, as much as possible, not overlap with item 7 of the agenda for the Panel 2 intersessional meeting regarding the “determination of responses to the ROP Consortium regarding clarification of provisions of Rec. 19-04”. Regarding this particular issue, it was suggested that Panel 2 organise a technical meeting with interested CPCs which could be held back to back to the next Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM) Working Group meeting.

The list of relevant items discussed are presented below together with those issues for which further deliberations are sought from Panel 2 and other ICCAT working bodies.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

Mr. Takeshi Miwa, Associate Director of the International Division of Fisheries Agency from the Government of Japan, was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda and meeting arrangements

The Agenda was adopted with the understanding that items 4, 5 and 6 would be reviewed together, as would items 7, 8 and 9. The Agenda is attached as **Appendix 1** (WG_BFT_CT_01A).

The Executive Secretary, Mr. Camille Jean Pierre Manel, introduced the CPCs and observers present and informed participants of the meeting arrangements. The List of Participants is attached as **Appendix 2**.

4. Presentations by CPCs with active bluefin tuna farms on the procedures to carry out the random controls and follow-up actions foreseen

The WG started with presentations by CPCs with active bluefin tuna farms: EU (represented by the European Fisheries Control Agency/EFCA), Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey. These presentations focused on the procedures to implement relevant provisions of control and traceability with particular emphasis, as requested in advance by the Chair, on the procedures to carry out the random controls and follow-up actions foreseen. All presentations are available on the ICCAT website.

5. Presentation by the ROP Consortium to highlight weakness/loopholes identified based on several years of experience of implementation of the bluefin tuna recovery/management plan

The presentation by a representative of the ROP Consortium highlighted certain situations in which they encounter problems when performing their assigned tasks, providing a list of main points that could be changed to make their job easier and more effective¹. The ROP Consortium representative was welcomed by the Chair to stay for the rest of the discussions of the WG, as their presence could be useful in clarifying some of the issues that might arise in the WG's discussions.

6. Presentation by the Japanese Delegation regarding the observed growth rates and utility of growth rates for control purposes, which is related to paragraph 28 of Rec. 19-04

Japan presented the work they have been carrying out on observed growth rates and the utility of growth rates for control purposes, which was related to the review of paragraph 28 of Rec. 19-04. This presentation was complemented by the document *Growth rate observed in bluefin tuna farmed in eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean* (WG_BFT_CT_04) on this topic prepared by Japan and already presented during Panel 2 at the 2019 ICCAT Annual meeting. At the end of the presentation, Japan offered a number of concrete recommendations to respond to the identified weaknesses. As this presentation was linked to paragraph 28, it was agreed to continue discussions during the anticipated revision of Rec. 19-04. In this presentation, it was also clarified that the problems raised by Turkey on conversion factors of processed tuna would be deferred to the Panel 2 Intersessional meeting as this was not an issue to be addressed by this WG.

The WG thanked Japan for its thorough and helpful presentation. It was noted that the issue of growth rates needed to be addressed and that it was disappointing that ICCAT was in this situation given the longstanding requirement for farming CPCs to provide growth rate data to the Commission.

7-9 Review of the comments sent by CPCs on the inventory table prepared by the Chair of the WG and solutions/recommendations agreed for each of the provisions

The Chair informed the WG that comments on the inventory table circulated in advance of the meeting were received from Algeria, Japan, European Union, Morocco and Turkey, and were consolidated by the ICCAT Secretariat in the document *Inventory of provisions related to the management and control of bluefin tuna destined for farms (live BFT) contained in the Rec. 19-04* [WG_BFT_CT_02_1 and WG_BFT_CT_02]. It was suggested to proceed to the review of the comments on Rec. 19-04 measures on a provision-by-provision basis.

Carry-over (Paragraphs 8-9)

Paragraph 8: According to this paragraph the carry-over within a farm of non-harvested live bluefin tuna from a previous year's catch is not authorized unless a reinforced system of control is implemented and reported to the Secretariat. Such a reinforced system shall include at least the provisions defined in paragraph 103 and 107. It also stipulates that further control measures will be examined within Panel 2. Discussions focused on adding clarity to the text. The WG recommended that Panel 2 redraft paragraph 8 to cover all relevant activities – not only carry-over - and to ensure that carry-over should not be allowed unless a reinforced control system is ensured, as well as to establish template language for use in farming plans for coordinated approaches among farm CPCs regarding carry-over.

Paragraph 9: this paragraph requires that prior to the start of the fishing season, the farm CPC must assess the live bluefin tuna carried over after "bulk-harvests" in farms under their jurisdiction. To that end, all carried-over bluefin tuna from a catching year (fish that were not subject to bulk-harvest in the farms) must be transferred to other cages and recorded by stereoscopic camera (or an approved alternative method with the same level of precision and accuracy), Carry-over of bluefin tuna from years that were not subject to bulk-harvest shall be controlled annually by applying the same procedure to appropriate samples based on risk assessment. Moreover, full traceability of the carried over bluefin tuna must be ensured at all times and the measures to ensure such traceability shall be fully documented. During the discussions, CPCs suggested, among other issues, adding clarity regarding some specific concepts, the need to standardise controls/best practices

¹ BFT Traceability – The BFT ROP Perspective [5.ROP-BFT_Presentation_WG-BFT-traceability] – Last slide of the presentation.

regarding carry over, and how to act when encountering discrepancies identified during carry-over operations. Moreover, it was raised that in order to estimate the weight of the bluefin tuna carried over, a new algorithm to convert length into weight for fattened fish was needed. As a result of the exchange, the WG recommended that Panel 2: develop a better definition of what is considered appropriate “alternative methods” to stereoscopic camera recording if the concept needs to be retained in Rec. 19-04, put all carry-over provisions related to farms from all ICCAT Recommendations (19-04 and 18-13) together in one single section; define “bulk harvest”; clarify the meaning of “full traceability”; and treat any carry-over discrepancy on a cage-by-cage basis without applying any compensation. The WG also recommended that Panel 2 consider the possibility of grouping fish in carry-over operations from different cages and, if this is agreed upon, to refer this issue to IMM/PWG to discuss amendments needed to Rec. 18-12 and 18-13 as well as the functionality that would need to be developed in the eBCD system.

Farming (Paragraph 24 to 27):

According to *paragraph 24*, each farming CPC shall establish an annual farming management plan that shall demonstrate that the total input capacity and the total farming capacity is commensurate with the estimated amount of live bluefin tuna available for farming. Regarding this issue, the WG discussed the possibility of creating a register for the number of cages, which also should be clearly marked. However, several CPCs noted that it was impossible to know this figure at the time of the farming plan. At the end of this discussion, the WG recommended that Panel 2 discuss whether to set definitions of farming and input capacity.

Growth rates (Paragraph 28):

This paragraph requires that farm CPCs shall endeavour to ensure that the growth rates derived from the eBCDs are consistent with the growth rates published by the SCRS and if significant discrepancies are found between the SCRS tables and growth rates observed, that information should be sent to the SCRS for analysis. The discussion on this particular provision was a continuation of the presentation and paper provided by Japan under agenda item 6. Japan presented several proposals to solve the issues identified as problematic until a new table for the calculation of growth rates is finalised by the SCRS. While recognising all the work done by Japan on this particular topic, it was suggested that this issue not be further discussed by the WG and that no change to this paragraph in the Recommendation should be made until the SCRS table is adopted. In the meantime, the relevant CPCs could continue using the Excel spreadsheet proposed by Japan for the calculation of growth rates, and it was suggested to organise a technical meeting with relevant CPCs to discuss possible adaptations/improvements on how to calculate growth rates. The WG agreed to refer the discussion to Panel 2 to decide if a technical meeting between relevant CPC experts was needed under the supervision of Panel 2.

Observers (Paragraphs 83 to 85)

National (i.e., CPC) Observer Programme (Paragraph 83): this paragraph requires CPC national observers to be present on all towing vessels and harvesting operations from traps. Discussions focused on the lack of training for national observers and the need to check the video camera footage recorded by the observers in cases where further transfer occurs following the first transfer and before caging. The WG recommended that Panel 2 ensure that national observers on towing vessels conduct the analysis of the videos of such further transfers that follow the first transfer and report to the flag CPC of the towing vessels. The WG also recommended that discussion regarding training of national observers be deferred to the IMM.

