

**Report of the Meeting of the eBCD Technical Working Group (eBCD TWG)**  
*(Online, 23-24 January 2023)*

**1. Opening of the meeting**

The Executive Secretary, Camille Jean Pierre Manel, welcomed all the attendees and the Meeting of the eBCD Technical Working Group (eBCD TWG) was opened by the Chair, Mr. Neil Ansell.

**2. Nomination of Rapporteur**

The Chair of the TWG requested a volunteer to act as rapporteur and as result a member of the ICCAT Secretariat agreed to take on this responsibility.

**3. Adoption of the Agenda**

The Chair briefly outlined the agenda and asked CPCs to present any matters to be included: all CPCs agreed with the order and content of this document.

The Agenda was adopted and is contained in **Appendix 1**.

The List of participants is contained in **Appendix 2**.

**4. System overall state of play**

**4.1 Annual Report of User Support Service**

Tragsa presented their report, noting the statistics on the processing of requests and incidents from eBCD users throughout 2022. They informed that further information was available in the graphs and tables in points 1.1 and 1.2 of the report from Tragsa, which is contained in **Appendix 3**.

In this regard, the EU asked whether there had been an evolution in the submission and resolution of issues over the years in terms of eBCD profiles. Tragsa confirmed that such an evolution has indeed taken place, as in the early years almost all the queries/issues were directly addressed to the eBCD support team, and in recent years it is the administrators themselves who resolve a significant part of these queries/issues. Nevertheless, in new developments released to production, it is the support team that's in charge of resolving questions until the administrators are familiar with the new functionality.

Tragsa briefly described the new developments uploaded to production, as well as the outstanding time/cost estimates pending agreement by the TWG.

**5. Review/progress of system developments and received cost/time estimates**

**5.1 Issues developed and updated in Production Environment**

*5.1.1 Asynchronous Reports*

The proposal to facilitate the extraction of the Flag's Raw Data/BCDs Data report is to carry out this procedure in an asynchronous manner. Therefore, the user will make the request and once it is generated, the report will be displayed on another page in the eBCD system, created for this purpose.

This functionality was uploaded to the eBCD System in March 2022.

### *5.1.2 eBCDs search*

Through the option 'BCD and BFTRC Registry/Search BCD', the search for a single eBCD by its code is performed relatively quickly. However, if you do not know the eBCD code and you try to find one or more eBCDs through the other filters, the search becomes impossible in most cases (probably due to the high volume of data already in the database).

This functionality has been reworked to improve the performance of this type of search.

This functionality was uploaded to the eBCD System in March 2022.

### *5.1.3 Campaign setup using a form*

The proposal is to create a form in the system in order to be able to setup each fishing campaign for users with ICCAT Secretariat profile. This functionality was uploaded to the eBCD System in December 2022.

### *5.1.4 Modification of a term in the JFO form of the eBCD*

The United States indicated that it is currently not clear from the printed eBCD corresponding to a JFO catch which vessel physically makes the catch. It is related to the term used: 'Representative'. It was noted that in the Spanish and French version the term used is 'Responsible', while in the English version the term used was 'Representative'. Tragsa confirmed that the English version had been changed to harmonize with the language with French and Spanish which was uploaded to the eBCD System in October 2022.

In view of the presentation of this development, the United States considered that, despite the modification published in production, there is still some confusion as to the terminology used in the printed version of eBCD related to JFOs and that it would be useful to broaden the discussion on this terminology. They went on to propose that in a footnote it could be stated that 'Catch responsible' means the vessel/trap that caught the bluefin tuna in the context of a JFO and uploaded that information into the eBCD system.

It was agreed that the United States and Tragsa would discuss further to suggest any language in this regard.

## **5.2 Issues cost estimated but not requested**

### *5.2.1 Reference 2019-8 (35): Trades companies of other countries adapt the system to allow access to NCP*

The requirements for the creation of the different profiles for non-CPC countries for accessing the system were sent in the time/cost estimate on 31 May 2019.

The Chair introduced this item noting that this issue has been discussed in several previous WG meetings originating from the [Recommendation by ICCAT to clarify and amend aspects of ICCAT'S Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation Program to facilitate the application of the eBCD system \(Rec. 15-10\)](#) ([Recommendation by ICCAT amending the recommendation 19-04 amending recommendation 18-02 establishing a multi-annual management plan for Bluefin Tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean \(Rec. 21-08\)](#), currently Paragraph 5j) which states that, until functionality is developed to allow non-CPCs access to the eBCD system, their entry into the system would be through paper BCDs. Since then, although its cost/time estimation has been carried out, it had been left pending by the TWG and considered a low priority given also its relatively high cost.

The European Union enquired about how many trades from Non-Contracting Parties had been received by the ICCAT Secretariat in order to assess its relevance and priority. The ICCAT Secretariat noted that there were currently 17 Non-Contracting Parties with active companies registered in the eBCD system.

The United States considered that this proposal is not a priority because of its cost although if there were ever a sufficient budget, it would not oppose its development. Other CPCs including the EU expressed the same view.

The ICCAT Secretariat went on to point out that the data provided for 17 Non-Contracting Parties was limited to those that have importing companies registered in the system, but it does not know the volume of their re-exports which is the main reason for this proposal since the ICCAT Secretariat does not receive paper BCDs from non-CPCs.

*Final decision:* Approved for development for the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa ('Requirements for the TWG Requests 2019, dated 31 May 2019).

#### *5.2.2 Reference 92: Transshipments linked with eBCD (Rec. 21-08, para 92)*

Paragraph 92 of [Rec. 21-08](#) establishes that a transshipment declaration shall be linked to an eBCD to facilitate data cross-checking. The option of including functionality that will allow uploading documents in transshipment section was again discussed. The TWG however considered that the simplest approach, which would not require any system development, would be for users to include the Transshipment Declaration Number in the eBCD notes field. The TWG felt that this issue should be deferred to the meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM) including whether this suggestion would meet the requirements as laid down in the Recommendation. Cost estimation was requested, and requirements were sent on 8 September 2022.

*Final Decision:* Approved for development for the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa ('Requirements for the TWG Requests 2022' **Annex 1 to Appendix 3**). To be discussed at the 16th Meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM).

#### *5.2.3 Reference 5.5.3: Transport area within td section to be mandatory and include dates of departure and arrival*

In the previous TWG meetings the use of the transport area in the trade (TD) section to include more information related to the transport used was discussed.

Tragsa stated that currently in the transport area of the TD section a document can be included, however the proposal was the ability to introduce more data/documents. They informed that they have checked and informed that it would be possible to include more data if necessary, however they had the following questions:

- Which fields should be included?
- What type of profile would be responsible for filling in this information?
- Would these fields be editable in the following cases? TD exempted/TD validated/TD signed by importer?
- If the fields were editable, what type of profile would be able to modify them?
- If the fields were editable and the TD was validated, would the changes have to be audited?
- Do these fields need to be included in the printed version?

Cost/time estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 8 September 2022. Tragsa explained that as there was no consensus the requirements would not be compulsory. The main reason was that if these data were made compulsory the section would be blocked pending their entry.

The Chair noted that this proposal needed to be postponed because Türkiye saw drawbacks in its implementation and that since Türkiye is not present at the meeting it should be postponed until this CPC can be consulted.

The United States asked whether this functionality should be considered as a mandatory item in the eBCD completion procedure.

The Chair summarized that once Türkiye has been consulted the discussion can be resumed at the next meeting.

*Final Decision:* Open, more discussion by TWG needed (request views of Türkiye).

*5.2.3 Reference 5.5.4: Inclusion of stereoscopic camera results in the caging section of the printed eBCD*

In accordance with Annex 9 of the [Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 18-02 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean \(Rec. 19-04\)](#) and Annex 3 of the [Recommendation by ICCAT replacing Recommendation 11-20 on an ICCAT Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation Program \(Rec. 18-13\)](#) Morocco had previously presented a proposal to include the weight and number of fish results from the stereoscopic camera control in the caging section of the printed eBCD. Cost estimation was requested, and requirements were sent on 8 September 2022.

The EU noted that in relation to the screenshots accompanying the requirements of this proposal, it considers the label "Cage Description" to be inappropriate (it should be "Caging Operation") and also that it may further be necessary to add text in the section making it clear who is responsible (operator or competent authorities) for declaring the quantities both before and after the use of the stereoscopic cameras.

Morocco recalled that they had already raised the issue of Section 6 of the eBCD in previous meetings, in particular, the issue on how the data should be recorded in the two parts of Section 6, including the results of the stereoscopic cameras. They also clarified that the label "Cage Description" is from the original paper BCD and associated Recommendation.

Tragsa confirmed that the label "Cage Description" indeed originated from the paper BCD and noted who was responsible for filling in the quantities declared in the section. It also considered that if a change is required in a BCD section label this change should be consistent with what is shown in the printed BCD.

**Final Decision:** Approved for development for the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa (**Annex 1 to Appendix 3**).

*5.2.4 Cage Registry (previously Reference 5.5.5: Development of functionality to allow grouping of fish from the same flag origin/same JFO)*

Panel 2 (Paragraph 100 of [Rec. 19-04](#)) requested the eBCD TWG to study the consideration of the regrouping of fish in intra-farm transfers, in particular how traceability could be ensured. This subject was now foreseen in paragraph 198 of [Rec. 22-08](#). Cost/time estimates had been requested and were received on 27 September 2022.

Tragsa explained that in order to tackle this functionality it would be essential to divide this proposal into two phases: in the first phase, the cages would be registered in the system's database, identifying them individually (currently they are registered through a field with a free text). This registration entails the creation of a new synchronization from the ICCAT Secretariat and the modification of all the sections concerned (caging and movement of cages). Once this first phase is developed and operational, it would be possible to tackle in a second phase, the analysis of the proposal on how to carry out the grouping of fish.

Japan noted that this functionality of "Cage registry" could be connected to the proposed growth rate calculation given its requirement to identify and register individual cages in the system. As for the grouping comprising the second phase indicated by Tragsa, Japan agreed to its development if traceability with respect to growth rates can be assured. This aspect should be further dealt with by IMM.

The United States and Canada noted similar doubts about traceability with respect to growth rates.

The EU considered that in light of these uncertainties and complexities regarding 'cage registry' and traceability, it might be necessary to postpone this issue to the Second Meeting of the eBCD Technical Working Group (eBCD TWG) on 5 June 2023 before reverting to IMM on a way forward.

Tragsa explained that traceability would not be lost as long as changes were made to the system on the basis of the 'cage registry'. However, they stressed that for the second phase (grouping) it would be necessary for the TWG to clearly determine what grouping operations should be facilitated by the system.

Having dealt with the proposal "Question from Japan on the obtaining of the data necessary for the calculation of the growth rates", the Chair asked the CPCs if the TWG could approve the development of the first phase described by Tragsa ('Cage registry').

The United States asked whether cage registration would be strictly necessary for growth rate calculations and Japan confirmed that in their view, it was. The EU noted that it did not disagree with the approval of the development 'cage register' but asked confirmation if the budget could be broken down to cover the first phase.

Tragsa clarified that the budget presented was actually only for this first phase, therefore the TWG agreed to change name of this item to avoid confusion. Once this phase was completed, the time/cost analysis would be carried out by Tragsa to address the second phase: grouping.

*Final decision:* Approved for development on the basis of the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa ("Requirements for the TWG requests 2022. Part II" (**Annex 2 to Appendix 3**) and agreement to change name of this item to "Cage Registry".

#### *5.2.5 Reference 6.1: Farming Capacity (Rec. 21-08, para 26)*

It was reminded that under this para, the ICCAT Secretariat compiles statistics on the annual amount of caging (input of wild caught fish), harvesting, and export, by farm CPC, using the data in the eBCD system. The eBCD TWG is required to consider the development of such a data extraction functionality, and until such functionality becomes available each farm CPC report these statistics to the ICCAT Secretariat. These statistics shall be made available on the ICCAT website subject to confidentiality requirements.

Cost estimation was requested, and requirements were sent on 27 September 2022.

The EU agreed with the solution presented by Tragsa in its requirements for this proposal.

The United States and Japan proposed that this functionality should not only be restricted to use by the ICCAT Secretariat profile but also made available to CPC administrators. The ICCAT Secretariat indicated that this request would be feasible provided that an agreement was reached to ensure the confidentiality of the data.

Japan explained that this functionality provides basic aggregated statistics which should not pose confidentiality issues.

Tragsa noted that Japan may be confusing this proposal with another "Question from Japan on obtaining the necessary data for the calculation of growth rates", which does have the access that Japan and the United States are requesting. Regarding this functionality different confidentiality conditions were set and Tragsa confirmed that only the ICCAT Secretariat profile has access.

Japan confirmed that the two proposals were developed with different confidentiality requirements in mind however but suggested there was consistency between them.

In the interest of time, the United States insisted that this proposal could be made available to CPCs (therefore avoiding the ICCAT Secretariat having to post them on the website).

Morocco considered that Tragsa's proposal, as reflected in the time/cost estimation, correctly reflects the provisions of paragraph 26 of Recommendation 21-08. In fact, according to this provision it is the ICCAT Secretariat profile that must have access to this feature. The EU supports this view.

The ICCAT Secretariat asked for details on the periodicity of the publication of the data and whether these data should be published as they are extracted through the functionality provided by Tragsa or whether certain adjustments related to confidentiality should be made before they are published.

The EU, with regard to the fields to be published, considered that 'Transfers' should also be included; a view that was supported by the United States.

*Final decision:* Approved for development for the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa (**Annex 2 to Appendix 3**).

*5.2.6 Rec. 21-08, para 102: ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (ROP)*

In accordance with paragraph 102 of [Rec. 21-08](#), by way of derogation from paragraph 101, harvesting from farms up to 1,000 kg per day and up to a maximum of 50 t per farm per year to supply the fresh bluefin tuna market, may be authorized by the relevant CPC provided that an authorized inspector from the farm CPC is onsite for 100% of such harvests, and controls the entire operation. The authorized inspector shall also validate the harvested quantities in the eBCD system. In this case, the regional observer's signature should not be required in the harvest section of the eBCD. Cost/time estimates were requested and requirements were sent on 27 September 2022.

Tragsa outlined their approach for the development of this derogation in the system:

- As not all farms may choose to benefit from this derogation, a new field in the data synchronized from the ICCAT Secretariat would need to specify this;
- With regard to the limitations set out in the derogation (1,000 kg per day and up to a maximum of 50 t per farm per year), the system would check them at the time harvests are recorded in the system (with system alerts being generated if such limits are exceeded);
- After the recording of the information in accordance with these two conditions, the system would not display the Observer's signature section, only the section for the CPCs Inspectors signature.

The EU, given the complexity and cost of this development including the intervention of inspectors, requested that discussion on this functionality be deferred to the IMM.

The United States supported and encouraged further discussion on this issue in the IMM to assess whether this suggested approach is the right one. They also asked who would be making use of the derogation, adding whether it could be possible to develop and use a simpler intermediate solution.

Tragsa explained that currently the system conditions associated with the derogation are currently not taken into account by the system and therefore it's not possible for it to implemented (i.e., observer signature required).

The Chair asked TWG who currently uses the derogation. The EU informed the TWG that it did not yet implement this derogation. The Chair concluded it may therefore be prudent to consult all CPCs at IMM to ascertain who would be using it before engaging in further technical discussions.

*Final decision:* Open, more discussion by TWG needed and deferred to IMM.

*5.2.7 Reference 5.4.1: Reference 2019-7: Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT inspectors under the Joint Inspection Scheme (JIS)*

The Chair noted that previous TWG meetings have discussed the issue of how inspectors operating in the context of Joint International Inspection Schemes under [Rec. 21-08](#) and the [Recommendation by ICCAT replacing the Recommendation 13-04 and Establishing a Multi-annual Recovery Plan for Mediterranean Swordfish \(Rec. 16-05\)](#) would have access to the eBCD system both in the context of risk assessment and for the vessels they are inspecting. Different technical approaches had been discussed in depth by the TWG considering system integrity, data confidentiality and the operational specificities of accessing the system in the field. Cost/time estimate was requested, and requirements were sent by Tragsa on 27 September 2022.

The Chair asked the CPCs whether they agree with Tragsa's approach to the requirements and the EU responded that it not only agrees with Tragsa's approach but that its development is a priority to be development before the 2023 fishing season.

Notwithstanding the technical aspects, the ICCAT Secretariat asked Tragsa to confirm whether the ICCAT Secretariat's procedure to cover this functionality with respect to Inspectors will be similar to that currently used for the Regional Observer access and account management. Tragsa confirms that this will be the case.

*Final decision:* Approved for development for the time/cost estimate provided by Tragsa (**Annex 2 to Appendix 3**) with priority.

#### *5.2.8 Question from Japan on obtaining the necessary data for the calculation of growth rates*

As previously raised to the TWG, Japan noted that they were continuing to explore the possibility for the eBCD System to calculate growth rates of farmed and exported BFT. Information that allowed Japan to make these calculations was currently being provided to Japan on a voluntary basis by farming CPCs. Cost estimation was requested, and requirements were sent on 27 September 2022.

Japan presented the document "Instruction for Development of Function of Automatic monitoring of Growth Rate in eBCD System" (**Appendix 4**) describing in detail how the growth rate calculations would be made in the system. The format of the proposed report was also presented which would be available in the system for CPC administrators. Finally, Japan pointed out that the main challenges were when BFT was transferred between cages within the same farm or transferred to other farms.

The EU welcomed the report proposed by Japan in particular on its approach to data aggregation to protect confidentiality but noted that the level of data aggregation itself raises doubts on its overall usefulness. They also expressed doubts on the growth rate table presented by Japan with respect to the growth rate report presented by the SCRS last year when considering the extended caging times and noted the possible need for further SCRS review. They also shared with Japan their concern on the difficulties related to transfers and movements of fish between cages.

Morocco asked how the average harvesting date is estimated. Japan noted that if there are several harvesting operations on a cage, a weighting would be applied between dates and the number of fish harvested on each date.

The United States noted that this development was important to prevent fraudulent actions and the TWG should not abandon this proposal on basis of the technical difficulties presented.

Japan noted that their proposal and development of this functionality should be made in several phases so that in the first phase the most problematic cases, such as transfers, are avoided. Japan proposed further technical discussions at IMM meeting.

Following the first phase, the EU asked Japan whether it would be necessary to continue the voluntary data exchange between Japan and the EU. It also proposed to Tragsa that, given that the associated calculations and functionality are likely to evolve over time, it should prepare a way to modify the configuration of the calculations easily each time the calculations (growth rate) changes.

Japan replied to the EU that voluntary data exchange would no longer be necessary and that it agrees with the idea of parameterising the calculations in the functionality so that they can be easily configured. Japan also reminded that the development of the Cage Registry in the system (point 5.2.4 of this report) would be essential for the development of this functionality.

Tragsa considered the parameterisation of the calculations was feasible, although in order to make a full assessment it would first need to analyse the algorithm of the calculations as well as the table on which the parameterisation would be based.

Japan encouraged Tragsa to ask them for all the information they require about the algorithm in order to clarify their doubts and move forward on this issue.

*Final decision:* New time/cost analysis requested on the basis of the documents submitted by Japan.



### 5.3 Issues pending cost estimation – further questions

#### 5.3.1 Reference 5.5.6: Mortality during towing voyage

Some CPCs reminded the TWG on the difficulties faced declaring mortality during the towing voyage. Tragsa noted that a procedure existed, although some CPCs explained that this mortality should be reflected in chronological order and not in the caging section. Tragsa explained that this could be done with a new section that could allow declaring dead fishes chronologically. This 'new section' could be added from the Transfer section and would be a final section (this section would not allow to add any other related section in the system for those BFT).

Tragsa presented question 1 of document "Time cost development's estimation by the Working Group (April 2022)" (**Appendix 5**) describing in which sections the system currently records mortalities, noting that it differs from the requirement in para 5 of Annex 11 of the [Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 21-08 establishing a Multi-annual Management Plan for Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean \(Rec. 22-08\)](#).

The EU confirmed that the registration procedure described by Tragsa is not in line with the Recommendation. Consequently, it should be considered whether it is more worthwhile to modify the eBCD system or to modify the recommendation to be consistent with the system.

Tragsa explained that the system currently correctly reflects all mortalities, but the question is due to the fact that there are CPCs that want a strictly chronological record. Therefore, at the [Meeting of the eBCD Technical Working Group \(TWG\) \(6-7 April 2022\)](#), the creation of a specific section for the recording of dead fish was raised. Tragsa emphasised that the problem of recording fish as indicated in the Recommendation would reproduce the problems that occurred when parallel transfers were introduced (which have already been solved in the system).

The United States raised doubts as to whether the system currently covers all the possibilities for BFT mortalities (thefts, disease, escaped fish, etc.) and therefore asked whether the new section that has been proposed for the registration of dead fish could cover all these possibilities.

Tragsa confirmed that this new section would cover these cases although they were still analyzing.

The EU recalled that Annex 11 requires mortality to be counted in 4 cases: capture, first transfer, during towing/caging and finally during growth (the latter would include removals, escaped fish or death due to weather events). The EU stressed that the aim is to achieve consistency in the recording of all these cases between the sections and offered to provide input on this point at the Second eBCD TWG Meeting.

The United States agreed that consistency between the system and the recommendations must be maintained.

*Final decision:* Open, time/cost needed after additional discussion by TWG. EU will produce a document for discussion at the Second eBCD TWG.

#### 5.3.2 Reference 5.4.2: Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight. Tagging

United States asked if the system cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight. Tragsa confirms that the system does not report on these differences. The option of reporting to Administrators when these figures exceed a certain % of tolerance was discussed (e.g., an email sent to administrators, but no inconsistency shown in the system).

Tragsa presented question 3 of **Appendix 5** in which they questioned the type of cross-checks that would be carried out in order to be able to specify further a cost/time estimate.

The United States considered that this proposal is not a priority and believes that the details of this item should be postponed to future discussions.

*Final decision:* Open, time/cost needed after further discussion by TWG.



*5.3.3 Reference in the 2022 eBCD TWG Report: Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies*

The United States asked whether it would be possible to have a functionality that would solve the problem of duplicate sessions through a single action by a user.

Tragsa explained that the questions that appear in point 2 of **Appendix 5** originate for two reasons: the Support team hardly ever has incidents of this type as the removal of cookies is usually done using the browser options and the other reason would be to know if other CPCs share the same difficulties that the United States have mentioned.

The United States reported that they had some difficulties with this issue last year, as some of their users, when trying to log in to the system, were blocked for a long period of time. However, they will continue to monitor this issue this year to see if there is a need to contact Tragsa to resolve the problem, although this is not a priority issue.

Tragsa reminded that prior to 2018 this issue was problematic in the sense that the United States has commented, but a series of actions were taken to solve this problem by deleting the cookies from the browser.

*Final decision:* Open, the United States will continue to test this issue in order to define at the Second eBCD TWG Meeting whether it should be discarded or request a time/cost analysis would be needed.

*5.3.4 Reference 27: Growth Rates (Rec. 21-08, para 27)*

The measure notes that Farm CPCs shall endeavor 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.

Given that this point is related to the items already discussed at this meeting (e.g., Cage Registry), the Chair proposed that discussions on this point be postponed until a later TWG meeting.

*Final decision:* Open, time/cost needed after additional discussion by TWG.

*5.3.5 Reference 138: Amendments to ITDs and eBCDs following inspections at sea or investigations (Rec. 21-08, para 138)*

This measure notes that if following an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority of the donor operator to reflect the result of the investigation.

With regard to question 5 of **Appendix 5**, Tragsa asked when a eBCD does not comply with [Rec. 21-08](#), para 138 (the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD) would it be sufficient for the system to display an alert or should it perform additional actions. In short, whether it was sufficient to create a new inconsistency or reuse the existing one in terms of inconsistency of fish/kilos between sections.

The EU and the United States considered that the warning message would be sufficient, and it would not be necessary to block the section or create new alerts.

The Chair indicated that since the text of the Recommendation also states that the inspector should amend the quantities, a new field may also be necessary.

The United States expressed doubts as to how the system would meet the requirements set out by the Recommendation, what the procedure would look like and how the system would work with regard to the intervention of the inspector in accordance with the text.

The Chair also noted that the TWG should consider whether the alert message should disappear once the inspector has made the adjustment or whether it would continue to report that an adjustment has taken place.

The EU considered that the system should not only show an alert when an inconsistency exists but also record the adjustment made by the inspector(s) so that it can subsequently be analyzed as required.

Tragsa confirmed that when sections are validated, edits in the data can be reviewed through the 'change audit functionality' and thus can be fully tracked.

*Final decision:* Time/cost analysis to be requested. Request made for time/cost analysis but since sent back by Tragsa for further clarification from eBCD TWG. To be discussed at the Second eBCD TWG meeting.

#### **5.4 Other issues considered "Open" at April 2022**

##### *5.4.1 Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections*

'Plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections were discussed for inclusion into the eBCD System (i.e., 'gutted and gilled' cannot be followed by 'whole'). The functionality was uploaded to the system in December 2018, however, awaits the uploading of the 'plausible' cases considered by CPCs. It was decided in the [2022 Meeting of the eBCD Technical Working Group \(eBCD TWG\)](#), that a document would be drafted and shared with the TWG in order to agree on such plausible transformations.

The United States presented the document "eBCD Plausible Transformations" (**Appendix 6**) presenting possible plausible transformations of different BFT products.

Japan noted that in addition to the presentation of the products, plausibility should also include checks on the quantities recorded before and after the transformations to verify conversion factors. Japan went on to ask the ICCAT Secretariat if they had any documents on this issue.

The ICCAT Secretariat provided the document that can be found as 'GuideRevised' in the meeting SharePoint but clarified that conversion factors are not available in ICCAT between all products/presentations.

The United States proposed that this proposal should be addressed in two phases. In the first phase it would be sufficient for the system to only check plausible transformations taking into account the products presentations and, in a second phase it could also address the conversion factors.

Tragsa reminded the TWG that this functionality has already been implemented since 2018, so that if agreement was reached on the document presented by the United States, it could be uploaded into the system without any costs. On the other hand, the introduction of conversion factors in plausibility checks would require a new time/cost estimate.

The United States raised the question of whether a help tool would be useful, either contextually or by "tooltips", to indicate to the user which plausible transformations are supported. It also expressed doubts as to how the system would act in the event that a plausible transformation was incorrectly entered by the user.

The Chair, referring to the United States question, suggested that it might be useful to have a cost estimate to add some kind of contextual help or tooltips for the user.

Tragsa explained that, in addition to validating the transformations entered, when a user enters a certain product in a section, the system only presents the user in the next section with those presentation options that are valid (avoid entering an implausible transformation).

The United States also asked what happens with OT (Other) presentations and if this could facilitate a user circumventing validation. Tragsa answered this question by showing a document with the possible plausible transformations to and from the OT (Other) presentation that are allowed by the system which prevent the user from using this type of presentation to circumvent validation.

The United States proposed to publish the validation of the possible transformations in the test environment to avoid that any error in its conception could block the eBCD activity. At the Second eBCD TWG meeting, the conclusions could be discussed, and a decision made on whether to publish it in the production environment.

Tragsa confirmed that this functionality could be uploaded only in the test environment until the Second eBCD TWG Meeting and reminded participants that there is already a document describing the product types in the help module of the system.

*Final decision:* Time/cost analysis to be requested to extend functionality with conversion factors and add contextual help (tooltips). The plausible transformations presented by the United States in **Appendix 6** will be introduced in the Test environment of the eBCD system until the Second eBCD TWG Meeting.

*5.4.2 When a traceability alert is generated due to an inconsistency in a split BCD, the alert is shown in all the branches*

The possibility of displaying alerts only in the relevant branches was discussed. Depending on the inconsistencies, the alerts are displayed in one section or in the whole eBCD.

Tragsa explains that this issue was largely solved in 2018 by introducing a validation that prevents inconsistencies in kilos/fish between sections. Since then such inconsistencies have been drastically reduced.

*Final decision:* Removed/Not approved.

*5.4.3 Annex 11 of Rec. 21-08: treatment of dead and/or lost fish*

<p><b>Annex 11</b></p>	<p><b>Treatment of dead and/or lost fish</b></p>	<p><i>Treatment of fish that die during first transfer</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The bluefin tuna that die during the first transfer from a purse seine vessel or trap shall be recorded in the purse seine vessel logbook or the trap daily catch report and reported on the ICCAT Transfer Declaration (ITD) and on the transfer section of the <i>eBCD</i>.</li> <li>4. The <i>eBCD</i> shall be provided to the towing vessel(s) with Section 2 (Total Catch), Section 3 (Live fish trade) and Section 4 (Transfer - including “dead” fish) completed.</li> <li>5. The total quantities reported in Sections 3 and 4 shall be equal to the quantities reported in Section 2, after deductions of all the mortalities observed between the catch and completion of the transfer.</li> <li>6. The <i>eBCD</i> shall be accompanied by the ITD in accordance with the provisions of this Recommendation. The number of bluefin tuna reported in the ITD (transferred live), must equal the number reported in Section 3 in the associated <i>eBCD</i>.</li> <li>7. A split of the <i>eBCD</i> with Section 8 (Trade information) shall be completed and given to the auxiliary vessel which will transport the dead bluefin tuna to shore (or retained on the catching vessel or the trap if landed directly to shore). This dead fish and split <i>eBCD</i> must be accompanied with a copy of the ITD.</li> <li>8. With regard to <i>eBCD</i>, the dead fish shall be allocated to the catching vessel which made the catch or, in the case of JFOs, either to participating catching vessels or flags.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Annex 11</b></p>	<p><b>Treatment of dead and/or lost fish</b></p>	<p><i>Treatment of fish that die during caging operations</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. The fish that die during caging operations shall be reported by the operator on the caging declaration. The farm CPC competent authority shall ensure that the number and weight of the fish that die is reported in the relevant field of Section 6 of the <i>eBCD</i>.</li> </ol>

<p><b>Annex 11</b></p>	<p><b>Treatment of dead and/or lost fish</b></p>	<p><i>Treatment of fish that die and/or are lost during farming activities</i></p> <p>14. Dead or lost fish in farms or those that disappear from farms, including allegedly stolen or escaped fish, shall be reported by the farm operator to the farm CPC competent authority immediately after the event has been detected. The farm operator's report shall be accompanied by the necessary supporting evidence (complaint filed about the stolen fish, damage report in case of damage to the cage, etc.). After receipt of such report, the farm CPC competent authority shall apply the necessary changes or cancellation of <i>the eBCD concerned (following the necessary developments in the eBCD system)</i>.</p>
------------------------	--	--

ROP- BFT Consortium question

<p><b>Fish that die during caging</b></p> <p><b>Rec. 22-08, para 167 and Annex 11</b></p> <p><b>Rec. 18-13</b></p>	<p>Para 167 and Annex 11 of the <a href="#">Rec. 22-08</a> require that fish that die during caging operations shall be reported in the relevant field in section 6 of the eBCD. However, section 6, as outlined in <a href="#">Rec. 18-13</a>, does not yet have a relevant field for reporting dead fish, only live fish caged.</p> <p>Currently the consortium understand that this dead fish shall be recorded in the comments section of Section 6. Can the consortium clarify if this fish shall also be included in section 7 and/or 8 of the eBCD?</p>
--	--

The Chair recalled that as this issue, like the question from ROP-BFT Consortium present at the end of (**Appendix 5**), was closely related to issue “5.3.1 Mortality during towing voyage”; it be deferred to the Second eBCD TWG Meeting.

*Final decision:* Open, further discussion by TWG.

### 5.5 Priority of developments

The Chair stated that since Tragsa cannot carry out all the developments at the same time, it was necessary to prioritise the order of the developments.