ROP (paragraphs 84 to 85)

Paragraph 84 refers to operations for which the presence of ROP observers is required and the observer’s specific tasks. The WG sought to avoid overlap of intersessional discussions by Panel 2 regarding this paragraph and others related to the ROP. It was also suggested to discuss whether control transfers conducted near the farm following the catch and before caging should be monitored by ROP observers. In response to the question regarding CPCs facing cases of *force majeure*, no CPC confirmed to have experienced such a situation. One CPC indicated that diversification of action by ROP observers over several different activities could lead to misinterpretations of ICCAT Recommendations. After further discussion, the WG recommended that Panel 2 request the IMM and/or the ROP Consortium at the next technical meeting with that Group to consider the need for further training of ROP observers on the interpretation/implementation of ICCAT Recommendations.

Paragraph 85: the ICCAT Regional Observer tasks listed in this paragraph assume that the observer has “access to stereoscopic camera footage at the time of caging that enables the measuring of length and estimating the corresponding weight.” During the discussions, the importance of ensuring properly recorded video footage of the first transfers and proper training of the ROP observer was underscored. Human error was also recognised with regard to counting fish in the videos, and CPCs were encouraged to use the artificial intelligence (AI) system on a trial basis during the next fishing season. The WG recommended that Panel 2 agree on the necessity of ROP observers to review stereoscopic camera (SC) footage at caging and to encourage CPCs with active bluefin tuna farms to participate in trials using AI analysis on SC footage in order to eliminate human error. Depending on the outcome, Panel 2 may wish to consider revising Rec. 19-04 and, in that regard, it was noted that paragraph 104 is related to these matters. Finally, it was recommended to seek further training for ROP observers to improve their capacity regarding review of SC footage and to raise this matter at the 2020 IMM meeting and/or the next technical meeting with the ROP Consortium.

Transfers (paragraphs 86 to 91)

Paragraph 86: According to this paragraph, all transfers must be pre-notified, each transport cage is assigned a unique ID number (which shall be permanent and not transferable), and a single transfer may use different transport cages. During the discussions, emphasis was made on the need to clarify in Rec. 19-04 the obligation of using unique numbers for cages in farms and to ensure that the cage number cannot be altered or changed (e.g., stamp or paint on ring of cages) because other methods, like signs attached to a mast, cannot guarantee this. The concept of unique numbering already exists in Rec. 06-07 and this language could be considered when revising Rec. 19-04. The ICCAT Transfer Declaration (ITD) should be changed to allow the registration of transfer to more than one cage. The WG recommended that Panel 2: (1) clarify the obligation for all farm cages used for farming or associated activities to be assigned a unique number while considering existing language in Rec. 06-07 to ensure consistency; (2) ensure that the unique number for cages is not changed or tampered with and is visible and legible at all times for purposes of surveillance; and (3) create a space or section in the ITD to record the number of multiple transport cages. On this last point, it was noted that Turkey submitted a *Draft ITD* revision for consideration (**Appendix 3**).

Paragraph 87: this paragraph stipulates that within 48 hours, the flag CPC must deliver an authorisation number to each transfer from a catching vessel, a trap or a farm. Moreover, during the transfer from a purse seiner, dead bluefin tuna shall be recorded in the logbook and counted against the CPC quota. During the discussions, it was highlighted that the Recommendation does not include an obligation to report dead/lost bluefin tuna during transfers from traps, during transport, caging and farming operations or how to deal with unreported dead fish. It was also clarified that the difference in this particular case between dead and unreported fish is that the dead fish can be weighed while for unreported fish, it is impossible to calculate the weight. The possibility to use the logbook to declare dead fish was mentioned. The WG recommended that Panel 2 edit Annex 11 to include clarification of CPC responsibilities, in particular, procedures and a timetable for reporting dead fish at all stages of the process of transferring bluefin tuna from the catching vessel or trap to towing cage, to farm, including incorporating relevant provisions of Rec. 06-07.

Paragraph 88: This paragraph concerns the refusal of transfer authorisation and release. The flag, farm or trap CPC must refuse the transfer if the catch is beyond the quota, the catching vessel is not authorised to fish bluefin tuna, the towing vessel is not registered, or the towing vessel is not equipped with a vessel monitoring system (VMS) (or equivalent). In case of refusal, a release order must be issued. If the VMS system fails, it must be repaired within 72 hours, or the towing vessel can be replaced. During the discussion, it was suggested to extend VMS to tugs regardless of the vessel length, to consider increasing the VMS frequency of positions and the possibility to equip transport cages with a tracking device in order to monitor all movements of towing vessels and towed cages. The Chair requested the need for further clarifications regarding problematic issues in Annex 10 as well as any new measures. Questions arose such as: why is two hours not enough time for towing vessels and whether manual reporting frequency has caused any problems so far. The possibility of using fax or email every 4 hours in the case of VMS interruption was suggested. The WG also suggested that alternative methods be mentioned under this paragraph. Also mentioned was the difficulty to increase the frequency beyond two hours due to financial reasons. Finally, it was suggested to move all VMS provisions in different paragraphs of Rec. 19-04 to the same section. At the end of the discussion, the WG recommended that Panel 2 establish the obligation for all tug vessels to be equipped with VMS regardless of their length and regroup all provisions related to VMS (88, 94, 105) in the same section. The WG also recommended deferring the following issues for discussion to the next IMM meeting: (1) increasing the frequency of transmission of VMS positions

from 2 hours to 1 hour for towing vessels, (2) increasing the frequency of reporting in case of technical failure of VMS from every 4 hours to 2 hours, while considering general VMS provisions of Rec. 18-10, and (3) installing tracking/locating devices on transport cages. Finally, the WG recommended developing a reporting template for releases and strengthening the provisions of paragraph 88 by deleting the phrase "or legitimate operational constraints".

Paragraph 89 on transfer declarations requires that an ITD must be completed at the end of the transfer operation, the original accompanies the transfer and the catching vessel or trap and the towing vessel keeps a copy. The transfer must appear in the logbook of the towing vessel and the farm of destination must be specified. During the discussion, the need to duplicate the ITD (i.e., have two originals) when the destination is two different farms and/or when there is a need to split one ITD into different cages, even if the destination is the same farm. It was suggested that a possible solution could be to add extensions, such as /1 or /2, to the concerned ITDs to link them. The WG recommended that Panel 2 explore ways to reflect in paragraph 89 the possibility that transfers can be destined for more than one farm and revise the ITD template accordingly, taking into account the proposal by Turkey, which would be further amended.

Paragraphs 91, 92 and 93 on the monitoring by video camera of a transfer, requires that the first transfer must be recorded by a conventional camera to determine the number of bluefin tuna transferred. The original video remains with the donor vessel or trap. Moreover, if the video quality is insufficient to count the number of bluefin tuna and if voluntary transfer by the operator fails to achieve satisfactory results, a control transfer must be ordered by "the control authorities." Discussions started by seeking confirmation that the first transfer is considered finished only when the video is clear enough to count the number of fish and that the ROP is supposed to stay on scene until the video is of good quality (i.e., the tug and catching vessel cannot separate until there is a valid video). On this last point, it was suggested to establish a benchmark, in terms of maximum number of first transfer attempts, after which the ROP could leave. A review of all references to numbers and quantities in the overall text of the Recommendation was also suggested to add clarity. The WG recommended that Panel 2 confirm that the transfer operation is only concluded when the video complies with the requirements of Annex 8 concerning the quality of the footage. It also recommended that paragraphs 91 and 92 be redrafted to clarify the roles of ROP and the CPC authorities, taking the following issues into consideration: (1) ROP should stay until video is clear or until some benchmark on the number of control transfers is reached (requires determination by Panel 2); (2) If an investigation is launched (discrepancy is more than 10%), the video must be reviewed by the flag State as part of the investigation; and (3) check consistency with provisions in Recs .18-12 and 18-13 related to validations as fish cannot progress from catch through the transfer and caging processes without prior validation of the eBCD. It was also recommended to create a new ITD template based on the proposed model form provided by Turkey and to extend the requirements on paragraphs 91 and 92 to all transfers, including splits. Finally, it was recommended to delete the last sentence of paragraph 92 (regarding "control caging") and to replace "quantities" by "number" in paragraph 92.

Caging operations (paragraphs 94-95):

As a general comment on caging operations, the WG recommended that Panel 2 transfer relevant provisions on farming contained in Rec. 06-07 and potentially other recommendations, such as 18-12 and 18-13, into a revision of Rec. 19-04. Consideration should also be given to the possible need to move some provisions of Rec. 06-07 into a revision of Rec. 18-13.

Paragraph 94, on caging authorisations and possible refusal, requires that transport cages cannot be anchored < 0.5 miles from the farm. It was suggested that at least 1 mile instead of 0.5 miles should be required between transport cage and farming facilities as well as between the transport cages themselves; however, it was unclear how to implement those requirements. It was also suggested that farm CPCs should include coordinates in their plans as required; the WG suggested that Panel 2 discuss this when reviewing CPCs' farming plans. The WG considered that the issue of the coordinates should be discussed at Panel 2 and suggested that Panel 2 revise paragraphs 88, 94 and 105 to improve monitoring of towing vessels and transport cages when they are approaching farms, as well as to move relevant provisions of Rec. 18-12 and 18-13 into Rec. 19-04 when considering revisions of the above- mentioned paragraphs.

Paragraph 95: According to this paragraph, before caging, the farm CPC informs the flag or trap CPC about the quantities to be caged and in case of refusal, the flag or trap CPC issues a release order. The release must be recorded by conventional video and occur within three weeks after the caging is completed. Caging cannot begin without the prior confirmation (within 24 hours/1 working day of the request) of the flag or trap CPC - or of the farm CPC if agreed with the flag CPC of the catching vessel or CPC authorities of the trap. In addition, all caging must be completed by 22 August, except in cases of *force majeure*, and, in any case, before 7 September. Discussions started by seeking clarification on what to do if there is a refusal that is unrelated to the 24-hour rule (e.g. in cases where farm capacity had been reached). One suggestion was that, where no authorisation to cage is provided within one month, the fish should be released. In addition, in all cases, a follow up procedure should be put in place to ensure communication can continue after the 24-hour deadline. Some concerns were raised regarding CPCs with different working days in their work week, which could cause problems in the future. In light of the discussion, the WG recommended that Panel 2 ensure that the same actions (e.g. seizure of the catch or the release of the fish) would be taken by each farm CPC in case that flag CPC does not respond within 24 hours and to add a reference to the text regarding the sharing of information with other CPCs through the ICCAT Secretariat in cases where a farm CPC does not respond within the 24 hour deadline or refuses a caging operation. In case of refusals, the WG noted that, for those related to illegal catch, releases are required, but, for cagings refused for other reasons, such as the lack of available farm capacity the WG recommended that fish should be released after no more than one month in the transport cage.

Paragraph 97 on monitoring by video camera, specifies that transfer activities "from cages to the farm" must be monitored by enforcement authorities by video camera (see Annex 8 for details). On this particular point, it was proposed to introduce an obligation for the authorities to collect during the caging all relevant information from the towing vessel and to keep it for five years, as well as modify the heading to cover all aspects covered by the text. If such changes are introduced into this paragraph, it was suggested that the heading of this section will likely need to be revised. The WG recommended that Panel 2 insert the word "transport" before "cages" to add clarity to this paragraph as well as to refine the text to request that farm CPCs collect all of the relevant information brought by the towing vessel before the conclusion of the caging operation. Moreover, it was recommended to request that farm CPCs store such information for at least five years to preserve evidence of caging operations for potential future investigations.

Paragraph 98: This paragraph stipulates that investigations must be launched by the farm CPCs, in cooperation with the flag or trap CPC, if the number of bluefin tuna at caging diverges by > 10% between estimations of the regional observer, relevant control authorities and/or farm operator. During the discussions, it was suggested to define the roles of the CPCs involved in an investigation. The need to ensure cooperation between CPCs in the event of investigations was also raised and, in that regard, it was proposed that provisions of Rec. 06-07 should be imported to this paragraph. Moreover, it was requested to clarify the role of the ROP regarding the stereoscopic footage, in particular, if more than a 10% difference is detected. It was suggested that, in cases of < 10% difference, which occurs often, only stereoscopic cameras will be used instead of conducting investigations. It was further noted that there can be value in conducting investigations to determine why there is a difference of more than 10% whether the figure is 10% higher or 10% lower than that estimated by the regional observer, control authorities, or farm operator. The WG recommended to redraft paragraphs 98, 99 and 101 to bring consistency and clarity in the flow of investigation and information sharing, including the term 10% difference, and to review and clarify the roles of each party, including incorporating text from Rec. 06-07, where appropriate. It was also recommended to clarify the role of the ROP related to SC camera footage (see paragraph 85 also) and to review the protocol/methodology for releases.

Paragraph 99, regarding measures and programmes to estimate the number and weight of bluefin tuna, requires that: (1) each caging operation must be recorded by stereoscopic camera (or approved alternative method), to verify the number and weight of the fish; (2) the farm CPC communicates the results to the flag or trap CPC; (3) an investigation must be launched if the quantities of bluefin tuna differ from quantities caught and transferred at a single caging operation, or all cagings related to a JFO; (4) in case of tuna in excess of that declared caught and transferred, the flag or trap CPC must issue a release order (and the figures in the caging declaration and the eBCD must be corrected accordingly); and (5) the release operation must be done in the presence of an enforcement authority and ICCAT observer. During the discussion, it was suggested that the SCRS should examine the size-to-weight conversion algorithm to adapt it to particular circumstances and recalled that the eBCD system already has a field, although it is not mandatory because of doubts about the accuracy of the length/weight conversions. It was proposed that the concept of "quantities" be clarified and that references to numbers of individuals and quantities in the text be revised. The need to consider a certification tool for measurement devices to ensure coherence across CPCs was also suggested, otherwise it is

difficult to calibrate the devices. The WG suggested that the issue of verification methods for analysis should be deferred to IMM for further discussion. As a result of this exchange, the WG recommended that Panel 2 request the SCRS to develop length-weight conversion formulae specific for seasons/areas. In addition, the WG highlighted the need to clarify the responsibilities of farm CPCs at caging, including requiring monitoring by SC cameras. Regarding the verification by a third party (such as the ROP) and the encouragement of trials for the AI system, the WG referred to the recommendations made on paragraph 85 above.

Paragraph 100 requires that intra-farm transfers must be authorised by the farm CPC, that this should be done with the presence of an enforcement authority, and that each intra-farm transfer must be recorded to monitor the number of specimens and recorded in the eBCD. Discussions here focused on “grouping” eBCDs and on the importance of ensuring traceability. It was recalled that Paragraph 6 of Rec. 18-13 does not allow grouping for intra-farm transfers. Some CPCs suggested that Rec. 18-12 and 18-13 should be amended to allow for such grouping and the eBCD system updated accordingly. It was noted that the work within the eBCD Technical Working Group to develop a functionality for recording intra-farm transfers was ongoing but did not include a grouping aspect at this time. The WG recommended that Panel 2 continue to discuss the issue of grouping and, as appropriate, refer the matter to the IMM Working Group meeting to consider possible amendments to Recs. 18-12 and/or 18-13, if appropriate.

Paragraph 101 requires that a difference of > 10% between the catch quantities reported by the vessel/trap and at caging constitute a Potential Non-Compliance (PNC) and must be investigated. One CPC informed the WG that the flag CPC needs to launch the investigation with the farm CPC and offered the possibility to submit to Panel 2 a proposal for the procedure to be followed for the investigations. CPC recommendations to Panel 2 on this particular item are included in paragraphs 98-99.

Paragraph 103, on intra-farm transfers and random controls, requires that a traceability system in farms must be implemented and include the video recording of intra-farm transfers. Based on a risk analysis, random controls must be conducted by the farm CPC between the time of completion of caging operations and the first caging of the following year. The farm CPC must fix a minimum percentage of fish to be controlled. This percentage shall be reflected in their inspection plan transmitted for review and possible endorsement by Panel 2 under paragraph 14 of Rec. 19-04. Results of those checks shall be communicated to ICCAT. The need for common rules to conduct random controls and for data on traceability to monitor intra-farm transfers was identified, and the WG recommended that Panel 2 develop an Annex for inclusion in Rec. 19-04 to outline procedures for random controls, including cooperation of operators, and for follow up in case of discrepancies. The WG also recommended that Panel 2 request the eBCD technical Working Group and/or IMM to look into eBCD data extraction possibilities that includes intra-farm transfer data.