Tragsa presented two options for developments that would be possible to publish for the start of the catching campaign in May:

- Option 1:  
Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT Inspectors under JIS
- Option 2:  
Reference 92: Transshipments linked with eBCD ([Rec. 21-08](#), para 92)  
Reference 6.1: [Rec. 21-08](#), para 26: Farming capacity inclusion of stereo camera results in the caging section of the printed eBCD

The EU emphasized the importance to develop Option 1 presented by Tragsa (*Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT inspectors under JIS*).

Japan noted that it could be flexible as to the choice of both options, although like the EU, it also considers Option 1 to be a priority. Regarding proposal ‘[Rec. 21-08: Farming Capacity](#)’ they considered that they would be satisfied if it were ready by the end of this year or early next year.

Following further discussion by the TWG, the following order of priorities and approximate deadlines for the development of the approved items was agreed as follows:

Order of priority	Issue	Needed by
1	Reference 5.4.1: Reference 2019-7: Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT inspectors under JIS	May
2	Reference 5.5.5: Development of functionality to allow grouping of fish from the same flag origin/same JFO => 'Cage Registry'	July
3	Reference 5.5.4: Inclusion of stereo camera results in the caging section of the printed eBCD	August
4	Reference 92: Transshipments linked with eBCD ( <a href="#">Rec. 21-08</a> , para 92)	Sept/Oct
5	Reference 6.1: <a href="#">Rec. 21-08</a> , para 26: Farming Capacity	end of year
6	Reference 2019-8 (35): Trades companies of other countries adapt the system to allow access to NCP	after others

## 6. Consideration of new developments

No CPC requested the consideration of any other new developments.

## 7. Future intersessional work as required

The Chair indicated that this years 16th Meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM) will be held 7-9 June 2023 and that it should, amongst other topics, review the functioning of the plausible transformations introduced in the system (Test Environment).

Japan recalled that at the 23rd Special Meeting of the Commission they proposed that the necessary functionality be introduced in the eBCD system to validate the BFT's processing activities. It was considered that it would be discussed first at the IMM and then by the eBCD TWG, however the Second eBCD TWG Meeting (5 June 2023) is scheduled to take place before the 16th Meeting of IMM (7-9 June 2023).

The EU considered that the current order of first TWG and then IMM would not raise problems with regard to the issue raised by Japan.

As a way forward, the Chair proposed that the ICCAT Secretariat should send circular letter to CPCs to gather their views. The Chair also mentioned that a short additional meeting of eBCD TWG could be held later in the year to deal with this issue if needed.

## 8. Budgetary and contractual matters

The ICCAT Secretariat provided a brief update on the Budgetary and contractual situation. With regards to the approved developments, the United States asked whether there is sufficient budget to carry them out and the ICCAT Secretariat confirmed there was. However, they noted that the budget may need to be updated to address the issue of access for Non-Contracting parties. Following the meeting, they plan to contact Tragsa in this regard.

## 9. Any other matters

No other matters were discussed.

**10. Adoption of the report and adjournment**

It was agreed that the report would be adopted by correspondence.

**Agenda**

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Nomination of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. System overall state of play
5. Review/progress of system developments and received cost/time estimates
6. Consideration of new developments
7. Future intersessional work as required
8. Budgetary and contractual matters
9. Any other matters
10. Adoption of the report and adjournment



## List of Participants

### **CONTRACTING PARTIES**

#### **ALGERIA**

**Ouchelli, Amar\***

Sous-directeur de la Grande Pêche et de la Pêche Spécialisée, Ministère de la pêche et des productions halieutiques, Route des quatre canons, 16000 Alger

Tel: +213 550 386 938, Fax: +213 234 95597, E-Mail: amarouchelli.dz@gmail.com; amar.ouchelli@mpeche.gov.dz

**Bouaouina, Chahrazed**

Route des quatre canons, 16000 Alger

Tel: +213 553 734 193, Fax: +213 239 755 55, E-Mail: chahrapeche1@gmail.com

**Tamourt, Amira**

Ministère de la Pêche & des Ressources Halieutiques, 4, Route des Quatre Canons, 16100 Alger

Tel: +213 664 367 720, E-Mail: miratamourt@gmail.com

**Zouadi, Chanez**

Ingénieur en Statistiques, Ministère de la Pêche et des Ressources Halieutiques, Rue des Quatre Canons, 16000 Alger

Tel: +213 658 354 006, Fax: +213 433987, E-Mail: zouadi.chanez@gmail.com

#### **BRAZIL**

**Matos, Vitor Luis**

Chief of Division, Fisheries and Aquaculture Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply, Endereço Edifício Siderbrás - Secretaria da Aquicultura e Pesca do MAPA Reitoria IFB Asa Sul, A empresa está localizada no bairro DF - Asa Sul e no endereço Setor de Autarquias Sul Q. 2, 70297400 Brasilia

Tel: +55 619 815 80931, E-Mail: vitor.matos@agro.gov.br

#### **CANADA**

**Kerwin, Jessica**

Large Pelagic Resource Manager, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6

Tel: +1 613 291 7480, E-Mail: jessica.kerwin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

#### **EGYPT**

**Abdelaziz, Mai Atia Mostafa**

Production Research Specialist, 210, area B - CITY, 5TH DISTRICT ROAD 90, 11311 New Cairo

Tel: +201 003 878 312, Fax: +202 281 117 007, E-Mail: janahesham08@gmail.com

**Badr, Abdelrazek Mohamed**

Fisheries Specialist, 210, area B - CITY, 5TH DISTRICT ROAD 90, 11311 New Cairo

Tel: +201 228 708 220, Fax: +202 281 117 007, E-Mail: abdelrazek.mohamed004@gmail.com

**Magdy, Walaa**

Production Research Specialist, 210, area B - CITY, 5TH DISTRICT ROAD 90, 11311 New Cairo

Tel: +201 021 854 600, Fax: +202 281 117 007, E-Mail: walaamagdy.qw@gmail.com; walaaswisspak@yahoo.com

#### **EUROPEAN UNION**

**Khalil, Samira**

European Commission, DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Unit B-1 "International Affairs, Law of the Sea and RFOs", J II - 99 3/74, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 2 298 03 39; +32 229 11111, E-Mail: samira.khalil@ec.europa.eu

**Miranda, Fernando**

Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries - DG MARE, Fisheries Control and Inspections, Rue Joseph II St, 99 01/090, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +322 299 3922, E-Mail: fernando.miranda@ec.europa.eu

---

\* Head Delegate

**Ribeiro, Cristina**

DG MARE, Rue Joseph II, 1049 Brussels, Belgium  
Tel: +32 470 529 103, E-Mail: cristina-ribeiro@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

**Bošnjak, Marija**

Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries, Service for aquaculture, Office Split, Trg hrvatske bratske zajednice 8, 21000, Croatia  
Tel: +385 21 444 062, Fax: +385 21 444 027, E-Mail: marija.bosnjak@mps.hr

**Caladé Tomás Rosa, Maria Manuela**

Technician, DGRM, DIRECÇÃO GERAL DE RECURSOS NATURAIS, SEGURANÇA E SERVIÇOS MARÍTIMOS, Direção de Serviços de Inspeção, Monitorização e Controlo das Atividades Marítimas, Avda. Brasília, 1449-030 Lisboa, Portugal  
Tel: +351 21 302 51 51, Fax: +351 21 302 51 05, E-Mail: mrosa@dgrm.mm.gov.pt

**Conte, Fabio**

Dipartimento delle Politiche Europee e Internazionali, Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste - Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione Generale della Pesca Marittima e dell'Acquacoltura - PEMAC III, Via XX Settembre, 20, 00187 Rome, Italy  
Tel: +39 06 4665 2838, Fax: +39 06 4665 2899, E-Mail: f.conte@masaf.gov.it

**Ergolavou, Anna**

Ministry of Rural Development and Food, DG for Sustainable Fisheries, Directorate Control of Fishing Activities and Fishery Products, 150, A.Sygrou Avenue, 17671 Athens, Greece  
Tel: +30 2109287135, Fax: +30 210 928 7130, E-Mail: aergolavou@minagric.gr

**Fernández Despiou, Estrella**

Inspectora de Pesca, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, Secretaría General de Pesca, S.G. Vigilancia Pesquera y Lucha contra la pesca ilegal, C/ Velázquez, 147 - 3ª planta, 28002 Madrid, España  
Tel: +34 91 347 84 40, E-Mail: efdespiou@mapa.es

**Gatt, Mark**

Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Food and Animal Rights Fort San Lucjan, Triq il-Qajjenza, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Malta Aquaculture Research Centre, MRS 3303 Marsaxlokk, Malta

**Harris, Sarah**

Malta Aquaculture Research Centre, Fort San Lucjan, BBG 1287 Marsaxlokk, Malta  
Tel: +356 229 26918, E-Mail: sarah.harris@gov.mt

**Herrador Benito, Ruth**

C/ Velázquez 147, 28002 Madrid, España  
Tel: +34 913 476 150; +34 648 768 905, E-Mail: rherrador@mapa.es; ruth.herrador@correo.gob.es

**Lanza, Alfredo**

Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste - Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione Generali della Pesca Marittima e dell'acquacoltura - PEMAC VI, Via XX Settembre, 20, 00187 Roma, Italy  
Tel: +39 331 464 1576; +39 646 652 843, E-Mail: a.lanza@masaf.gov.it

**Loisel, Fanny**

Chargée de mission, Bureau du contrôle des pêches, Fisheries Control Unit Direction Générale des Affaires Maritimes, de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture (DGAMPA), Directorate for Sea Fisheries and Aquaculture, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation, Tour Séquoia, 1 place Carpeaux, 75020 La Défense (Paris), France  
Tel: +33 140 819 331, E-Mail: fanny.loisel@agriculture.gouv.fr; fanny.loisel@hotmail.fr

**Magnolo, Lorenzo Giovanni**

Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste - Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione Generale della pesca Marittima e dell'Acquacoltura, Via XX Settembre, 20, 0187 Roma, Italy  
Tel: +39 0 646 652 819, E-Mail: lorenzo.magnolo@masaf.gov.it

**Orozco, Lucie**

Chargée de mission affaires thonières, Direction générale de affaires maritimes, de la pêche et de l'aquaculture (DGAMPA), Bureau des Affaires Européennes et Internationales (BAEI), 1 place Carpeaux, 92055 La Défense, Ile de France, France

Tel: +33 140 819 531; +33 660 298 721, E-Mail: lucie.orozco@mer.gouv.fr

**Papachristou, Elisavet**

Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development & Food Directorate General for Fisheries, 150 Syggrou Av., 17671 Athens, Greece

Tel: +302 109 287 171, E-Mail: epapachristou@minagric.gr; syg016@minagric.gr

**Sánchez Sánchez, Ricardo**

TRAGSA, C/ Julián Camarillo 6B, 28037 Madrid, España

Tel: +34 610 540 627, E-Mail: rssa@tragsa.es

**Šebalj, Valentina**

Ministry of Agriculture, Ivana Mažuranića 30, 23000 Zadar, Croatia

Tel: +385 23 309 820, E-Mail: valentina.sebalj@mps.hr

**Simão, Ana Paula**

DGRM, Avenida Brasilia, 1400-298 Lisboa, Portugal

Tel: +351 213 035 700, E-Mail: asimao@dgrm.mm.gov.pt

**JAPAN**

**Ito, Kohei**

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Tokyo Chiyoda-ku 100-8907

Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: kohei\_ito060@maff.go.jp

**Kumamoto, Jumpei**

Technical Official, Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, International Affairs Division, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100-8907

Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: jumpei\_kumamoto270@maff.go.jp

**Morita, Hiroyuki**

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100-8907

Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: hiroyuki\_morita970@maff.go.jp

**MEXICO**

**Soler Benítez, Bertha Alicia**

Comisión Nacional de Acuicultura y pesca (CONAPESCA), Av. Camarón Sábalo 1210 Fracc. Sábalo Country Club., 82100 Mazatlán, Sinaloa

Tel: +52 669 915 6900 Ext. 58462, E-Mail: bertha.soler@conapesca.gob.mx; berthaa.soler@gmail.com

**MOROCCO**

**El Fatouani, Zineb**

Cadre à la Direction de Contrôle des Activités de la Pêche Maritime

Tel: +212 668 342 618, E-Mail: Z.ELFATOUANI@mpm.gov.ma; zineb.elfatouani@hotmail.com

**Hmidane, Abdellatif**

Chef du Service de la Coordination de la Lutte contre la Pêche INN / DCAPM, Ministère de l'agriculture, de la pêche maritime, du développement rural et des eaux et forêts / Département de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal Rabat

Tel: +212 537 688 356, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: hmidane@mpm.gov.ma

**Sabbane, Kamal**

Chef du Service du Suivi et du Contrôle par Outil informatique / DCAPM, Ministère de l'Agriculture de la Pêche Maritime, du Développement Rural et des Eaux et Forêts, Département de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal, Rabat

Tel: +212 537 688 528, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: sabbane@mpm.gov.ma

## **PANAMA**

### **Aguilar, Mario**

Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá-, Calle 45, Bella Vista, Edificio Riviera, 0819-05850  
Tel: +507 511 6098, E-Mail: meaguilar@arap.gob.pa

### **García, Génesis**

Captadora de datos, Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá - ARAP, Dirección de Cooperación y Asuntos Pesqueros Internacionales, Ave. Justo Arosemena y Calle 45 Bella Vista, Edificio la Riviera  
Tel: +507 511 6000 Ext. 301; +507 617 80430, E-Mail: ggarcia@arap.gob.pa

### **Quiros, Vivian**

Analista y Operadora de Cooperación Internacional, Dirección de Cooperación y Asuntos Pesqueros Internacional, Edificio la Riviera - Avenida Justo Arosemena y Calle 45, Bella Vista (Antigua Estación El Árbol)  
Tel: +507 511 6008 Ext. 205, E-Mail: vquiros@arap.gob.pa

### **Vergara, Yarkelia**

Directora encargada de Cooperación y Asuntos pesqueros, Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario, Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá, Cooperación Técnica y Asuntos pesqueros Internacional, Edificio Riviera, Ave. Justo Arosemena, Calle 45 Bella Vista, 0819-02398  
Tel: +507 511 6008 (ext. 359), E-Mail: yvergara@arap.gob.pa; hsfes@arap.gob.pa

## **TUNISIA**

### **Ben Abdallah, Asma**

Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche, 30 Rue Alain Savary, 1002 Tunis  
Tel: +216 963 85490, E-Mail: asmajk.benabdallah@gmail.com

### **Hayouni ep Habbassi, Dhekra**

Ingénieur principal, Direction de la préservation des ressources halieutiques, Direction Générale de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, Ministère d'Agriculture, des Ressources hydrauliques et de la Pêche  
Tel: +216 718 90784, Fax: +216 717 99401, E-Mail: hayouni.dhekra@gmail.com; hayouni.dhekra1@gmail.com

### **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, 30, Rue Alain Savary - Le Belvédère, 1002 Tunis  
Tel: +216 24 012 780, Fax: +216 71 799 401, E-Mail: hamadi.mejri1@gmail.com

### **Toumi, Néji**

Directeur de la Ste TUNA FARMS of Tunisia, Port de pêche de Hergla, 4012, 4012 Hergla, Sousse  
Tel: + 216 22 25 32 83, Fax: + 216 73 251 800, E-Mail: neji.tft@planet.tn; hntm64@yahoo.com

## **UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

### **Eglintine, Steven**

MMO IUU Team Operations Room Lancaster House, 12 Alveston Close Sherbourne Park, Newcastle NE4 7YH  
Tel: +44 208 265 495, E-Mail: Steven.eglantine@marinemangement.org.uk

### **Flaherty, Jacob**

MMO IUU Team Operations Room Lancaster House, Newcastle NE4 7YH  
Tel: +44 2082 65495, E-Mail: Jacob.flaherty@marinemangement.org.uk

### **Maan, Perdeep**

E-Mail: Perdeep.Maan@defra.gov.uk

### **May, Stefan**

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2nd Floor, Foss House, Kings Pool, 1-2 Peasholme Green, York, YO1 7PX  
Tel: +44 208 026 7627, E-Mail: stefan.may@defra.gov.uk

## **UNITED STATES**

### **Blankenbeker, Kimberly**

Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs, Trade, and Commerce (F/IATC), NOAA, 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

**Harris, Madison**

Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs, Trade, and Commerce (F/IATC), NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  
Tel: +1 202 480 4592, E-Mail: madison.harris@noaa.gov

**Miller, Alexander**

NOAA Fisheries, National Seafood Inspection Lab, 3209 Frederic Street Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567  
Tel: +1 228 369 1699; +1 228 217 4188, Fax: +1 228 762 7144, E-Mail: alexander.miller@noaa.gov

**INVITED EXPERT FROM TRAGSA**

**Cuadra García**, Manuel Francisco

**Fernández Sanjuán**, María José

**Rodríguez Sánchez**, Mercedes

\*\*\*\*\*

**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

**Cheatle**, Jenny

**Parrilla Moruno**, Alberto Thais

**Baity**, Dawn

**Martínez Herranz**, Javier

**Samedy**, Valérie

**Vieito**, Aldana

**ICCAT INTERPRETERS**

**Baena Jiménez**, Eva J.

**Calmels**, Ellie

**Faillace**, Linda

**Liberas**, Christine

**Linaae**, Cristina

**Pinzon**, Aurélie

**Tragsa Report**

**Implementation of the eBCD System - State of play of eBCD project (April 2022 – January 2023)**

**1. Annual Report of User Support Service**

All data provided in this report considers 1 January 2022 as start date and 31 December 2022 as end date.