Control measures (paragraph 105)

Paragraph 105 obliges CPCs to implement a vessel monitoring system (VMS) in line with the technical and operational standards set out in Rec. 18-10 for their fishing vessels with a length equal to or greater than 15m. The transmission of VMS data to ICCAT shall start at least 5 days before their period of authorisation and shall continue at least 5 days after their period of authorisation, unless the vessel is removed from the lists of authorized vessels by the flag CPC authorities. For control purposes, the transmission of VMS shall not be interrupted when vessels are in port, unless there is a system of hailing in and out of port. CPCs discussions and recommendations on this particular paragraph were covered in paragraph 88.

Enforcement (paragraphs 106 and 107)

Paragraph 106 on enforcement requires that the flag CPC must sanction its non-compliant vessels, commensurate with the gravity of the offense and ensure that they effectively deprive those responsible of the economic benefit derived from the infringement. Those sanctions shall also be capable of producing results proportionate to the seriousness of such infringement, thereby effectively discouraging further offences of the same kind. It was suggested to revise the list of serious violations (Annex 7) to include infringements related to farm and trap activities, as well as to extend the application of the current list to all the Convention area. Moreover, it was proposed to set an efficient, proportionate, and dissuasive level of financial sanctions. Some CPCs raised concerns on this point, indicating that harmonization of penalties among CPCs required careful consultations, including with legal experts. The Working Group did not reach agreement on amending this paragraph; however, it was recommended that Panel 2 defer for future consideration the definition/list of

serious violations, including those relating to trade, and the EU offered to prepare a working paper for further discussion. One CPC reserved its position on this matter.

Paragraph 107 obliges the farm CPC to sanction any offense linked to farm operations, commensurate with the gravity of the offense; this includes the suspension or withdrawal of the farm authorisation. It was suggested to impose accompanying sanctions on farms, including suspension of the farm activities for two years if illegal activities are uncovered and to calculate the overall level of accompanying sanctions in such a way that they effectively deprive those responsible of the economic benefits derived from the violation. On this proposal, it was underscored that harmonizing sanctions is a very delicate issue and closely related to the overall legal system of each CPC (also referring to the proposal on paragraph 106) and, thus, the topic would need further consideration, including consultation with legal experts. The WG did not reach an agreement on the need to amend this paragraph.

Other possible measures:

1. eBCD system

It was suggested that a possible weakness in the use of eBCD could occur during transport and market phases when *paper copies of the eBCD* are used by some CPCs, with the risk that the same eBCD (printed copy) is duplicated. To tackle this weakness, it was proposed to include extra information in the trade section of the eBCD (e.g. by adding compulsory information on the transport means such as flight number, license plate, or the date of departure and arrival). The possibility of broadening the access to the eBCD system such that CPC authorities could access not only eBCDs related to the operations of the CPC concerned but also to other eBCDs was also suggested as a way to help address this situation. Regarding the possibility of adding information on transport means, concerns were expressed because of last minute changes that can take place during the process of marketing fresh fish. Regarding the use of printed copies of eBCDs, it was recalled that Rec. 18-12 prescribes very limited situations when paper can be used. It was noted that the use of paper is often in addition to entering the required data in the eBCD system, such as to attach to a shipment upon export. Regarding the possibility of using a printed copy of the eBCD several times, it was mentioned that this situation was potentially a problem only for the EU due to the derogation to validation related to the domestic trade of certain product forms (after catch and first trade) and that further technical discussions are required among EU member States before introducing any changes at the ICCAT level. It was suggested that there could be technical solutions that could help address the potential need to attach a printed eBCD to a shipment, such as the creation of a barcode or other machine readable format that is produced from the eBCD system and would link back to the original eBCD record. The WG recommended that Panel 2 consider whether to require the completion of the section for transport means in the trade section of the eBCD (entering information on transport means in the eBCD is currently voluntary) as well as to consider adding the dates for departure and arrival into the eBCD system. If agreed, the matter could be referred to IMM and/or the eBCD TWG for appropriate action. One CPC reserved its position on this matter. It was also recommended that the possibility of increasing CPC access to the eBCD system beyond those records that a CPC has a direct connection to needed additional discussion on the basis of further explanations from the EU about the scope of the proposal.

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 and Annex 3 of Rec. 18-13, regarding clarification in section 6 “FARMING INFORMATION” in the eBCD system, it was recommended to modify Rec. 18-13 to mirror the two headings of section 6 of the eBCD system to ensure clarity and consistency.

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, which is linked to paragraph 13(b) of Rec. 18-13, it was recommended to add a footnote after the word “accurate” in paragraph 13 of Rec. 18-13 to reflect that insofar as the CPC applies Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, the number and weight would be considered accurate.

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point iii (Section 2), it was recommended to clarify paragraph iii regarding the determination of the percentage range.

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point v (Section 2), it was recommended to clarify that the phrase “in case of compensation” means to deal with difference between stereoscopic camera and catch and it is possible for JFOs/ traps to use iii or v.

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point i (Section 2), it was recommended to add clarity to point i to better explain the methodology to be followed.

On Rec. 18-12, paragraphs 5b (product forms) and 5d (tagging) regarding the derogations on validation applicable to the EU, which will expire on 31/12/2020 unless extended, the WG encouraged the EU to present in advance of the 2020 ICCAT annual meeting a more robust report on the implementation of these derogations (in particular, the elements agreed in 2017) to allow the PWG to effectively evaluate how they are functioning and, on that basis, decide whether one or both should be extended.

2. *BFT Processing vessels:*

Effective control and traceability of the bluefin tuna transported by processing vessels is not easy to achieve with the available means, and the need to explore control measures for this activity was acknowledged. The WG recommended that Panel 2 decide on the possibility of opening discussions on this particular issue and, if agreed, refer the discussion to the Panel 2 session at the annual meeting on the basis of a working paper to be prepared by the EU.

10. Conclusions and next steps to be reported to Panel 2 – Intersessional Meeting 5-6 March 2020

The WG developed a list of recommendations, which is presented in the document *Conclusions of the Working Group on bluefin tuna control and traceability measures* [WG_BFT_CT_05A] (**Appendix 4**). The WG agreed this list and submitted it to the Intersessional meeting of Panel 2 (5-6 March 2020) for consideration and possible endorsement.

11. Adoption of report and adjournment

It was agreed that a report of the meeting would be adopted by correspondence and would focus on summarizing the principal discussions and work of the Working Group on bluefin tuna control and traceability measures but would not elaborate on all technical issues discussed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Agenda

Day 1

9h-13h

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda and meeting arrangements
4. Presentations by CPCs with active BFT farm on the procedures to carry out the random controls and follow-up actions foreseen.
5. Presentation by the ROP Consortium on presentation to highlight weakness/loopholes identified based on several years of experience of implementation of the BFT recovery/management plan
6. Presentation by Japanese Delegation regarding the observed growth rates and utility of growth rates for control purposes, which is related to paragraph 28 of Rec. 19-04

(Lunch break 13h-14h)

14h-18h

7. Start the review of the comments sent by the different Contracting Parties on the inventory table prepared by the Chair of the Working Group

Day 2

9h-18h (lunch break 13h-14h)

8. Continue with the review of the comments sent by the different Contracting Parties on the inventory table prepared by the Chair of the Working Group

Day 3

9h-18h (lunch break 13h-14h)

9. Finalise the review of the comments sent by the different Contracting Parties on the inventory table prepared by the Chair of the Working Group
10. Conclusions and next steps to be reported to Panel 2 – Intersessional Meeting 5-6 March 2020
11. Adoption of Report and adjournment

List of Participants²¹**CONTRACTING PARTIES****ALBANIA****Palluqi, Arian^{3*}**

Responsible in charge of sector, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Fisheries Directorate, Fisheries and Aquaculture Unit, Blv. "Dëshmoret e Kombit", Nr.2, kp.1001, 1010 Tiranë, Shqipëri
Tel: + 355 695 487 657; +355 4223 2796, Fax: +355 4223 2796, E-Mail: Arian.Palluqi@bujqesia.gov.al