**1.1. Statistics about User Support Service**


From 1 January to 31 December 2022 (365 calendar days), Tragsa carried out a 7 hours 5 days user support service during May, June and August, and 6 hours 5 days user support service the rest of the months in 2022.

From 1 January to 31 December 2022, 38 CPCs or Flags have contacted the user support service, 1,451 emails were received and a total of 1,776 emails were exchanged. Per each day of this 365 calendar days, were received an average of 4,0 emails.


January 1 <sup>st</sup> to December 31 <sup>st</sup> 2022							
Type day	Received from 1 <sup>st</sup> January to 31 <sup>st</sup> December	Nº of CPCs/ Flags that contacted the Support team	Emails received	Emails exchanged	Nº of days	Average emails received per day of this period	Average emails exchanged per day of this period
<b>Total</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>1451</b>	<b>1776</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>4,0</b>	<b>4,9</b>
Working days	Within Support Schedule	35	1097	1332	247	4,4	5,4
	Out of Support Schedule	18	291	368		1,2	1,5
Weekends and Bank holidays		15	63	76	118	0,5	0,6

120,9 is the average of emails received per month, being May the month with the highest number of emails received (203 emails), with an average of 6,55 emails/per day.

The figure below desegregates the number of emails received during the working days in the user support working hours, out of these working hours and on weekends and bank holidays.




The total emails received per each month in 2019, 2020 and 2021 in comparison to the ones received in 2022, can be seen in the chart below.



**1.2. Main difficulties found from 1 January 2022**

The figure below illustrates the main categories on which incidences received could be included.

Most of the incidents received are related to actions that only Support and/or ICCAT Secretariat can do (28%). Many others are involved with actions that could be done by Flag/CPC administrators (23%). Besides, incidents related of how to use the eBCD (13%) are common. Furthermore, problems related to user’s access (users creation and maintenance) represent 9% of incidents received.





Among the emails classified as "**Actions could only be done by Secretariat/Support**", the following issues may be highlighted:

- Request from a country / user to write other flag requesting an action.
- Creation, maintenance and consult, of Non-CPC companies.
- Request to delete or change a registry in the Database.

Within the emails classified as '**Actions that could be done by administrators**', include actions such as:

- Information of pending account requested.
- Edit companies' permits or information.
- Edit user's permits or information.
- Actions related to section's edition.

Main problems included in "**Training**" category can be grouped in:

- General doubts regarding 'how to use the eBCD': i.e., how new sections in the system are created (related to new functionalities), how an information in the system can be modified, and how to use the test environment.
- Problems due to doubts regarding the creation and maintenance of users: i.e., doubts related to how the management of the requests is, username and password misplaced or incorrect, or users that were not familiar with self-registration.
- Mails related to problems that can be solved by the Flag Technical Support and it was sent to them.
- Problems related to validation process: i.e. most of the doubts to certificate misplace or expired.

Among the emails classified as '**Technical problems within eBCD**', the following can be underlined:

- Errors found in the system: i.e., as the problem with the generation of the asynchronous reports in randomly moments, printing BFTRCs with a high number of BCDs associated. Both errors have been corrected.

Within classified as '**Technical problems outside system**', we can find incidents related to problems accessing the system or receiving emails from the system.

## **2. Status of issues discussed at April 2022 WG meeting**

At the last WG meeting in April 2022, the Group decided to address in first place all the issues whose cost estimation were requested. Then, issues pending a decision from IMM or the Group were discussed. After this, new issues detected since last meeting and the consideration of new development due to the new Recommendation 21-08 were treated.

Below can be found four summary tables. The first one includes the activities that are already in production environment, updated from the last WG meeting. The second one includes the issues whose cost estimation has been requested; the third one includes issues that are pending of IMM decision and/or pending answers to doubts related the subjects. Finally, the fourth one contains issues considered "Open" to continue the discussion. For a more depth explanation of what was discussed in the meeting, go to Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.

Summary tables regarding the pending issues:

**Table 1.** List of issues developed from last Working Group and updated in Production Environment.

ISSUES DEVELOPED FROM LAST WORKING GROUP	ISSUE	STATUS
<b>ISSUES DEVELOPED</b>	ASYNCHRONOUS REPORTS	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	BCDs SEARCH	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	CAMPAIGN SETUP USING A FORM	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	MODIFICATION OF A TERM IN THE JFO FORM OF THE EBCD	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT

**Table 2.** List of issues on which cost estimation was considered necessary by the group.

ISSUES WHERE A COST ESTIMATION WAS CONSIDERED NECESSARY BY THE GROUP	ISSUE	STATUS (OPEN/ CLOSED)
<b>ISSUES COST ESTIMATED BUT NOT REQUESTED</b>	REFERENCE 2019-8 (35): TRADES COMPANIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES ADAPT THE SYSTEM TO ALLOW ACCESS TO NCP	Requirements sent on May 31 <sup>st</sup> 2019 (Open)
	REFERENCE 92: TRANSHIPMENTS LINKED WITH EBCD (Para 92 Rec 21-08)	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE 5.5.3: TRANSPORT AREA WITHIN TD SECTION TO BE MANDATORY AND INCLUDE DATES OF DEPARTURE AND ARRIVAL	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE 5.5.4: INCLUSION OF STEREO CAMERA RESULTS IN THE CAGING SECTION OF THE PRINTED EBCD	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE N° 5.5.5: DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW GROUPING OF FISH FROM THE SAME FLAG ORIGIN/SAME JFO	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE N° 6.1.: PARAGRAPH 26 OF REC. 21-08: FARMING CAPACITY	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	PARAGRAPH 102 OF REC. 21-08: ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME (ROP)	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE N° 5.4.1: REFERENCE 2019-7: DEVELOP A READ-ONLY PROFILE FOR ICCAT INSPECTORS UNDER JIS	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	QUESTION FROM JAPAN ON OBTAINING THE NECESSARY DATA FOR THE CALCULATION OF GROWTH RATES.	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022

**Table 3.** Issues pending of answers for addressing requirements' cost estimation.

ISSUES PENDING AN ACTION FROM WG OR IMM	TOPIC	STATUS (OPEN/ CLOSED)
Reference n° 5.5.6.: Mortality during towing voyage	Reflect mortality during towing vessel in chronological order	Referred to IMM
Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight-4. Tagging	Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight-	Referred to IMM
Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies.	Functionality that would solve duplicate sessions through a single action by the user	Open
Reference n° 27: Growth rates (Paragraph 27 of Rec. 21-08)	Farm CPCs shall endeavor to ensure that the growth rates derived from the eBCDs are coherent with the growth rates published by the SCRS	Referred to IMM
Reference n° 138: Amendments to ITDs and eBCDs following inspections at sea or investigations (Paragraph 138 of Rec. 21-08)	After an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority	Referred to IMM

**Table 4.** List of issues considered “Open” at April 2022.

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	STATUS
Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections	Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections	Open
When a traceability alert is generated due to an inconsistency in a split BCD, the alert is shown in all the branches (splits) of that catch	Show traceability alert in all branches added from the section that triggers the inconsistency	Open
Annex 11 of Rec. 21-08: Treatment of dead and/or lost fish	Treatment of fish that die during first transfer	Open
Coordination with the CDS WG and of issues from CDS WG of relevance	Coordination with the CDS WG and of issues from CDS WG of relevance	Open

## 2.1. Issues developed and updated in Production Environment

ISSUES DEVELOPED FROM LAST WORKING GROUP	ISSUE	STATUS
ISSUES DEVELOPED	ASYNCHRONOUS REPORTS	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	BCDs SEARCH	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	CAMPAIGN SETUP USING A FORM	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT
	MODIFICATION OF A TERM IN THE JFO FORM OF THE EBCD	IN PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT

### 2.1.1. Asynchronous Reports

The eBCD Support Team has received several incidents from different administrator's profile users, due to the difficulty they encountered in obtaining the “Flag's Raw Data” and the ‘eBCD's Raw Data’ reports.

Because of the large amount of data, that the system has for those flags, even for several months' time slots, the timeout error occur due to the time the system needs to extract the query on the database, as this is lengthy. For this reason, the users cannot download the report (for example: EU\_ESP from 1 January to 31 December 2021). The system does allow obtaining the same report in shorter time slots. I.e., by semesters or quarters, dividing the request the user needs in different months (for example in the case before, from 1 January to 30 June and another report from 1 July to 31 December). Therefore, the different reports would have the same information, but this is obtained in different files.

The proposal to ease the achievement of this report is to do this procedure in an asynchronous manner. Therefore, the user will make the request and once it is generated, the report will be displayed on another page in the eBCD system, created for this purpose. Cost estimation and requirements were sent on 31 March.

TRAGSA April 2022: No doubts of the WG were arisen on this topic. It was approved to undertake the development. ***This functionality was uploaded to the system on October 2022.***

### 2.1.2. eBCDs Search

Through the option 'BCD and BFTRC Registry/Search BCD', the search for a single eBCD by its code is performed relatively quickly. However, if you do not know the eBCD code and you try to find one or more eBCDs through the other filters, the search becomes impossible in most cases (Probably due to the high volume of data already in the database).

It would be convenient to reformulate this functionality or to try to find solutions to this type of searches so that they can be useful.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was discussed whether this issue was a necessity for the CPCs and if they have problems within the searching area in the eBCD system. The result was inconclusive. If the improvement of the searching is taking into consideration, Tragsa would need to do an analysis in order to see how to improve it. Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 31 March.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** No doubts of the WG were arisen on this topic. It was approved to undertake the development. ***This functionality was uploaded to the system on December 2022.***

### 2.1.3. Campaign Setup using a Form

The proposal is to create a form in the system in order to be able to setup each fishing campaign for users with ICCAT Secretariat profile.

The form will allow including the necessary information for activating the fishing campaign. Within this information it could be included, linking the campaign to the appropriate CPCs, associate the quotas for each CPC or link recommendations applicable to the campaign.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was considered an issue that can help the Secretariat management of the campaign. Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 31 March.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** No doubts of the WG were arisen on this topic. It was approved to undertake the development. ***This functionality was uploaded to the system in December 2022.***

### 2.1.4. Modification of a term in the JFO form of the eBCD

The US indicated that it is currently not clear from the printed eBCD corresponding to a JFO catch which vessel physically makes the catch. It is related to the term used: 'Representative'. It is noted that the Spanish and French version the term used is 'Responsible' while in the English version the term used is 'Representative'.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that it could be change the term 'Representative' for 'Responsible' in the English JFO form of the eBCD system in order to avoid any misunderstanding. This would equal the term for the three language versions. This could be done under maintenance allotment. It was decided to do this change under maintenance allotment. ***This change was updated to the system on October 2022.***

## 2.2. Issues cost estimated but not requested

ISSUES WHERE A COST ESTIMATION WAS CONSIDERED NECESSARY BY THE GROUP	ISSUE	STATUS (OPEN/ CLOSED)
ISSUES COST ESTIMATED BUT NOT REQUESTED	REFERENCE 2019-8 (35): TRADES COMPANIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES ADAPT THE SYSTEM TO ALLOW ACCESS TO NCP	Requirements sent on May 31 <sup>st</sup> 2019 (Open)
	REFERENCE 92: TRANSSHIPMENTS LINKED WITH EBCD (Para 92 Rec 21-08)	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE 5.5.3: TRANSPORT AREA WITHIN TD SECTION TO BE MANDATORY AND INCLUDE DATES OF DEPARTURE AND ARRIVAL	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE 5.5.4: INCLUSION OF STEREO CAMERA RESULTS IN THE CAGING SECTION OF THE PRINTED EBCD	Requirements sent on September 8 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE Nº 5.5.5: DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW GROUPING OF FISH FROM THE SAME FLAG ORIGIN/SAME JFO	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE Nº 6.1.: PARAGRAPH 26 OF REC. 21-08: FARMING CAPACITY	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	PARAGRAPH 102 OF REC. 21-08: ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME (ROP)	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	REFERENCE Nº 5.4.1: REFERENCE 2019-7: DEVELOP A READ-ONLY PROFILE FOR ICCAT INSPECTORS UNDER JIS	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022
	QUESTION FROM JAPAN ON OBTAINING THE NECESSARY DATA FOR THE CALCULATION OF GROWTH RATES.	Requirements sent on September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2022

2.2.1. *Reference 2019-8 (35): Trades Companies of Other Countries Adapt the System to Allow Access to NCP*

Issue is discussed in March 2017 WG Meeting and it is decided that in order to meet Rec. 15-10, access to non-CPC member should be facilitated. Tragsa explains that opening the current roles to non-CPCs could be addressed under maintenance allotment. In case new roles must be created, resorting to flexible allotment will be necessary. In the meeting it is agreed that:

- Importer/Exporter and validator roles will be opened to Non-CPCs. Modifications under maintenance allotment. Tragsa propose not to start this modification until it is decided to re-adapt the system to allow the access to non CPCs (development of new roles and profiles, see comments below)
- Representative of BFT ICCAT vessel; Representative of non BFT ICCAT vessel, Representative of a trap and Representative of a farm are types of roles that are not going to be available for NCPs.
- Create two new roles under flexible allotment.
  - “Representative of NCP carrier vessel”: This type of user will only have “read-only” permissions over BCDs in which he is involved.
  - NCP Administrator: This type of role will have different permissions than CPC/Flag administrators. The requirements were decided during the meeting and are listed below.

*Time cost analysis needs to be officially requested by ICCAT Secretariat.*

<b>Possible requirements for the role Person Responsible of Non-CPC Administration</b>
Access to record transshipment data of the tuna transshipped by his NCPC
Access to record export/selling data of dead fish from his NCPC
Access to record of the signature and date of signature in the purchase/import of dead fish of the purchases
Access to modification of the buyer/importer Company of the dead fish products) of the purchases of his
Access to record re-exportation data from his NCPC
Access to record re-exporter declaration of the re-exports from his NCPC
Access to record importer declaration of the purchases (re-exports) of his NCPC
Access to record and edit companies) of his NCPC
Access to check companies of his NCPC
Access to check vessels of his NCPC
Access to check authorized ports of his NCPC
Access to massive renewal of companies authorizations of his NCPC
Access to check entities from his NCPC
Access to check agencies from his NCPC
Access to record and edit users data associated with the entities of his NCPC
Access to check users associated with the entities of his NCPC
Access to users requests and/or roles upon entities of his NCPC
Access to modify users data
Access to change users password
Access to check Query Total Kg Imported by his NCPC
Access to check Query Total Kg Exported by his NCPC
Access to check Query Total Kg Re-exported by his NCPC
Access to Help section
Access to Audit Changes

**TRAGSA March 2019:** This activity was cost-estimated on 18 October 2018 and has not been officially requested yet. The budget presented by Tragsa was considered too expensive, so Tragsa proposes to re-calculate the budget including less functionality so the group can decide which option should be developed.

**TRAGSA September 2019:** This activity was cost-estimated again on 31 May 2019 and the development has not been officially requested yet.

Tragsa explains the impact of deciding the development or not of the items cost estimated:

- Not having **NCP Administrators**. In that case the ICCAT Secretariat profile should be responsible of accepting new users/roles and new companies.
- Not having **Representatives of NCP Carrier vessels**. This seems to be the activity less important as a representative of carrier vessel is not necessary for recording transfers or transshipments.
- Adapting the **Registers** record will allow creating NCPC validation entities and Agencies.
- Adapting the **Users Registration** functionality will allow the search and creation and edition of NCPC users.
- Adapting the **Self-Registration** functionality will allow the self-registration of importers and exporters from NCPCs
- Adapting the **BCD Registry** allows the addition of trades from NCPCs to existing BCDs
- Adapting the **BFTRC Registry** allows the creation of BFTRCs from NCPC exporting companies.
- Adapting **Reports** functionality allows NCPCs to download info concerning the BCDs on which they are involved.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was discussed the importance of this development regarding the transactions record in the eBCD system with No CPCs. It was considered a non-urgent development to be undertaken immediately. Development has not been officially requested yet.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was decided to keep it open for more discussion in the following TWG.

*2.2.2. Reference 92: Transshipments linked with eBCD (Para 92, Rec. 21-08)*

Paragraph 92 of Rec. 21-08 establishes that transshipment declaration shall be linked to eBCD system to facilitate data cross-checking. The masters of fishing vessels shall complete and transmit to their flag CPC the ICCAT transshipment declaration no later than 15 days after the date of transshipment in port as per Recommendation 16-15. The masters of the transshipping fishing vessels shall complete the ICCAT transshipment declaration in accordance with the format set out in Annex 3. The transshipment declaration shall be linked with the eBCD to facilitate crosschecking of data contained thereof.

In the meeting is discussed the option of including again a functionality that will allow uploading documents in transshipment section. This functionality will need to be cost estimated. At the end it was decided to address the issue to **IMM** to see if this paragraph could be met if eBCD code is included in transshipment declaration.

**TRAGSA September 2019:** We are not aware if the **IMM** has decided that it is enough if BCD code is included in transshipment declaration.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** After further discussed of the different ways of facing this issue it was decided to be addressed to IMM.


**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was discussed if this could be done by adding a code number of the transshipment declaration in the eBCD. Tragsa explains that this could be done in the 'Observations' field but it would not be easily cross reference, as 'Observation' field is a free text field in the section. A new field could be added if it is considered necessary. It was decided to defer it to IMM. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 8 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_03/i2023').

*2.2.3. Reference 5.5.3: Transport area within td section to be mandatory and include dates of departure and arrival*

Paper copies of the eBCD are used during transportation and in marketing places with the risk that same eBCD is duplicated. EU propose 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. 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.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** Discussion over the obligation of including the transport document were held, besides the possibility of including the date of departure and arrival, or the type of transportation in the trade section within the area of transportation. It was asked to Tragsa to see this viability of this obligation and the inclusion of new fields in this area of the TD section.

**NOTE:** The area in the TD section on the eBCD system for including the transport document, is the following:



In this area, it is possible to include the fields the WG consider necessarily (ie. Date of departure and arrival, type of transportation, etc.). Tragsa have a list of specific doubts regarding this issue in case it is decided to include these fields in the ‘Transportation description’ area:

Which would be the fields that need to be included?

What would be the profile type in charge of filling in this information?

Would be these fields editable in the following cases? TD exented/TD validated/TD signed by the importer.

If the fields were editable, which would be the profile type able to modify them?

If the fields were editable and the TD was validated, would the changes need to be audited? Would these fields need to be included in the print version?

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was decided to defer to IMM group, in order to find out whether this information might be mandatory or optional. It was decided that more discussion is needed by TWG regarding this issue. ***Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 8 September*** (Requirements can be found in the document ‘eBCD\_03/i2023’).

*2.2.4. Reference 5.5.4: Inclusion of stereoscopic camera results in the caging section of the printed eBCD*

On Annex 9 of Rec. 19-04 and Annex 3 of Rec. 18-13, Morocco presented a proposal to include the weight and number of fish results from the stereoscopic camera control in the caging section of the printed eBCD.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was explained that once the stereoscopic cameras fields in the caging sections are fill in, the data valid by the system are those ones. Therefore, once these fields are completed the data showing in the print BCD are the one from the stereoscopic cameras excluding the data first included in the caging section.



**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that this modification is feasible and can be done in the print eBCD version. After a discussion including different opinions regarding the necessity of change the printed eBCD version, and when the printed eBCD version should be used. It was decided to defer to the IMM to consult these questions and keep it open for more discussion in TWG. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 8 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_03/i2023').

*2.2.5. Reference 5.5.5: Development of functionality to allow grouping of fish from the same Flag origin/same JFO*

The Sub-Commission 2 (Paragraph 100 of Rec. 19-04) requested the working group to study the consideration of the regrouping of fish, in intra-farm transfers, in a new cage by assigning this operation a new eBCD with its own code. All this grouping would be within same flag origin/same JFO. An eventual amendment to para. 6 of Rec. 18-13 would be needed by adding a new one: Para. 6bis.

This issue was also discussed as a proposal arisen during TWG due to [Rec. 21-08](#) (2.7). As it is reflected in the paragraph 197: 'During intra-farm transfers, regrouping fish of the same flag origin and the same JFO, may be authorised by the farm CPC competent authority, providing that traceability, as established in paragraph 5 of Recommendation 18-13, and the applicability of SCRS's growth rates, are maintained'.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** Discussion over the regrouping of fish assigning a new code were made however seeing the complexity of the issue it was decided to leave it for further discussion in future TWG.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was decided that more discussion is needed in this matter and also to defer to IMM group. Time cost estimation would be requested in order to analyse the implications for traceability of this development. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 27 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_04/i2023').

*2.2.6. Reference 6.1: Farming Capacity (Paragraph 26 of [Rec. 21-08](#))*

The ICCAT Secretariat shall compile statistics on the annual amount of caging (input of wild caught fish), harvesting, and export, by farm CPC, using the data in the eBCD system. The eBCD- TWG shall consider the development of such a data extraction functionality, and until such functionality becomes available each farm CPC shall report these statistics to the ICCAT Secretariat. These statistics shall be made available on the ICCAT website subject to confidentiality requirements.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explains that these data can be obtain by the reports in the eBCD system, but right now it should be done CPC/Flag by CPC/Flag and it would be a complicated issue to compile all the data. A new report can be done that compile and simplify the extraction of the data needed, but it would require a new development. It was decided to ask for a time cost analysis of this development. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 27 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_04/i2023').

*2.2.7. ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (ROP) (Paragraph 102 of [Rec. 21-08](#))*

By way of derogation from paragraph 101, harvesting from farms up to 1000 kg per day and up to a maximum of 50 tons per farm per year to supply, the fresh bluefin tuna market, may be authorized by the relevant CPC provided that an authorized inspector from the farm CPC is onsite for 100% of such harvests, and controls the entire operation. The authorized inspector shall also validate the harvested quantities in the eBCD system. In this case, the regional observer's signature should not be required in the harvest section of the eBCD. This derogation shall be reviewed, as appropriate, by the PWG, possibly through its IMM Working Group, by 2023 at the latest.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was discussed the better option to approach this exception to the observer signing in the harvesting. A checkbox similar as the one used in 'Natural deaths' in the harvesting section is proposed. However, Tragsa explained that as the conditions of the exception needs to be accomplished in this new 'Checkbox' option, it would be a big change in the harvesting section. It was decided to ask for a time cost analysis studying the different possibilities. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 27 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_04/i2023').

2.2.8. *Reference 5.4.1: Reference 2019-7: Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT inspectors under JIS*

These users will have permissions to access any eBCD under inspection.

**TRAGSA March 2019:** At TWG meeting it is discussed how access of international inspectors to BCDs could be managed in the system. Tragsa informs that a list of inspectors will be necessary and someone should establish periods of authorizations to let them access all BCDs generated on that period of time. Another option could be giving permissions over certain vessels on a certain period of time, so they could check all BCDs recorded for that vessel at that time. Constrains on this option will be that someone should maintain the observers list and give permissions to the international inspectors. Finally it was decided that this should be addressed to **IMM**.

**TRAGSA September 2019:** This functionality has not been cost estimated yet as some doubts have not been solved. The list of doubts sent by Tragsa and answer provided are:

- 1. Who would create and maintain these users in the system:** ANSWER: The Secretariat would provide a list, or enter them similar to the ROPs
- 2. Should all these users have access to all BCDs in the system or only to those from vessels inspected?** ANSWER: All relevant ones (i.e catches and live trades for that year and hence 'enroute' (e.g. not harvests) – is this possible?
- 3. Would these users have an “activity period”, so they would only have access to the documents during that period** ANSWER: perhaps the period they are designated as inspectors

Tragsa gives some option to limit the access of these inspectors only to BCDs inspected or vessels inspected. At the end the group decides that the following three options will be considered:

1. The operator will give temporary access to the inspectors by sharing with him his account.
2. The inspector will not have access to the system. Nevertheless, the operator provides a copy of the document to the inspector.
3. The inspector will have access to the system and will search inspected BCDs using a functionality that will let him search BCDs from a vessel searched.

Tragsa will not be able to advance with the cost-estimation until the Group communicates the development team how the system should work.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was deeply discussed the different approaches of this profile. Important point for WG participants were that inspector has permit to do their inspection only when it is needed, moreover that CPC administrator were notified when the entity is going to have an inspection. Tragsa present a first draft of how these features could be combined in a profile in order to have a first approach. Further discussion needs to be done for deciding how this profile should work within the eBCD system.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was decided to keep it open for more discussion, however it is considered an important issue to achieve shortly. It was deferred to IMM with priority and to continue the discussion in the following WG. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 27 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_04/i2023').

2.2.9. *Question from Japan on obtaining the necessary data for the calculation of growth rates*

Japan was exploring the possibility for the eBCD System to allow officials of importing CPCs to know the data related to the calculation of the growth rate handled by exporting CPCs. This information is currently provided to Japan by these CPCs on a voluntary basis on request.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that actually it is not possible to obtain this information in the 'Raw data' reports until there is a trade, which involved the CPCs mentioned. It is decided to refer this issue to the Panel 2, in order to consider confidentiality issues. **Cost estimation was requested and requirements were sent on 27 September** (Requirements can be found in the document 'eBCD\_04/i2023').

### 2.3. Issues pending of answers for requirements' cost estimation

ISSUES PENDING AN ACTION FROM WG OR IMM	TOPIC	STATUS (OPEN/ CLOSED)
Reference n° 5.5.6.: Mortality during towing voyage	Reflect mortality during towing vessel in chronological order	Referred to IMM
Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight-4. Tagging	Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight-	Referred to IMM
Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies.	Functionality that would solve duplicate sessions through a single action by the user	Open
Reference n° 27: growth rates (Paragraph 27 of Rec. 21-08)	Farm CPCs shall endeavor to ensure that the growth rates derived from the eBCDs are coherent with the growth rates published by the SCRS	Referred to IMM
Reference n° 138: Amendments to ITDs and eBCDs following inspections at sea or investigations (Paragraph 138 of Rec. 21-08)	After an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority	Referred to IMM

#### 2.3.1. Reference 5.5.6: Mortality during towing voyage

Some flags have highlighted the difficulties of declaring mortality during the towing voyage. There is a procedure in order to declare this, but some Flags explain that this mortality should be reflected in chronological order and not in the caging section. It has been observed that transfer section is used in some eBCDs to declare this mortality occurred during the towing voyage. The transfer section does not keep the records of changes done and it does not need validation. Therefore, if declaration of fish is made in the transfer section instead of the caging section, tracking traceability and problems that may arise becomes complicated to solve.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** Discussion over the possibility of the system in order to declare the BFT mortality in chronological order was held. It was asked to Tragsa to see this viability and propose how this could be done in the system.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that this could be done with a new section that could allow declaring dead fishes chronologically. This 'new section' could be added from the Transfer section and would be a final section (this section would not allow to add any other section in the system). It was decided that more discussion is needed regarding this issue and to defer it to IMM group. **Cost estimation was requested.** In order to send the requirements and cost it is needed to discuss some doubts/questions. Questions sent on 6 October can be found in the document 'eBCD\_02/i2023'.

#### 2.3.2. Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight - 4. Tagging:

**TRAGSA September 2016:** US asks if the system cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight. Tragsa confirms that the system does not inform about differences. **The option of reporting Administrators when these figures exceed a certain % of tolerance is discussed.** An email will be sent to administrators but no inconsistency will be shown in the system. While Tragsa was present no % of tolerance was established. Modifications need to be done under Flexibility allotment.

**TRAGSA March 2017:** The issue is addressed again but no conclusion was obtained. At the end it is decided to leave the issue open and could be discussed in future meetings if Commission decides an action like this is necessary.

**TRAGSA January 2018:** US asks EU why the figures of sampling average weight does not match with average weight calculated by the system for the total catch. Spain explains that sampling average weigh can be less or equal to the one obtained by the system depending on the product presentation of BFT sampled. The issue is left **Open** as the TWG considered necessary further discussion.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** Issue not discussed in the WG, however USA asks to be remained 'Open' for further discussion in next meetings.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was decided to keep it open for more discussion in the IMM and the following WG. **Cost estimation was requested.** In order to send the requirements and cost it is needed to discuss some doubts/questions. Questions sent on 6 October can be found in the document 'eBCD\_02/i2023'.

2.3.3. *Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies*

The US asked whether it would be possible to have a functionality that would solve the problem of duplicate sessions through a single action by the user.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that currently in production there is already a message that adequately describes what is happening and how to solve this issue. This solution is already implemented by the browsers. However, Tragsa could do an analysis of the development of a button for this purpose. It was decided to request a time cost estimation for this development. **Cost estimation was requested.** In order to send the requirements and cost it is needed to discuss some doubts/questions. Questions sent on 6 October can be found in the document 'eBCD\_02/i2023'.

2.3.4. *Reference N° 27: Growth Rates (paragraph 27 of Rec. 21-08)*

Farm CPCs shall endeavor 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.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was discussed the necessity of a development that do a calculation of the growth rates in the system, not as a short term development but as long term one, in order to use a consistent methodology in the calculation of growth rates for all CPCs. It is decided to keep it open for TWG discussion in the future. **Cost estimation was requested.** In order to send the requirements and cost it is needed to discuss some doubts/questions. Questions sent on 6 October can be found in the document 'eBCD\_02/i2023'.

2.3.5. *Reference N° 138: Amendments to ITDs and eBCDs following inspections at sea or investigations (paragraph 138 of Rec. 21-08)*

If following an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority of the donor operator to reflect the result of the investigation.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** After the discussion of this issue it was decided it should be deferred to IMM. Besides, it was decided to defer it to Panel 2 for further discussion in order to examine this issue and its implications. **Cost estimation was requested.** In order to send the requirements and cost it is needed to discuss some doubts/questions. Questions sent on 6 October can be found in the document 'eBCD\_02/i2023'.

2.4. *Other issues considered "Open" at April 2022*

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	STATUS
Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections	Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections	Open
When a traceability alert is generated due to an inconsistency in a split BCD, the alert is shown in all the branches (splits) of that catch	Show traceability alert in all branches added from the section that triggers the inconsistency	Open
Annex 11 of Rec. 21-08: Treatment of dead and/or lost fish	Treatment of fish that die during first transfer	Open
Coordination with the CDS WG and of issues from CDS WG of relevance	Coordination with the CDS WG and of issues from CDS WG of relevance	Open

2.4.1 *Include the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections*

The WG requested in the September 2014 meeting to include only **the 'plausible' transformations of declared products between different sections**. This also applies to the transshipment section in the E-BFT. (i.e., 'gutted and gilled' cannot be followed by 'whole'). Any modification will be considered new developments under flexibility allotment.