ALGERIA**Kaddour, Omar ***

Directeur du Développement de la Pêche, Ministère de la Pêche et des Productions Halieutiques, Route des Quatre Canons, 16001
Tel: +213 21 43 31 97; +213 696 18 16 10, Fax: +213 21 43 39 38, E-Mail: kadomar13@gmail.com

Cheniti, Sarah

Sous Directrice des Pêcheries Hauturières et spécialisées, Ministère de la pêche et des Productions Halieutiques, Route des Quatre Canons, 1600
Tel: +213 21 43 32 56, Fax: +213 21 43 32 56, E-Mail: chenitisarah@yahoo.fr

EGYPT**Shalaby, Ghada ***

Director General of Agreement Department, General Authority for Fish Resources Development (GAFRD), 210, Area B-city, 5th district Road 90, 11865 New Cairo
Tel: +202 22620118; +201 000653247, Fax: +202 281 17007, E-Mail: gafrd_eg@hotmail.com; zaki_raafat2000@yahoo.com

EUROPEAN UNION**Miranda, Fernando ***

DG MARE, Joseph II St, 99, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +322 299 3922, E-Mail: fernando.miranda@ec.europa.eu

Aláez Pons, Ester

International Relations Officer, European Commission - DG MARE - Unit B2 - RFMOs, Rue Joseph II - 99 03/057, 1049 Bruxelles, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 296 48 14, E-Mail: ester.alaez-pons@ec.europa.eu

Harford, Fiona

European Commission, DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE), Unit B2: Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Belgium
Tel: +32 2 299 31 30, E-Mail: Fiona.harford@ec.europa.eu

Moya Díaz, Marta

European Commission DG MARE, Rue Joseph II 99, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 460 794 574, E-Mail: marta.moya-diaz@ec.europa.eu

Spezzani, Aronne

Head of Sector, Fisheries control in International Waters - DG MARE-B3 J79-2/214, European Commission, Rue Joseph II, 99, 1049 Bruxelles, Belgium
Tel: +322 295 9629, Fax: +322 296 3985, E-Mail: aronne.spezzani@ec.europa.eu

Vázquez Álvarez, Francisco Javier

European Commission DG Maritime B2 Affairs and Fisheries, Rue Joseph II - 99 Room 3/77, 1049 Bruxelles, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 295 83 64; +32 485 152 844, E-Mail: francisco-javier.vazquez-alvarez@ec.europa.eu

Ansell, Neil

European Fisheries Control Agency, Avenida García Barbón 4, 36201 Vigo, España
Tel: +34 986 120 658; +34 698 122 046, E-Mail: neil.ansell@efca.europa.eu

²¹ Some delegate contact details have not been included following their request for data protection.

* Head Delegate.

Boulay, Justine

Bureau du contrôle des pêches, Fisheries Control Unit, Direction des Pêches Maritimes et de l'Aquaculture, Directorate for Sea Fisheries and Aquaculture, Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Energie et de la Mer, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation, Tour Séquoia, 1 place Carpeaux, 92055 La Défense, Cedex, France
Tel: +33 140 819 555, E-Mail: justine.boulay@agriculture.gouv.fr

Callus, Bjorn

Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights Government Farm, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, MRS 3303 Marsa, Malta

García García, Beatriz

Inspectora de Pesca, Ministerio de Agricultura y Pesca, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente. Secretaría General de Pesca, S.G. CONTROL E INSPECCIÓN, C/ Velázquez, 147 - 3ª planta, 28002 Madrid, España
Tel: +34 680 574 382, E-Mail: bggarcia@mapa.es

Jugović, Iva

Ministry of agriculture, Directorate of fisheries, Sector for Surveillance and Fisheries Control, Unit for Fisheries Control, Ivana Mažuranića 30, 23000 Zadar, Croatia
Tel: +385 994 865 841, E-Mail: iva.jugovic@mps.hr

Lombardo, Francesco

Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights Fort San Lucjan, Triq il-Qajjenza, Marsaxlokk, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, ZTN09 Marsa, Malta

Mihanovic, Marin

Ministry of Agriculture - Directorate of Fisheries, Ulica Grada Vukovara 78, 21000 Split, Croatia
Tel: +385 981 858 182; +385 214 44053, Fax: +385 16 44 3200, E-Mail: marin.mihanovic@mps.hr

Molina Schmid, Teresa

Subdirectora General Adjunta, Subdirección General de Acuerdos y Organizaciones Regionales de Pesca, Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, Secretaría General de Pesca, C/ Velázquez, 144 2ª Planta, 28071 Madrid, España
Tel: +34 91 347 60 47; +34 656 333 130, Fax: +34 91 347 60 42, E-Mail: tmolina@mapa.es

Seguna, Marvin

Chief Fisheries Protection Officer, Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights Government Farm, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, MRS 3303 Marsa, Malta

JAPAN

Ota, Shingo *

Councillor, Resources Management Department, Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: shingo_ota810@maff.go.jp

Aoki, Masahiro

Japanese Embassy in Spain, C/ Serrano 109, 28006 Madrid, España
Tel: +34 91 590 7621, Fax: +34 91 590 1329, E-Mail: masahiro.aoki@mofa.go.jp

Hiruma, Shinji

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Resources Management Department, Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Tokyo Chidoya-ku 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: shinji_hiruma150@maff.go.jp

Miwa, Takeshi

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Resources Management Department, Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: takeshi_miwa090@maff.go.jp

MOROCCO

Ben Bari, Mohamed *

Directeur du Contrôle des Activités de la Pêche Maritime (DCAPM), Nouveau Quartier Administratif, BP 476, Haut Agdal Rabat
Tel: +212 537 688 196, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: benbari@mpm.gov.ma

Fakri, Mohamed

Cadre à la Direction de Contrôle des Activités de la Pêche Maritime, Ministère de l'Agriculture, de la Pêche Maritime, du développement rural et des eaux et Forêts, Département de la Pêche Maritime, Quartier Administratif, BP 476 Agdal, Rabat
E-Mail: mohamed.fakri@mpm.gov.ma

Haoujar, Bouchra

Cadre à la Division de Durabilité et d'Aménagement des Ressources Halieutiques, Département de la Pêche Maritime, Administrative, Nouveau Quartier Administratif, BP 476, Haut Agdal, Rabat
Tel: +212 666 140 318, Fax: +212 537 688 089, E-Mail: haoujar@mpm.gov.ma

Hassouni, Fatima Zohra

Cadre à la Division de Durabilité et d'Aménagement des Ressources Halieutiques, Département de la Pêche maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif, Haut Agdal, Rabat
Tel: +212 537 688 122/21, Fax: +212 537 688 089, E-Mail: hassouni@mpm.gov.ma

Sabbane, Kamal

Cadre à la Direction de Contrôle des Activités de la Pêche Maritime, Ministère de l'Agriculture de la Pêche Maritime, du Développement Rural et des Eaux et Forêts
Tel: +212 537 688 196, E-Mail: sabbane@mpm.gov.ma

NORWAY

Mjorlund, Rune *

Directorate of Fisheries, Strandgaten 229, 5804 Bergen
Tel: +47 952 59 448, E-Mail: rune.mjorlund@fiskeridir.no

TUNISIA

M'Rabet, Ridha *

Directeur Général de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture - DGPA, Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche, 30 Rue Alain Savary, 1002 Tunis
Tel: +216 71 892 253, Fax: +216 71 799 401, E-Mail: bft@iresa.agrinet.tn; ridha.mrabet@iresa.agrinet.tn

Mejri, Hamadi

Directeur adjoint, Conservation des ressources halieutiques, Ministère de l'agriculture et des ressources hydrauliques et de la pêche, Direction Générale de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, 32, Rue Alain Savary - Le Belvédère, 1002 Tunis
Tel: +216 240 12780, Fax: +216 71 799 401, E-Mail: hamadi.mejri1@gmail.com

Sohlobji, Donia

Direction Générale de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, Ministère de l'Agriculture des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche, 32 Rue Alain Savary, 2036 Le Belvédère
Tel: +216 534 31307; +216 71 890 784, Fax: +216 71 799 401, E-Mail: doniasohlobji@gmail.com; bft@iresa.agrinet.tn