Tragsa is now working on including BFTRC in these cross-checks. When re-exporting parts of a batch of BCDs, the system will consider all the plausible options included in the whole batch. This is the only valid solution as when using batches in BFTRCs, the BFT re-exported is not assigned to a specific BCD.

**USA March 2019:** USA recalls that the group needs to send to Tragsa the plausible transformations.

**TRAGSA September 2019:** This functionality was requested on June 2018 after its cost-estimation. In product presentation drop-down menu, the system will only display the plausible options compatible with the products selected in previous section. Tragsa is waiting for receiving from the Group the list of plausible transformations, but the functionality was uploaded to the system in December 2018.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** It was discussed which would be the plausible transformations. It was decided that a document will be done and share within the CPC WG participants in order to agree in these transformations.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that to determine which transformation will be followed by each of the product types, is what it is needed to update in the eBCD system. It was proposed to have a volunteer group to look into this issue and prepare a draft document in order to continue the discussion.

#### *2.4.2 When a traceability alert is generated due to an inconsistency in a split BCD, the alert is shown in all the branches (splits) of that catch (05/07/2016)*

In March 2017 it is discussed the possibility of showing alerts only in concerned branches. Tragsa informs that how to prevent an alert being displayed in all the branches of a BCD can be studied. However, detecting in which specific section the error was performed is impossible. Consequently, the alert needs at least to be displayed in all branches added from the section that triggers the traceability alert. The alert is also shown in the section that triggers the alert.

I.e., if we have a harvesting of 300 kgs, and afterwards two trade sections adding up 301 kgs are added to that harvesting, the traceability alert is displayed in the harvesting and in both trade sections. The system cannot know which trade section is wrong. Time cost analysis needs to be officially requested by ICCAT Secretariat.

**TRAGSA March 2019:** Issue not discussed and Cost estimation of this issue has never been requested.

**TRAGSA September 2019:** Tragsa explains again that if a trade has an alert, the alert will be displayed in all the trades (branches) of that BCD. Importers will find the message but they will not be able to detect that the problem is in a different trade operation. The Group must decide if this development is necessary or not.

**TRAGSA June 2021:** Tragsa explains that since the upload of an updated in 2018 regarding the Frozen and Fresh products, it was unable to record a trade (TD) section with more kilos than the available in the section above. Therefore, the inconsistencies regarding traceability in TD (the ones discussed in the previous WG) did not appear now. Regardless traceability inconsistencies in other sections will remain displayed because it is the way the system alerts the users of these errors in order to be corrected. Cost estimation of this issue has never been requested.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that the inconsistencies that affect the whole eBCD cannot be delimited by branches, because they are established for affecting the whole eBCD. In order to be able to delimit by branches, it would be necessary to change these inconsistencies affecting the whole eBCD to be displayed in a determinate section. It was decided not to do anything for the moment but to keep it open.

#### *2.4.3 Annex 11 of Rec. 21-08: Treatment of dead and/or lost fish*

##### **Treatment of fish that die during first transfer**

3. The bluefin tuna that die during the first transfer from a purse seine vessel or trap shall be recorded in the purse seine vessel logbook or the trap daily catch report and reported on the ICCAT Transfer Declaration (ITD) and on the transfer section of the eBCD.

4. The eBCD shall be provided to the towing vessel(s) with Section 2 (Total Catch), Section 3 (Live fish trade) and Section 4 (Transfer - including "dead" fish) completed.
5. The total quantities reported in Sections 3 and 4 shall be equal to the quantities reported in Section 2, after deductions of all the mortalities observed between the catch and completion of the transfer.
6. The eBCD shall be accompanied by the ITD in accordance with the provisions of this Recommendation. The number of bluefin tuna reported in the ITD (transferred live), must equal the number reported in Section 3 in the associated eBCD.
7. A split of the eBCD with Section 8 (Trade information) shall be completed and given to the auxiliary vessel which will transport the dead bluefin tuna to shore (or retained on the catching vessel or the trap if landed directly to shore). This dead fish and split eBCD must be accompanied with a copy of the ITD.
8. With regard to eBCD, the dead fish shall be allocated to the catching vessel which made the catch or, in the case of JFOs, either to participating catching vessels or flags.

#### **Treatment of fish that die during caging operations**

13. The fish that die during caging operations shall be reported by the operator on the caging declaration. The farm CPC competent authority shall ensure that the number and weight of the fish that die is reported in the relevant field of Section 6 of the eBCD.

#### **Treatment of fish that die and/or are lost during farming activities**

14. Dead or lost fish in farms or those that disappear from farms, including allegedly stolen or escaped fish, shall be reported by the farm operator to the farm CPC competent authority immediately after the event has been detected. The farm operator's report shall be accompanied by the necessary supporting evidence (complaint filed about the stolen fish, damage report in case of damage to the cage, etc.). After receipt of such report, the farm CPC competent authority shall apply the necessary changes or cancellation of the eBCD concerned (following the necessary developments in the eBCD system).

**TRAGSA April 2022:** It was discussed how the treatment of these dead fishes could be implemented in the eBCD system. Tragsa explains that it could be done with a new section for not marketable fishes with the different assumptions (escaped, stolen,...), in order to declared dead fishes in the different parts of the system. This section would be a final section and it would deduct number and kg of dead fishes from the ones available in the eBCD. An analysis is necessary in order to see how this development could be implemented. It was decided to request a time cost estimation of this analysis for having a concrete proposal. ***Time cost estimation has not been officially requested yet.***

#### *2.4.4 Coordination with the CDS WG and of issues from CDS WG of relevance*

The TWG Chair explained that ICCAT agreed that there should be a Working Group dedicated exclusively to the CDS, under the framework of Res. 21-21. This CDS Working Group met on 4 and 5 April 2022. There is a reference in the Resolution that calls for coordination with the eBCD TWG on the different issues that may be interconnected, such as the extension of the CDS for new species, etc. The first question that Tragsa should be consulted on would be whether new developments would be necessary or whether there is the possibility of extending the current eBCD System to meet the needs of the CDS. In this case, each CDS does not imply using all the sections currently used by a BCD as the latter is more complex and deals with more operations.

**TRAGSA April 2022:** Tragsa explained that the eBCD system is a very large system, which means that any modification to include new species will require a precise definition of what should be the new implementation in order to evaluate its feasibility. It was decided that Tragsa would be asked to provide a list of the current eBCD fields to be compared with those that conform the different specific ICCAT KDEs.

**Requirements for the TWG requests 2022. Part I**

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

---

**CONTENT**

<b>1. SPECIFIC FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TWG REQUESTS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1 Report section No. / Reference n° 92: Transhipments linked with eBCD (Para 92 Rec. 21-08).....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1.1 Background.....	2
1.1.2 Technical specifications.....	2
1.1.3 Specific requirements.....	2
1.1.4 Cost estimation.....	3
<b>1.2 Report section No. / Reference n° 5.5.3: Transport area within TD section to be mandatory and include dates of departure and arrival.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.2.1 Background.....	3
Objective.....	3
Current situation.....	3
1.2.2 Technical specifications.....	4
1.2.3 Specific requirements.....	4
1.2.4 Cost estimation.....	4
<b>1.3 Report section No. / Reference n° 5.5.4: Inclusion of stereo camera results in the caging section of the printed eBCD. ....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.3.1 Background.....	5
1.3.2 Technical specifications.....	6
1.3.3 Specific requirements.....	6
1.3.4 Cost estimation.....	7



## *Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

---

The specific requirements are collected from the final cost/time requests and the study of the existing documentation provided until today: the Recommendation currently in force on ICCAT Bluefin tuna Catch Documentation Program (Recommendation 21-08), the draft Recommendation by ICCAT to clarify and amend aspects of ICCAT's Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation of the eBCD to facilitate the application of the eBCD System (IMM-005B), and reports resulting from the meetings of the eBCD Technical Working Group that, in collaboration with ICCAT Secretariat, are responsible for defining the technical specifications to be met by the system.

These specifications have to be adapted to the modifications made to the current ICCAT Recommendations. It is important to stress that these legal obligations and their adaptation have a direct influence on these specifications and on the development of the system.

The following activities are included in the estimation:

- Analysis and design documents update
- New requirements implementation
- Unit and functional tests
- User manuals update

### ***1. SPECIFIC FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TWG REQUESTS***

#### ***1.1 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 92: TRANSHIPMENTS LINKED WITH EBCD (PARA 92 REC. 21-08).***

##### ***1.1.1 Background***

Paragraph 92 of Rec. 21-08 establishes: 'The transshipment declaration shall be linked with the eBCD to facilitate cross-checking of data contained thereof'

At the meeting, the option of including a functionality that would allow documents to be attached to the transshipment section of the eBCD system was proposed as a possible solution.

##### ***1.1.2 Technical specifications***

A new area will be included in the transshipment section of the eBCD system "Transshipment Description". When saving this section, the user can attach the ICCAT transshipment declaration in accordance with the format established in Annex 3 of Recommendation 21-08.

##### ***1.1.3 Specific requirements***

It would included the following changes:

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

- A new area to the transshipment section will be add: 'Transshipment Description'" in which it is allowed to upload pdf files.
- The information of the 'Transshipment Description' could be add/modify by:
  - o The user who do the recording of the section as long as the section has not been validated.
  - o The user who do the recording of the section if it is exempted as long as the section does not have subsequent sections.
  - o A Flag/CPC administrator responsible of the section at any time.

**1.1.4 Cost estimation**

Profile	Total Hours	Cost	Budget
Consultant	8	52,01 €	416,08 €
Project Manager	16	46,56 €	745,01 €
Business Analyst	40	35,83 €	1.433,30 €
Programmer Analyst	80	33,96 €	2.716,46 €
Business Expert	80	31,41 €	2.512,46 €
<b>REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 92</b>			<b>7.823,32 €</b>

**1.2 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 5.5.3: TRANSPORT AREA WITHIN TD SECTION TO BE MANDATORY AND INCLUDE DATES OF DEPARTURE AND ARRIVAL.****1.2.1 Background****Objective**

Provide within the form of the trade section (TD) fields that allow the inclusion of the information of the transport data.

**Current situation**

Currently in the trade section there is an area called 'Transportation description (Relevant documentation)', which allows to attach documents, but there are no specific fields where it can be included relevant transport's information.

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022***1.2.2 Technical specifications**

New fields will be included in the 'Transportation description (Relevant documentation)' area of the trade section of the eBCD system. In order for users to be able to include the transportation information in the new fields, when recording the section.

**1.2.3 Specific requirements**

The new fields would be added in the trade section to reflect the transport information.

The following fields are proposed:

- Departure date
- Expected arrival date
- Point of Exportation/Departure
- Transport type (Air / Sea / Land / Others)
- Transport company
- Transport vehicle registration number

This information will not be mandatory in order to guarantee the registration of the trade section even if these information is not available in the recording time. Besides, not being mandatory will also guarantee the data edition of the preexisting trades.

It would included the following changes:

- Add the new fields to the 'Transportation description (Relevant documentation)' area of the trade section
- The information of these fields could be add/modify by:
  - o An exporter as long as the section has not been validated.
  - o An exporter as long as the section has not been signed by the importer.
  - o An exporter as long as the section has not have subsequent sections.
  - o A Flag/CPC administrator responsible of the section at any time.

**1.2.4 Cost estimation**

Profile	Total Hours	Cost	Budget
Consultant	9,6	52,01 €	499,29 €
Project Manager	19,2	46,56 €	894,01 €
Business Analyst	48	35,83 €	1.719,96 €
Programmer Analyst	96	33,96 €	3.259,76 €
Business Expert	96	31,41 €	3.014,96 €
<b>REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 5.5.3</b>			<b>9.387,98 €</b>

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

---

**1.3 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 5.5.4: INCLUSION OF STEREO CAMERA RESULTS IN THE CAGING SECTION OF THE PRINTED EBCD.**

**1.3.1 Background**

It is proposed to modify the print version of the eBCD to include the information of the final caging results based on the results of the stereoscopic cameras (SC) in an explicitly manner. Therefore, the initial data and the ones resulting from the SC could be differentiated.

Currently in the system, as there is no differentiation, the information related to the fish description and size composition of the SC is shown in the printed eBCD version, if these have been declared. In case that the information of the SC is not declared, the information shown in the print version is the cage description included in the farming section when the registration of the section was done.

**► Cage Description**

Cage Code

No. of Fish

Total Weight  ,

Size Composition (number of pieces)

<6.4 Kg	<input type="text" value="0"/>
6.4-30 Kg	<input type="text" value="0"/>
>30 Kg	<input type="text" value="40"/>

Final caging results on the basis of the results of the SC cameras (if applicable)

Date of results   Time GMT

No. fish farmed

Total weight farmed  ,

Size composition according results

<6.4 Kg	<input type="text" value="0"/>
6.4-30 Kg	<input type="text" value="1"/>
>30 Kg	<input type="text" value="40"/>

Notes (max 4.000 characters)

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

5. FARMING INFORMATION						
FARMING FACILITY DESCRIPTION	NAME	PRT FARM COMPANY 01		CPC	EU.Portugal	ICCAT FFB No. AT051PRT99995
	NATIONAL SAMPLING PROGRAM? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			LOCATION		
CAGE DESCRIPTION	DATE(dd/mm/yy)	01/Aug/22		CAGE No.	JAULA_01	
FISH DESCRIPTION	No. of FISH	41	TOTALWEIGHT(kg)	4100.025	AVG. WEIGHT (kg)	100.001
ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER INFORMATION	NAME	TRAGSA OBSERVER TEST		TITLE	Observador Regional	SIGNATURE
						999
SIZE COMPOSITION	<=4 Kg	0	6.4-30 Kg	1	>30 Kg	40
GOVERNMENT VALIDATION						
NAME OF AUTHORITY	VALID01 PRT TEST					Validated <b>TEST</b> (This is an electronic BCD)
TITLE	Fisheries Assistant					
SIGNATURE	VALID01 PRT TEST					
DATE(dd/mm/yy)	05/Aug/22					
VALIDATOR NOTES						

**1.3.2 Technical specifications**

Print all the information related to the fish description and the size composition, both from the caging and from the results obtained from the SC.

**1.3.3 Specific requirements**

New fields will be added in the section '6. FARMING INFORMATION' to fill in the information of the final caging results based on the results of the SC.

The following format is proposed:

5. FARMING INFORMATION						
FARMING FACILITY DESCRIPTION	NAME	PRT FARM COMPANY 01		CPC	EU.Portugal	ICCAT FFB No. AT051PRT99995
	NATIONAL SAMPLING PROGRAM? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			LOCATION		
CAGE DESCRIPTION	DATE(dd/mm/yy)	01/Aug/22		CAGE No.	JAULA_01	
FISH DESCRIPTION	No. of FISH	40	TOTALWEIGHT(kg)	4000	AVG. WEIGHT (kg)	100
SIZE COMPOSITION	<=4 Kg	0	6.4-30 Kg	0	>30 Kg	40
FINAL CAGING RESULTS ON THE BASIS OF THE RESULTS OF SC CAMERAS				DATE(dd/mm/yy)	02/Aug/22	
FISH DESCRIPTION SC	No. of FISH	41	TOTALWEIGHT(kg)	4100.025	AVG. WEIGHT (kg)	100.001
SIZE COMPOSITION SC	<=4 Kg	0	6.4-30 Kg	1	>30 Kg	40
ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER INFORMATION	NAME	TRAGSA OBSERVER TEST		TITLE	Observador Regional	SIGNATURE
						999
GOVERNMENT VALIDATION						
NAME OF AUTHORITY	VALID01 PRT TEST					Validated <b>TEST</b> (This is an electronic BCD)
TITLE	Fisheries Assistant					
SIGNATURE	VALID01 PRT TEST					
DATE(dd/mm/yy)	05/Aug/22					
VALIDATOR NOTES						

In the row fields:

CAGE DESCRIPTION

FISH DESCRIPTION

SIZE COMPOSITION

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

The information recorded in the caging will be displayed


In the fields of the new rows added:

FINAL CAGING RESULTS ON THE BASIC OF THE RESULTS OF SC CAMERAS

FISH DESCRIPTION SC

SIZE COMPOSITION SC

The information recorded as a result of the SC will be displayed if these information has been included in the eBCD caging section.