Toumi, Néji

Directeur de la Ste TUNA FARMS of Tunisia, Port de pêche Hergla, 4012 Tunes Sousser
Tel: + 216 22 25 32 83, Fax: + 216 71 799 401, E-Mail: neji.tft@planet.tn

TURKEY

Türkyilmaz, Turgay *

Deputy Director-General, Head of Fisheries and Control Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (Balıkçılık ve Su Ürünleri Genel Müdürlüğü), T.C. Tarım ve Orman Bakanlığı, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-0, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara
Tel: +90 312 258 30 17, Fax: +90 312 258 30 39, E-Mail: turgay.turkyilmaz@tarim.gov.tr; turgay.turkyilmaz@tarimorman.gov.tr

Elekon, Hasan Alper

Senior Fisheries Officer, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (Balıkçılık ve Su Ürünleri Genel Müdürlüğü), Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MoFAL), T.C. Tarım ve Orman Bakanlığı, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-0, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara
Tel: +90 312 258 30 76, Fax: +90 312 258 30 39, E-Mail: hasanalper.elekon@tarimorman.gov.tr; hasanalper@gmail.com

Topçu, Burcu Bilgin

EU Expert, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Balıkçılık ve Su Ürünleri Genel Müdürlüğü Adres: T.C. Tarım ve Orman Bakanlığı, Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-0, 06800 Lodumlu/Ankara
Tel: +90 532 207 0632; +90 312 258 3094, Fax: +90 312 258 30 39, E-Mail: burcu.bilgin@tarim.gov.tr; bilginburcu@gmail.com; burcu.bilgin@tarimorman.gov.tr

Yelegen, Yener

Engineer, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (Balıkçılık ve Su Ürünleri Genel Müdürlüğü), Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, T.C. Tarım ve Orman Bakanlığı, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-0, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara

Tel: +90 312 258 3079; +90 505 530 2628, Fax: +90 312 258 3039, E-Mail: yener.yelegen@tarimorman.gov.tr; yener.yelegen@tarim.gov.tr; yeneryelegen@gmail.com

UNITED STATES

Blankenbeker, Kimberly *

Foreign Affairs Specialist, NOAA Fisheries, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection (F/IS), National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East West Highway, Silver Spring Maryland 20910

Tel: +1 301 427 8357, Fax: +1 301 713 1081, E-Mail: kimberly.blankenbeker@noaa.gov

McLaughlin, Sarah

Fishery Management Specialist, NOAA - National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, Massachusetts 01930

Tel: +978 281 9260, Fax: +978 281 9340, E-Mail: sarah.mclaughlin@noaa.gov

Miller, Alexander

NOAA Fisheries, National Seafood Inspection Lab, 3209 Frederic Street Pascagoula, MS, 39567

Tel: +1 228 369 1699; +1 228 217 4188, Fax: +1 228 762 7144, E-Mail: alexander.miller@noaa.gov

Walline, Megan J.

Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1315 East-West Highway SSMC-III, Silver Spring Maryland 20910

Tel: +301 628 1619, Fax: +1 301 713 0658, E-Mail: megan.walline@noaa.gov

OBSERVERS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ANATUN

Martínez Cañabate, David Ángel

Anatun, C/ Uruguay, parcela 8-27 Polígono Industrial Oeste Alcantarilla, 30820 Alcantarilla, Cartagena, Murcia, España

Tel: +34 696 440 361; +34 968 845 265, Fax: +34 968 165 324, E-Mail: es.anatun@gmail.com

ASOCIACIÓN DE PESCA, COMERCIO Y CONSUMO RESPONSABLE DEL ATÚN ROJO – APCCR

Navarro Cid, Juan José

Grupo Balfegó, 43860 L'Ametlla de Mar Tarragona, España

FEDERATION OF MALTESE AQUACULTURE PRODUCERS – FMAP

Caruana, Saviour

Federation of Maltese Aquaculture Producers, Tarxien Road, GXQ2901 Ghaxaq, Malta

Tel: +356 2180 9460, Fax: +356 2180 9462, E-Mail: saviour@fishandfish.com.mt

Gouder, Charlon

Head Executive, Federation of Maltese Aquaculture Producers (FMAP), 89, Level 4, St. John Street, VLT 1165 Valletta, Malta

Tel: +356 794 48106, E-Mail: goudercharlon@gmail.com; cg@aquacultureresources.com

PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS - PEW

Fresco Vanzini, Ignacio

Pew Charitable Trusts, 28045 Madrid, España

Tel: +34 669 437 267, E-Mail: i.frescovanzini@gmail.com

Samari, Mona

Pew Charitable Trusts, 248A Marylebone Rd, Marylebone, London NW1 6JZ, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7535 4000, E-Mail: monasamari@outlook.com

TUNA PRODUCER ASSOCIATION -TPA

Caruana, Joseph

Tuna Producer Association - TPA, 66 St Paul's Street, VLT 1212 Valletta, Malta

Tel: +356 994 94581, E-Mail: josephcaruana@fishandfish.com.mt

WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE – WWF

Buzzi, Alessandro

WWF Mediterranean, Via Po, 25/c, 00198 Roma, Italy

2020 BFTCT WG

Tel: +39 346 235 7481, Fax: +39 068 413 866, E-Mail: abuzzi@wwfmedpo.org

ICCAT Secretariat

C/ Corazón de María 8 – 6th floor, 28002 Madrid – Spain

Tel: +34 91 416 56 00; Fax: +34 91 415 26 12; E-mail: info@iccat.int

Manel, Camille Jean Pierre

Neves dos Santos, Miguel

Cheatle, Jenny

Idrissi, M'Hamed

Parrilla Moruno, Alberto Thais

Aleman, Francisco

Donovan, Karen

García-Orad, María José

Pinet, Dorothée

Fiz, Jesús

García Piña, Cristóbal

Pagá, Alfonso

Peña, Esther

Samedy, Valérie

Vieito, Aldana

Tensek, Stasa

ICCAT INTERPRETERS

Hof, Michelle Renée

Leboulleux del Castillo, Beatriz

Liberas, Christine

Linaae, Cristina

Meunier, Isabelle

Sánchez del Villar, Lucía

ICCAT GUEST

Franklin, Thomas

Silva, Jean Pierre

Draft ICCAT Transfer Declaration

Submitted by Turkey

Annex 1

Document No.		ICCAT Transfer Declaration			
1 - TRANSFER OF LIVE BFT DESTINATED FOR FARMING					
Fishing vessel name: Call sign: Flag: Flag State transfer authorisation no. ICCAT Register no. External identification: Fishing logbook no. JFO no. eBCD nbr.	Trap name: ICCAT Register no.	1 st Tug Vessel name: Call sign: Flag: ICCAT Register No: External identification:		1 st Name of destination farm: ICCAT Register No:	
		2 nd Tug Vessel name: Call sign: Flag: ICCAT Register No: External identification:		2 nd Name of destination farm: ICCAT Register No:	
				First cage number:	
				Second cage number:	
2 - TRANSFER INFORMATION					
Date: __/__/____		Place or position: Port:		Lat: Long:	
Number of Individuals in the First Cage:		Number of Individuals in the Second Cage:		Species:	
Type of product: Live <input type="checkbox"/> Whole <input type="checkbox"/> Guttred <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify):					
Master of fishing vessel / operator / farm operator name and signature		1 st. Master of receiver vessel (tug, processing, carrier) name and signature		2 nd. Master of receiver vessel (tug, processing, carrier) name and signature	
				Observer Names, ICCAT No. and signature:	
3 - FURTHER TRANSFERS					
Date: __/__/____		Place or position: Port: Lat: Long:			
Tug vessel name:		Call sign:		Flag: ICCAT Register no.	
Farm State transfer authorisation no:		External identification:		Cage no. Master of receiver vessel name and signature:	
Date: __/__/____		Place or position: Port: Lat: Long:			
Tug vessel name:		Call sign:		Flag: ICCAT Register no.	
Farm State transfer authorisation no:		External identification:		Cage no. Master of receiver vessel name and signature:	
Date: __/__/____		Place or position: Port: Lat: Long:			
Tug vessel name:		Call sign:		ICCAT Register no.	
Farm State transfer authorisation no:		External identification:		Cage no. Master of receiver vessel name and signature:	

**Conclusions of the Working Group on bluefin tuna
control and traceability measures**

The Working Group on Bluefin Tuna Control and Traceability Measures met on 2-4 March 2020 to discuss possible improvements to ICCAT Recommendation 19-04 and other related provisions on control and traceability of BFT. This Working Group submitted following recommendations to be considered by the Intersessional Meeting of Panel 2 and other relevant subsidiary bodies:

Recommendation 19-04		
General recommendation		To review throughout the whole Rec. 19-04 references to numbers/quantities/and control transfer/voluntary transfer/control caging.
Carryover		
<i>Para</i>	<i>Core Provisions in Rec. 19-04</i>	<i>Possible improvements</i>
8	<p>The carry-over of non-harvested live BFT is not authorized unless a reinforced system of control is implemented. Such reinforced system shall include at least the provisions defined in paragraphs 103 and 107.</p> <p>Further control measures will be examined in Panel 2.</p>	<p>To redraft paragraph 8 to cover all activities and to ensure that carry over should not be allowed unless a reinforced control system is ensured.</p> <p>To establish template language for use in farming plans for coordinated actions among farm CPCs regarding carry-over.</p>
9	<p>Prior to the start of the fishing season, the farm CPC must assess the live BFT carried over after "bulk-harvests", by ordering the farm to transfer to other cages and record by stereo camera (or an alternative method):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all the remaining live BFT of the catching year, for cages subject to a bulk-harvest. - based on a risk assessment, samples of live BFT, for cages not subject to bulk-harvest. <p>Full traceability of the carried-over must be ensured at all times. The measures to ensure such traceability shall be fully documented.</p>	<p>To develop a better definition for "alternative method".</p> <p>To put all carry-over provisions relating to farms from all Recommendations (19-04 and 18-13) together in one single section.</p> <p>To set definition of "bulk harvest".</p> <p>To clarify the meaning of "full traceability".</p> <p>To clarify that in case of carry-over discrepancy, it should be treated on a cage-by-cage basis without applying any compensation.</p> <p>To decide about the possibility of grouping in carry-over operations fish from different cages and if agreed to refer this issue to IMM/PWG to discuss amendments needed to Rec. 18-12 and 18-13 and functionality to be developed in the eBCD system.</p>
Farming capacity		
24	Each farming CPC shall establish an annual farming management plan. The plan shall demonstrate that the total input capacity and the total farming capacity is commensurate with the estimated amount of bluefin tuna available.	To discuss whether to set definitions of farming & input capacity.

Growth rates		
28	Farm CPCs shall endeavour to ensure that the growth rates derived from the eBCDs are coherent with the growth rates published by the SCRS. If significant discrepancies are found between the SCRS tables and growth rates observed, that information should be sent to the SCRS for analysis.	To refer the discussion to PA2 and to decide if a technical meeting between relevant CPCs' experts is needed under the supervision of PA2.
Observers		
83	CPC Observer Programme A national observer must be present on all towing vessels and harvesting operations from traps.	To ensure that national observers on towing vessels conduct the analysis of the videos corresponding to further transfers after the first transfer and report to the flag CPC of the towing vessels. To defer the discussion on training of national observers to the IMM.
84	ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (ROP) ROP observer must be present: - on all purse seine vessels, - at all transfers from purse seiners, - at all transfers from traps to transport cages, - at all transfers from one farm to another, - at all cagings, - at all harvests from farms, - at all release from farms. The ICCAT Regional Observer tasks shall: - monitor farming operations, including access to stereoscopic camera footages; - sign the ITD, caging declaration and eBCD, and, if it disagrees, explain why.	To request the IMM and/or next technical meeting with ROP Consortium to ensure further training on interpretation/implementation of ICCAT recommendations by ROP observers. To discuss whether control transfers conducted near to the farm following the catch and before caging should be monitored by ROP observers.
85	ICCAT Regional Observer tasks are listed. They include "access to stereoscopic camera footage at the time of caging that enables the measuring of length and estimating the corresponding weight".	To agree on the necessity for the review by the ROP observers of SC footages at caging. [This recommendation should take into consideration the second item under para 98 and para 99.] To encourage CPCs with active BFT farms to participate in trials using AI analysis on SC camera footages in order to eliminate human bias. Depending on the outcomes, PA2 may decide whether to revise Rec. 19-04. To ask the ROP Consortium for further training for ROP observers to improve their capacity on SC camera footage at the IMM/Consortium meeting.

Transfers		
86	<p>Transfer authorisation All transfers must be pre-notified.</p> <p>Each transport cage is assigned a unique ID number, permanent and not transferable.</p> <p>A single transfer may use different transport cages.</p>	<p>To clarify the obligation for all farm cages used for farming or associated activities to be assigned a unique number while considering existing language in Rec. 06-07 to ensure the consistency.</p> <p>To ensure the unique number for cages is not changed or tampered with and must be visible and legible at any time for purposes of surveillance.</p> <p>To create a space or section in the ITD to record the number of multiple transport cages. [Turkey has submitted a draft for consideration – Annex 1 to WG_CT_02_2.]</p>
87	<p>Within 48 hours, the flag CPC must deliver an authorisation number to each transfer from a catching vessel, a trap or a farm.</p> <p>The BFT died during the transfer from a purse seiner shall be recorded in the LB and counted against the CPC quota.</p>	<p>To edit Annex 11 to include, clarification of CPC responsibilities, procedures and timetable for reporting of dead fish at all steps of the BFT transfers to farms, including importing relevant provisions from Rec. 06-07.</p>
88	<p>Refusal of transfer authorisation and release The flag, farm or trap CPC must refuse the transfer if the catch is > quota, the catching vessel is not authorised to fish BFT, the towing vessel is not registered, or the towing vessel is not equipped with VMS (or equivalent).</p> <p>In case of refusal, a release order must be issued.</p> <p>If the VMS system fails, it must be repaired within 72 hours, or the towing vessel can be replaced.</p>	<p>To establish the obligation for all tug vessels to be equipped with VMS system regardless of their length.</p> <p>To regroup all provisions related to VMS in same paragraph/section (88, 94, 105).</p> <p>To defer the following issues for discussion to the next IMM meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing frequency of transmission of VMS positions from 2hrs to 1hr regarding towing vessels. - Increasing the frequency of reporting in case of technical failure of VMS from every 4 hours to 2 hours, while considering general VMS provisions of Rec. 18-10. - Installing tracking of cages/locating system to transport cages. <p>To develop a reporting template for releases.</p> <p>To strengthen the provisions of paragraph 88 by deleting the phrase “or legitimate operational constraints”.</p>
89	<p>Transfer declaration An ITD must be completed at the end of the transfer operation. The original accompanies the transfer and a copy is kept by the catching vessel or trap and towing vessel.</p> <p>The transfer must appear in the LB of the towing vessel; the farm of destination must be specified.</p>	<p>To explore how to reflect in this paragraph cases of transfers destined to more than one farm based on the template of ITD proposed by Turkey (Annex 1 to WG_CT_02_2).</p>

91	<p>Monitoring by video camera of a transfer</p> <p>The first transfer must be recorded by a conventional camera to determine the number of BFT transferred. The original video remains with the donor vessel or trap.</p> <p>If the video quality is insufficient to count the number of BFT, a control transfer must be ordered by "the control authorities".</p>	<p>To confirm that the transfer operation is concluded when the video complies with the requirements of Annex 8 concerning the quality of the footage.</p> <p>To redraft paragraphs 91 and 92 to clarify the roles of ROP and the CPC authorities, taking the following issues into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ROP should stay until video is clear or until some benchmark on the number of control transfers which may be requested by ROP is reached (requires determination by PA2). - If an investigation is launched (discrepancy is more than 10%), the video must be reviewed by the flag State as part of the investigation. - Check consistency with provisions related to validations of Recs. 18-12 and 18-13. <p>When redrafting 91 and 92 link also with 93 and annex 8, and the draft ITD template provided by Turkey (Annex 1 to WG_CT_02_2) extend the concept in paragraph 91 and 92 to all transfers.</p> <p>To delete from the last sentence of paragraph 92 "control caging" and replace "quantities" by "number".</p>
92	<p>Verification by ROP and launching and conduct of investigation.</p> <p>An investigation must be launched by the flag CPC if the number of BFT at first transfer diverges by > 10% between estimations.</p> <p>The investigation must be concluded prior to the time of caging and 96h after initiation.</p> <p>Caging and eBCD validation shall not occur before the investigation is closed.</p> <p>A voluntary transfer may be requested by the operator in cases when the video record is of insufficient quality or clarity to make such estimations; if its result is not satisfactory, the flag CPC shall initiate an investigation.</p>	
93	The ROP signs the ITD, or explains in case of disagreement.	See para 91.
Caging operations		
Section E Farming Activities		To transfer relevant provisions on farms of Rec. 06-07 to Rec. 19-04. Some provisions of Rec. 06-07 might be also transferred to the Rec. 18-13.