**1.3.4 Cost estimation**

Profile	Total Hours	Cost	Budget
Consultant	1,2	52,01 €	62,41 €
Project Manager	2,4	46,56 €	111,75 €
Business Analyst	18	35,83 €	644,99 €
Programmer Analyst	16	33,96 €	543,29 €
Business Expert	10	31,41 €	314,06 €
<b>2019-4B: PRINT FUNCTIONS: OTHER PRESENTATIONS</b>			<b>1.676,50 €</b>

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022*

---

**2. TOTAL COST**

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	18,8	52,01 €	977,78 €
Project Manager	37,6	46,56 €	1.750,77 €
Business Analyst	106	35,83 €	3.798,26 €
Programmer Analyst	192	33,96 €	6.519,51 €
Business Expert	186	31,41 €	5.841,48 €
<b><i>TOTAL COST</i></b>			<b>18.887,80 €</b>



## Requirements for the TWG requests 2022. Part II

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II***CONTENT**

<b>1. SPECIFIC FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TWG REQUESTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1 Report section No. / Reference n° 5.5.5: Development of functionality to allow grouping of fish from the same flag origin/same jfo /6.16. Paragraph 197 of Rec. 21-08: Control activities in farms after caging / Intra-farm transfers. ....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1.1 Background .....	2
1.1.2 Technical specifications and Specific Requirements .....	3
1.1.3 Cost estimation .....	4
<b>1.2 Report section No. / Reference n° 6.1.: Paragraph 26 of Rec. 21-08: Farming capacity.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.2.1 Background .....	4
Objective.....	4
1.2.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements .....	4
1.2.3 Cost estimation .....	6
<b>1.3 Report section No. / Reference n° 6.5.: Paragraph 102 of Rec. 21-08: ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (ROP) .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3.1 Background .....	6
1.3.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements .....	6
1.3.3 Cost estimation .....	8
<b>1.4 Report section No. / Reference n° 5.4.1: Reference 2019-7: Develop a read-only profile for ICCAT inspectors under JIS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.4.1 Background .....	8
1.4.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements .....	8
1.4.3 Cost estimation .....	10
<b>1.5 Report section No. / Reference n° "new question": Question from Japan on obtaining the necessary data for the calculation of growth rates.....</b>	<b>10</b>
1.5.1 Background .....	10
1.5.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements .....	11
1.5.3 Cost estimation .....	12
<b>2. TOTAL COST.....</b>	<b>12</b>



*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

The specific requirements are collected from the final cost/time requests and the study of the existing documentation provided until today: the Recommendation currently in force on ICCAT Bluefin tuna Catch Documentation Program (Recommendation 21-08), the draft Recommendation by ICCAT to clarify and amend aspects of ICCAT's Bluefin Tuna Catch Documentation of the eBCD to facilitate the application of the eBCD System (IMM-005B), and reports resulting from the meetings of the eBCD Technical Working Group that, in collaboration with ICCAT Secretariat, are responsible for defining the technical specifications to be met by the system.

These specifications have to be adapted to the modifications made to the current ICCAT Recommendations. It is important to stress that these legal obligations and their adaptation have a direct influence on these specifications and on the development of the system.

The following activities are included in the estimation:

- Analysis and design documents update
- New requirements implementation
- Unit and functional tests
- User manuals update

**1. SPECIFIC FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TWG REQUESTS**

**1.1 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 5.5.5: DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW GROUPING OF FISH FROM THE SAME FLAG ORIGIN/SAME JFO /6.16. PARAGRAPH 197 OF REC. 21-08: CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN FARMS AFTER CAGING / INTRA-FARM TRANSFERS.**

**1.1.1 Background**

As specified in the recommendations 21-08 and 18-13 about the issues, it establishes the following:

Recommendation 21-08, paragraph 197: *'During intra-farm transfers, regrouping fish of the same flag origin and the same JFO, may be authorized by the farm CPC competent authority, providing that traceability, as established in paragraph 5 of Recommendation 18-13, and the applicability of SCRS's growth rates, are maintained'*.

Recommendation 18-13, paragraph 5: *'Farm CPCs shall ensure that bluefin tuna catches are placed in separate cages or series of cages and partitioned on the basis of flag CPC origin. By derogation, if the bluefin tuna are caught in the context of a joint fishing operation (JFO) between different CPCs, farm CPCs shall ensure that bluefin tuna are placed in separate cages or series of cages and partitioned on the basis of joint fishing operations'*.

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

**1.1.2 Technical specifications and Specific Requirements**

As the eBCD system currently works, it is not possible to perform a regrouping in this way, creating a new eBCD code. The main reason is that the cage's field in the different sections of the eBCD are "free text" type field, not being specifically identified in the system.

In order to be able to plan this development, **it would be necessary first to establish a cage declaration for each farm**. It will be necessary to have a cage registry such as those that currently exist for vessels, traps, farms or companies. It will be necessary to determine which data will have to be registered for each cage in order to identify specifically each of the cages in which the caging or subsequent movements between cages will be carried out.

The information on these cages, as it is something specific to each farm, **would have to be provided together with the rest of the farm information by ICCAT**, so that it is incorporated into the eBCD system through the twice-daily farm synchronization process.

**Once this cage register is created, multiple changes would have to be done to the Farming (CG) and Movements between cages (MC) sections. The most obvious one will be that each of these sections will have a destination cage associated with it and in the case of MC also an origin cage that would be uniquely identified.**

When this development would be implemented, it could be considered to extend the functionalities of the system with new reports and/or forms to show, for example, which eBCDs are associated with a determinate cage or how many fish are available.

**Given the scope of the system configuration, this new functionality would only be available for newly registered eBCDs (it would not be retroactive).**

The inclusion of this cage registry would have a strong impact on the eBCD system involving changes in:

- database model
- farm synchronization
- farming section (form, business and printed BCD)
- movement between cages (form, business and printed BCD)
- existing reports involving these sections

After making all these changes, it would be possible to analyse how to group fish from different eBCDs (same flag/JFO origin) in the same cage, but as mentioned above, this is not feasible as the system is currently working. **The first phase for this development will have to be the cage-specific identification, in order to be able to start to evaluate the grouping BCDS.**

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

**In any case, eBCDs can only be regrouped when they have been recorded with the new developments updated in the system, and therefore all eBCDs recorded prior to this update cannot be regrouped, so both systems must coexist.**

**1.1.3 Cost estimation**

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	16	52,01 €	832,16 €
Project Manager	48	46,56 €	2.235,02 €
Business Analyst	80	35,83 €	2.866,61 €
Programmer Analyst	480	33,96 €	16.298,78 €
Business Expert	320	31,41 €	10.049,86 €
<i>Reference n° 5.5.5.: Development of functionality to allow grouping of fish from the same flag</i>			<b>32.282,43 €</b>

**1.2 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 6.1.: PARAGRAPH 26 OF REC. 21-08: FARMING CAPACITY.****1.2.1 Background****Objective**

As specified in the recommendation 21-08 paragraph 26: *'The ICCAT Secretariat shall compile statistics on the annual amount of caging (input of wild caught fish), harvesting, and export, by farm CPC, using the data in the eBCD system. The eBCD-TWG shall consider the development of such a data extraction functionality, and until such functionality becomes available, each farm CPC shall report these statistics to the ICCAT Secretariat. These statistics shall be made available on the ICCAT website subject to confidentiality requirements'.*

**1.2.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements**

For compliance with Paragraph 26 of recommendation 21-08, we propose the implementation of a new report that will be available only for users with an "ICCAT Secretary" profile. This report will compile information on the amount of fish (number and kilos) in cages, harvesting and first trades. The information in this report will be displayed in a disaggregated way grouping the data by year and CPC/Farm Flag, so that confidentiality is maintained in all cases.

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

This report will be available in the "Reports" section of the eBCD options menu and will only be shown to users with the "ICCAT Secretary" profile. Once this is defined and implemented, the possibility of including it in the asynchronous execution of reports will be evaluated to ensure its correct extraction.

The search parameters will be a period of caging:

- Date from
- Date until

The field to be displayed will be:

- Caging year
- CPC/Flag Farm
- Total No. fish caged
- Total kilos caged
- Total No. fish harvested
- Total kilos harvested
- Total Kg traded (1<sup>st</sup> trade)

An Excel template would be defined on which the data would be uploaded for downloading and correct visualisation.

Caging year	Farm's flag or Farm's CPC	Total No. fish caged	Total Kilos caged	Total Kilos harvested	Total No. fish harvested	Total Kilos traded (1 <sup>st</sup> Trade)
-------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---

If necessary, you can also add fields with information on released and lost fish from movements between cages:

- Total No. fish released
- Total No. fish lost

Caging year	Farm's flag or Farm's CPC	Total No. fish caged	Total Kilos caged	Total No. fish released	Total No. fish lost	Total Kilos harvested	Total No. fish harvested	Total Kilos traded (1 <sup>st</sup> Trade)
-------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II***1.2.3 Cost estimation**

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	8	52,01 €	416,08 €
Project Manager	15	46,56 €	698,45 €
Business Analyst	40	35,83 €	1.433,30 €
Programmer Analyst	80	33,96 €	2.716,46 €
Business Expert	60	31,41 €	1.884,35 €
<i>Reference n° 6.1.: Paragraph 26 of Rec. 21-08: Farming capacity</i>			<b>7.148,64 €</b>

**1.3 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 6.5.: PARAGRAPH 102 OF REC. 21-08: ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME (ROP)****1.3.1 Background**

As specified in the recommendation 21-08, paragraph 102: *'By way of derogation from paragraph 101, harvesting from farms up to 1000 kg per day and up to a maximum of 50 tons per farm per year to supply the fresh bluefin tuna market may be authorized by the relevant CPC provided that an authorized inspector from the farm CPC is onsite for 100% of such harvests, and controls the entire operation. The authorized inspector shall also validate the harvested quantities in the eBCD system. In this case, the regional observer's signature should not be required in the harvest section of the eBCD. This derogation shall be reviewed, as appropriate, by the PWG, possibly through its IMM Working Group, by 2023 at the latest'.*

**1.3.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements**

In order to comply with Paragraph 102 of recommendation 21-08, we propose the modification of the current harvesting section.

Information on whether or not the farm meets the requirements for a priori not needing the signature of the ROP at harvesting (maximum 1,000 kg per day/farm and up to a maximum of 50 t per farm per year), could be provided by ICCAT together with the farm's authorisation data. This information could be recorded in the eBCD during the twice daily entity synchronisation process. For this purpose, a Boolean field (T/F) could be created to indicate



*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

whether during the authorisation period the farm does not require the signature of the ROP for harvestings that meet the requirements of the recommendation.

The user will not know until the moment the harvesting has been registered whether or not it requires the signature of the ROP, as it is necessary that during the recording of the section, the system do the corresponding validations to determine whether or not the section meets the requirements established in paragraph 102 of recommendation 21-08.

In case the maximum amounts set out in this paragraph 102 could vary depending on the CPC, year or any other variable, it is proposed to parameterise these values in database tables in order to simplify the maintenance.

In any case, to control the total harvested farm/year, a new table will be required that establishes for each farm and year, the maximum number of kilos that can be harvested per year to manage without the signing of the ROP. Besides, another field must be included in which the kilos harvested will be counted. It will behave in a similar way to the quotas from vessels, although in this case it will be understood as a constant value, so the possibility that the value may change throughout the authorisation period would not be contemplated.

New fields will be added in the database which will be necessary to indicate whether or not the harvesting is within or out the recommendation, as it will be essential to know in case the section is modified/deleted whether the consumed values have to be modified and which is the reason:

- Maximum kg harvested farm/day
- Maximum kg harvested farm/year

If when recording a new harvesting it is found that the maximum Kg harvested per year has already been exceeded for that farm, no further checks will be carried out and the signature of the ROP will be mandatory requested. Otherwise, it will be necessary to check if the authorized kilos per farm/day have been exceeded, to request or not the ROP signature.

The form in the harvesting section of the eBCD will be modified to indicate whether the harvesting follows this recommendation.

**If it is finally agreed to implement this development, we would have to resolve several issues in order to define the final requirements of the functionality, for example:**

- Can the signature of the ROP be explicitly requested?

Since making changes to dates or kilograms of recorded harvesting may change whether or not these changes meet the requirements of paragraph 102 of recommendation 28-01 as they may have a direct impact on the values consumed, it would necessary also to know:

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

- When can changes be made?
- What changes would be authorised and to which profiles?

**1.3.3 Cost estimation**

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	8	52,01 €	416,08 €
Project Manager	48	46,56 €	2.235,02 €
Business Analyst	80	35,83 €	2.866,61 €
Programmer Analyst	320	33,96 €	10.865,86 €
Business Expert	160	31,41 €	5.024,93 €
<b>1.3 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 6.5.: PARAGRAPH 102 OF REC. 21-08: ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME (ROP)</b>			<b>21.408,49 €</b>

**1.4 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° 5.4.1: REFERENCE 2019-7: DEVELOP A READ-ONLY PROFILE FOR ICCAT INSPECTORS UNDER JIS****1.4.1 Background**

It is proposed to create a new user profile "JIS Inspector ICCAT" which will be incompatible with any other user profile.

**1.4.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements**

The management of these users will be the task of users with the "ICCAT Secretary" profile, as they may have permits over different entities from different CPCs/flags, and will be carried out from a new menu option: Registry → JIS ICCAT Inspectors

The "ICCAT Secretary" users shall be allowed to register new ICCAT inspector-type users by indicating the following data <sup>1</sup>:

- Name \*
- Surname \*

<sup>1</sup> All mandatory fields are marked with \*

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

- City
- Title
- Job Title
- Language \*
- Address
- Postal Code
- Phone
- Fax
- E-mail \*

This profile will have a special operation as for each of these inspectors, it will necessary to establishes the entities to which they have access to and the dates on which they have permissions over these entities.

Permits can be given for any existing entity in the eBCD system (vessels, traps, farms) for a limited period. In order to give these permits to the inspector, it is mandatory to provide the following information:

- Entity on which the inspection is going to be carried out \*
- Inspection start date \*
- Inspection end date \*

Upon registration, a username and password will be assigned to the user. The user will receive a new e-mail with its eBCD access credentials. A new email type [eBCD ICCAT] New JIS ICCAT Inspector must be defined.

It will be allowed to assign several entities to be inspected to the same JIS Inspector ICCAT in overlapping periods.

The assignment of several ICCAT JIS inspectors to the same entity in the same period will be allowed.

The user will be able to access the eBCD system with his credentials as long as he has inspection permits on any entity at that time.

It will be necessary for the ICCAT Secretariat to have configured the permissions of these users prior to the inspection to ensure that they can properly access the system and the data they need at the time of the inspection.

Users with this new user profile will be the ICCAT JIS Inspector:

- In the options menu, like all users, a User Registration option will be available with the following choices:
  - User account modification



*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

- Change password
- Access to a new menu option will be available in order to enable only to this profile to search for the BCDs associated to the entities over which permits at the time of the search the profile has.  
It will be necessary to select the entity to inspect and it would be necessary to decide whether this profile would be able to search any BCD associated to the entity or only those BCDs that are within a given period. The search will return a table with the results of the BCDs the profile has access to.
- The profile will have access from the search results panel in view mode to the BCDs over which the profile have permits.
- It will be necessary to adapt the BCDs page and the navigation tree within the BCD, so that users with the new JIS Inspector ICCAT profile can access them in read mode.