94	<p>Caging authorisations and possible refusal Transport cages cannot be anchored < 0.5 miles from the farm.</p>	
95	<p>Before caging, the farm CPC informs the flag or trap CPC about the quantities to be caged.</p> <p>In case of refusal, the flag or trap CPC issues a release order. The release must be recorded by conventional video and occur within 3 weeks after the caging is completed.</p> <p>Caging cannot begin without prior authorisation by the flag or trap CPC, or the farm CPC if no answer < 24 hours.</p> <p>All caging must be completed by 22 August, except force majeure, and anyway before 7 September.</p>	<p>To ensure same actions (e.g. seizure of the catch or the release of the fish) to be taken by farm CPC in case that flag CPC does not respond within 24 hours.</p> <p>To add reference to the text regarding sharing of information with other CPCs through ICCAT Secretariat in cases where a farm CPC refuses a caging operation. In case of refusal, after one month in the transport cage, fish should be released.</p>
96	<p>BFT catch documentation BFT cannot be caged in the absence of relevant documents and eBCD validated by the flag or trap CPC.</p>	
97	<p>Monitoring by video camera Transfer activities "from cages to the farm" must be monitored by enforcement authorities by video camera. Annex 8 for details.</p>	<p>To insert the word "transport" before cages to add clarity.</p> <p>To refine the text to request farm CPCs to collect all the relevant information brought by the towing vessel before the conclusion of the caging operation.</p> <p>To request farm CPCs to keep such information for at least five years to keep evidence of caging operation.</p>
98	<p>Launching and conduct investigations An investigation must be launched by the farm CPC, in cooperation with the flag or trap CPC, if the number of BFT at caging diverges by > 10% between estimations of the regional observer, relevant control authorities and/or farm operator.</p>	<p>To redraft paragraphs 98, 99 and 101 to bring consistency and clarity in the flow of investigation and information sharing, including the term 10% difference, and to review and make clear the roles of each party, including text from Rec. 06-07.</p> <p>To clarify the role of the ROP related to SC camera footages (see also paragraph 85).</p> <p>To review the protocol/methodology for release.</p>
99	<p>Measures and programmes to estimate the number and weight of BFT Each caging operation must be recorded by stereoscopic camera (or alternative method), to verify the number and weight of the fish.</p> <p>The farm CPC communicates the results to the flag or trap CPC.</p>	<p>To request the SCRS to consider length-weight conversion formula specific for seasons/areas.</p> <p>To clarify responsibilities of farm CPC at caging including monitoring by SC cameras.</p> <p>Regarding verification by a third party (such as ROP) and the encouragement of trials for the AI system, see conclusion on paragraph 85.</p>

	<p>An investigation must be launched if the quantities of BFT differ from quantities caught and transferred at a single caging operation, or all cagings related to a JFO.</p> <p>In case of tuna in excess of that declared caught and transferred, the flag or trap CPC must issue a release order. The figures in the caging declaration and the eBCD must be corrected accordingly.</p> <p>The release operation must be done in the presence of an enforcement authority and ICCAT observer.</p>	
100	<p>Intra-farm transfers must be authorised by the farm CPC, and done with the presence of an enforcement authority</p> <p>Each intra-farm transfer must be recorded to monitor the number of specimens and recorded in the eBCD.</p>	To continue discussion on grouping and refer to IMM meeting to amend provision of Rec. 18-12/18-13 if appropriate.
101	<p>A difference of > 10% between the quantities reported caught by the vessel/trap and at caging constitute a PNC and must be investigated.</p>	Please see conclusions for paragraphs 98-99.
102	<p>Caging report</p> <p>After completion of caging, the farm CPC must submit a caging report.</p>	
103	<p>Intra-farms transfers and random controls</p> <p>A traceability system in farms must be implemented, and include the video-recording of intra-farm transfers.</p> <p>Based on a risk analysis, random controls must be conducted by the farm CPC between the time of completion of caging operations and the first caging of the following year.</p> <p>The farm CPC must fix a minimum % of fish to be controlled. This percentage shall be reflected in their inspection plan transmitted under paragraph 14.</p> <p>Results of those checks shall be communicated to ICCAT.</p>	<p>To develop an Annex to outline procedures for random controls, including cooperation of operators, and to follow up in case of discrepancies.</p> <p>To request the eBCD TWG/IMM to look into data extraction including intra-farm data.</p>
104	<p>Access to and requirements for video records</p> <p>Video records of caging (para 97 and 99) must be made available to national and ICCAT inspectors and ICCAT and national observers on request.</p>	
Control measures		
105	<p>VMS CPCs shall implement a vessel monitoring system for their fishing vessels with a length equal to or greater than 15m, following Rec. 18-10.</p> <p>The transmission of VMS data to ICCAT shall start at least 5 days before their</p>	See paragraph 88.

	<p>period of authorisation and shall continue at least 5 days after their period of authorisation, unless the vessel is removed from the lists of authorized vessels by the flag CPC authorities.</p> <p>For control purposes, the transmission of VMS shall not be interrupted when vessels are in port, unless there is a system of hailing in and out of port.</p>	
106	<p>Enforcement The flag CPC must sanction its non-compliant vessels, commensurate with the gravity of the offense and ensure that they effectively deprive those responsible of the economic benefit derived from the infringement. Those sanctions shall also be capable of producing results proportionate to the seriousness of such infringement, thereby effectively discouraging further offences of the same kind.</p>	No agreement to amend the paragraph. Refer for future discussion the definition/list of serious violations, including those relating to trade. [Turkey reserves position.]
107	The farm CPC must sanction any offense linked to farm operations, commensurate with the gravity of the offense; this includes the suspension or withdrawal of the farm authorisation.	No agreement to amend the paragraph.

Other possible measures		
eBCD	Proposal of the EU	
	Paper copies of the eBCD are used during transportation and in marketing places with the risk that same eBCD is duplicated.	<p>To consider whether to use, on a mandatory basis, the section for transport means in the trade section of the eBCD to add information on transport mean used as well as to consider adding the dates for departure and arrival. [Turkey reserves position.]</p> <p>To discuss the possibility to access the eBCD system on the basis of further explanations from the EU about the scope of the enlarged access proposed.</p>
	Proposals of Morocco	
	On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 and Annex 3 of Rec. 18-13 regarding clarification in section 6 "FARMING INFORMATION" in the EBCD system.	To modify Rec. 18-13 to mirror the two headings of section 6 of the eBCD system to ensure clarity and consistency.
	On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 link to paragraph 13 b) of Rec. 18-13.	To add a footnote after the word "accurate" in paragraph 13 of Rec. 18-13 to reflect that insofar as the CPC applies Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, the number and weight would be considered accurate.
On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point iii. (Section 2)	Clarify section 2 of Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 para iii regarding the determination of the percentage range.	

	On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point v (Section 2)	Clarify that, for section 2 of Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 'in case of compensation' means to deal with the difference between stereoscopic camera and catch. It is possible for JFOs/ traps to use iii or v.
	On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04, point i (Section 2)	To add clarity to point i to better explain the methodology to be followed.
	US proposal	
	On Rec. 18-12 regarding the derogation of the EU to expire by 31/12/2020.	To encourage the EU to present a robust report on this derogation in the PWG meeting in 2020.

BFT Processing vessels	EU proposal	
	Effective control and traceability of the BFT transported by processing vessels is not easy to achieve with the available means, therefore explore control measures for this activity.	To decide on the possibility of opening discussions on this particular issue and if agreed, to refer the discussion to Panel 2 at the annual meeting on the basis of a working paper to be prepared by the EU.