**1.4.3 Cost estimation**

Profile	Total Hours	Cost	Budget
Consultant	8	52,01 €	416,08 €
Project Manager	48	46,56 €	2.235,02 €
Business Analyst	80	35,83 €	2.866,61 €
Programmer Analyst	320	33,96 €	10.865,86 €
Business Expert	160	31,41 €	5.024,93 €
<i>REFERENCE N° 5.4.1: REFERENCE 2019-7: DEVELOP A READ-ONLY PROFILE FOR ICCAT INSPECTORS UNDER JIS</i>			<b>21.408,49 €</b>

**1.5 REPORT SECTION NO. / REFERENCE N° "NEW QUESTION": QUESTION FROM JAPAN ON OBTAINING THE NECESSARY DATA FOR THE CALCULATION OF GROWTH RATES.****1.5.1 Background**

It was proposed by Japan the possibility of consulting information from the eBCD system related to farming calculations from other CPCs. In order to be able to do it, they have ask

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II*

---

how this access to farm information (dates, number of fish and weights at both caging and harvesting) can be implemented.

**1.5.2 Technical specifications and Specific requirements**

All the information in these sections is provided by the current Raw Data and Help Traceability reports, but for confidentiality reasons, users can only obtain information from farms under their flag or if they are involved in a trade of bluefin tuna. It is now provided by the farm CPCs on a voluntary basis, but they want to be able to obtain it directly independently from the farm CPC/Flag.

We propose the **implementation of a new report that compiles the disaggregated information on caging and harvesting in a way that guarantees the confidentiality of the data**. This new report could be very similar to the one it was proposed for the issue ‘Report section No. / Reference n° 6.1.: Paragraph 26 of Rec. 21-08: Farming capacity’ in this document.

This report would be available for users with "CPC Administrator", "Flag Administrator" and "ICCAT Secretary" profiles in the Reports section of the eBCD options menu. Once defined and implemented, the possibility of including it in the asynchronous execution of reports will be evaluated to ensure that it is obtained correctly.

The search parameters will be a period of caging:

- Date from
- Date until

The fields to be displayed will be:

- Caging year
- Farm’s flag/Farm’s CPC
- Total No fish caged
- Total kilos caged
- Harvesting year
- Total kilos harvested
- Total No fish harvested

An Excel template would be defined in which the data would be uploaded for downloading and correct displayed:

Farm's flag or Farm's CPC	Caging year	Total No. fish caged	Total Kilos caged	Harvesting year	Total Kilos harvested	Total No. fish harvested
---------------------------------	-------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

*Requirements for TWG Requests 2022. Part II***1.5.3 Cost estimation**

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	8	52,01 €	416,08 €
Project Manager	15	46,56 €	698,45 €
Business Analyst	40	35,83 €	1.433,30 €
Programmer Analyst	80	33,96 €	2.716,46 €
Business Expert	60	31,41 €	1.884,35 €
<b>REFERENCE N° "NEW QUESTION": QUESTION FROM JAPAN ON OBTAINING THE NECESSARY DATA FOR THE CALCULATION OF GROWTH RATES.</b>			<b>7.148,64 €</b>

**2. TOTAL COST**

The total cost of the proposal exposed above can be seen in the following summarize table:

<b>Profile</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant	48	52,01 €	2.496,47 €
Project Manager	174	46,56 €	8.101,96 €
Business Analyst	320	35,83 €	11.466,43 €
Programmer Analyst	1280	33,96 €	43.463,42 €
Business Expert	760	31,41 €	23.868,41 €
<b>TOTAL COST</b>			<b>89.396,70 €</b>

**Instruction for Development of Function of Automatic  
monitoring of Growth Rate in eBCD System**  
(Submitted by Japan)

### 1. Background

Japan submitted this paper in accordance with paragraph 27 of the *Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 21-08 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean* (Rec. 22-08), which says “A functionality within the eBCD system to automatically monitor growth rates shall be considered by the eBCD TWG in 2023”.

### 2. Implementation of monitoring growth rate in eBCD system (please see the Attachment 1)

- The monitoring of the growth rate is basically conducted *focusing on a single cage*.
- For each cage, following data is used to calculate the growth rate
  - (1) For All Caging operations to that cage:
    - Number of caged fish
    - Caging date
    - Total weight at that caging (average weight at caging)
  - (2) For all harvesting operations from that cage:
    - Number of harvested fish
    - Harvesting date
    - Total weight at that harvesting (average weight at harvesting)
- From the information above, the average weight at caging (kg) (D) and the average farming duration(days) (E-A) are calculated. For specific calculation formulas, please refer to the Excel file of Growth Calculation Sheet (GCS) (**Attachment 2**).
- Using average weight at caging (D) and farming duration(E-A), the expected maximum growth weight (I), which is the BENCHMARK, is calculated based on the 2022 SCRS growth table.
- Check whether the average weight at harvest (H) exceeds the BENCHMARK (I) or not.
- Whether an observed “excess” in growth rate could be of compliance issue depends on to what extent the caged tuna have been harvested. For example, if only 10% of caged fish have been harvested, excess growth rate may not be problematic whereas excess growth rate after the completion of all harvesting would be problematic. For this reason, it is necessary to include the harvest rate (% harvested) in the analysis.
- The results of analysis “Growth Rate Reports” should be made available to CPCs officials from the eBCD system. The search parameters will be “CPC name”, “Year of Caging” and “Farming Facility name”.

### 3. Potential issue for further consideration


- If carryover, intra-farm-transfer, or inter-farm transfer is conducted, growth rate calculation based on the methodology in section 1 becomes complicate in particular when fish in a cage is separated into several cages or fish in different cages are grouped into one cage. Further discussion on how to calculate/monitor growth rate for such cases would be necessary during future IMM and/or Panel 2 meetings. Input from farming CPCs would be welcome.

eBCD\_07\_Attachment 1

# Example of monitoring Growth Rate in a Cage

## ALL Caging in a Cage

## ALL Harvesting in a Cage





# Benchmark Weight calculated by 2022 SCRS Growth Table 95% CI

Avg. WEIGHT at CAGING (D)(=C/B) : 110 kg  
 Avg. FARMING DURATION (E-A) : 123 days

	A	B	CX	CY	CZ	DA	DB	DC	DD	DE	DF	DG	DH	DI	DJ	DK
1	2022SCRS growth table 95%CI															
2																
3																
4	month	→														
5	day	→														
6	day	→	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127
100		100	265.8	266.08	266.37	266.65	266.93	267.22	267.5	267.78	268.07	268.35	268.63	268.92	269.2	269.48
101		101	269.28	269.56	269.85	270.14	270.43	270.71	271	271.29	271.58	271.86	272.15	272.44	272.73	273.01
102		102	272.75	273.04	273.33	273.63	273.92	274.21	274.5	274.79	275.08	275.38	275.67	275.96	276.25	276.54
103		103	276.23	276.52	276.82	277.11	277.41	277.7	278	278.3	278.59	278.89	279.18	279.48	279.78	280.07
104		104	279.7	280	280.3	280.6	280.9	281.2	281.5	281.8	282.1	282.4	282.7	283	283.3	283.6
105		105	281.35	281.65	281.95	282.25	282.55	282.85	283.15	283.45	283.75	284.05	284.35	284.65	284.95	285.25
106		106	282.99	283.29	283.59	283.89	284.19	284.49	284.79	285.09	285.39	285.69	285.99	286.29	286.59	286.89
107		107	284.64	284.94	285.24	285.54	285.84	286.14	286.44	286.74	287.04	287.34	287.64	287.94	288.24	288.54
108		108	286.29	286.59	286.89	287.19	287.49	287.79	288.09	288.39	288.69	288.99	289.29	289.59	289.89	290.19
109		109	287.94	288.24	288.54	288.84	289.14	289.44	289.74	290.04	290.34	290.64	290.94	291.24	291.54	291.84
110		110	289.58	289.88	290.18	290.48	290.78	291.08	291.38	291.68	291.98	292.28	292.58	292.88	293.18	293.48
111		111	291.23	291.53	291.83	292.13	292.43	292.73	293.03	293.33	293.63	293.93	294.23	294.53	294.83	295.13
112		112	292.88	293.18	293.48	293.78	294.08	294.38	294.68	294.98	295.28	295.58	295.88	296.18	296.48	296.78
113		113	294.52	294.82	295.12	295.42	295.72	296.02	296.32							
114		114	296.17	296.47	296.77	297.07	297.37	297.67	297.97							
115		115	297.82	298.12	298.42	298.72	299.02	299.32	299.62							
116		116	299.46	299.76	300.06	300.36	300.66	300.96	301.26	301.56	301.86	302.16	302.46	302.76	303.06	303.36
117		117	301.11	301.41	301.71	302.01	302.31	302.61	302.91	303.21	303.51	303.81	304.11	304.41	304.71	305.01
118																
119																

BENCHMARK WEIGHT (I)※

※ Expected maximum average weight calculated by 2022 SCRS Growth table

# Proposed Format for Growth Rate Reports

The search parameters will be “CPC name”, ”Year of Caging” and ”Farming Facility name”.

Summary List (Growth rate of farmed BFT)														
Name of the Farming Facility														
Japanese farm AAA														
ICCAT FFB No.		AT001JP0001												
														update: 2022/12/5
Cage No.	Average and total of caged fish				Average and total of harvested fish				average farming duration (days)	% harvested	SCRS_95%CI			
	average caging date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at caging (kg)	average harvesting date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at harvest (kg)			Expected average weight after % growth in SCRS Table (kg)	Excess (kg)	Excess (%)	
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(C)/(B)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)=(G)/(F)	(E)-(A)	(F)/(B)	(I)	(I)>(H):OK (I)<(H):Ecces	(H)-(I)	((I)/(H)-1)*100	
JP-2021-001	2021/6/20	400	44,000	110	2021/10/21	400	59,000	147.500	123	100.0%	292.28	OK		
0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>total</b>		<b>400</b>	<b>44,000</b>	<b>110</b>		<b>400</b>	<b>59,000</b>	<b>148</b>		<b>100.0%</b>				

AutoSave On eBCD\_07\_Attachment\_2\_ENG.xlsx • Last Modified: Yesterday at 4:16 PM

File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Automate Help Team

Calibri 10

Normal Bad Good Neutral Calculation

Check Cell Explanatory ... Input Linked Cell Note

M13

7 Please fill in following information (cells highlighted in yellow)

8 Section 1: Identification of Farm and Cage

9 Section 3: information on all the caging and harvesting

10 Based on your input in Section 3, Section 2 will automatically calculate and display the growth rate and the comparison with SCRS table.

11

12

13 Section 1: Identification of Farm and Cage

14

15 Name of the Farming Facility Japanese farm AAA

16 ICCAT FFB No. AT0011P0001

17 Cage No. JP-2021-001

18 Information updated on 1/11/2021

19

20 Section 2: Automatic calculation of growth rate and comparison with % growth in SCRS table

21

22 Please do not edit!! These figures will be calculated automatically, based on your input in section 3.

23

(D)	(E)-(A)	Expected average weight after % growth in 2022 SCRS Table (kg)	(H)
average at caging	average farming duration (days)	Footnote 1	average weight at harvest(kg) Excess (kg) Excess (%)
110	128		
Benchmark for fish		2022 SCRS_95% 292.28	147.5 OK

Footnote 1: Based on average weight at caging and average farming duration, the cell automatically find a best approximate % growth from the sheet "SCRS(%)" by date and kg"

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 Section 3: information on all the caging and harvesting

36

37 Average and total of caged fish

38 Please do not edit!! These figures will be calculated automatically, based on your input on yellow highlighten cells below.

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(C)/(B)
average caging date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at caging (kg)
6/20/2021	400	44,000	110

41

42

43

44

45 Average and total of harvested fish

46 Please do not edit!! These figures will be calculated automatically, based on your input on yellow highlighten cells below.

(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)=(G)/(F)
average harvesting date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at harvest (kg)
10/21/2021	400	59,000	147.500

47

48 Please fill in the information in the cells highlighted in yellow.

49 Please note that "sections raw data" downloadable from the eBCD system would be of

Caging					Harvesting						
	BCD Doc. No	caging date	No. of fish	weight(kg)		BCD Doc. No	Destination	harvesting date	No. of fish	weight(kg)	average weight(kg)
1	JP 21: 123456:CG01	6/20/2021	200	20,000	1	JP 21: 123456:HA01	JAPAN	10/12/2021	100	17000	170.000
2	JP 21: 123456:CG01	6/21/2021	200	24,000	2	JP 21: 123456:HA02	JAPAN	10/17/2021	100	15000	150.000
3	#DIV/0!		0		3	JP 21: 654321:HA01	JAPAN	10/25/2021	100	15000	150.000
4	#DIV/0!		0		4	JP 21: 654321:HA02	JAPAN	10/30/2021	100	12000	120.000

50

51

52

53



AutoSave Off eBCD\_07\_Attachment\_2\_ENG.xlsx Search

File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Automate Help Team

Clipboard Font Alignment Number Styles Cells

154

1 eBCD\_07\_Attachment\_2/i2023

2 **Summary List (Growth rate of farmed BFT)**

3 Name of the Farming Facility

4 **Japanese farm AAA**

5 ICCAT FFB No. AT001JP0001

6 update: 12/5/2022

Cage No.	Average and total of caged fish				Average and total of harvested fish				average farming duration (days)	% harvested	SCRS_95%CI			
	average caging date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at caging (kg)	average harvesting date weighted by No. of fish	Total No. of fish	Total weight (kg)	average weight at harvest (kg)			Expected average weight after % growth in SCRS Table (kg)	Excess (kg)	Excess (%)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(C)/(B)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)=(G)/(F)	(E)-(A)	(F)/(B)	(I)	(I)>(H):OK (I)<(H):-Ecces	(H)-(I)	((I)/(H)-1)*100
JP-2021-001	6/20/2021	400	44,000	110	10/21/2021	400	59,000	147.500	123	100.0%	292.28	OK		
example cage1	0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
cage2	0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
cage3	0	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>total</b>		<b>400</b>	<b>44,000</b>	<b>110</b>		<b>400</b>	<b>59,000</b>	<b>148</b>		<b>100.0%</b>				

42

**Time cost development's estimation by the Working Group  
(April 2022)**

**Questions:**

1. Report section Reference/No. 5.5.6: Mortality during towing voyage / 6.23. Annex 11 of Recommendation by ICCAT amending the recommendation 19-04 amending recommendation 18-02 establishing a multi-annual management plan for Bluefin Tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean (Rec. 21-08): Treatment of dead and/or lost fish.
2. Report section No./Reference in "i2022 eBCD TWG"-report: Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies. It was decided to request a time/cost estimation of this analysis.
3. Report section Reference/No. 5.4.2: Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight -4. Tagging.
4. Report section Reference/No. 27: 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.
5. Report section Reference/No. 138: If following an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority of the donor operator to reflect the result of the investigation.

In the above issues, we have different questions we need to clarify in order to be able to do an accurate proposal. There is diverse information regarding every issue, so our doubts are described below in each issue.

1. *Report section Reference/No. 5.5.6: Mortality during towing voyage / 6.23. Annex 11 of Rec. 21-08: Treatment of dead and/or lost fish.*

In "Treatment of fish that die during first transfer" of Rec. 21-08, explanation is provided on how to deal with dead fish in the first transfer. In November 2021 a new version was updated in the system, this version included an adaptation of the transfers controlling the traceability of dead fish in parallel transfers. This means that now the system controls the traceability for dead and live fish correctly. However, it is not working as explained in this section of the Recommendation.

Currently, the system is working as illustrated in the following example:

Example: A real incident will be used received for support from a flag in January 2022. There was an inconsistency in an eBCD, because there was only one dead fish before the LT, but two were registered in the system, and an inconsistency appears. The data in that moment registered in the system were the following:

	<i>No. Fish</i>	<i>Kilos</i>	<i>Dead No. Fish</i>	<i>Dead kilos</i>
CA	538	74008,772	1	90
LT	537	73918,772		
TF	537	73918,772	1	90
CG	537	73918,772		

In this case, as previously stated, there was only one dead fish before the LT and the correct data for the system would have been the following:


	<i>No. Fish</i>	<i>Kilos</i>	<i>Dead No. Fish</i>	<i>Dead kilos</i>
CA	538	74008,772	1	90
LT	537	73918,772		
TF	537	73918,772		
CG	537	73918,772		

As the system works, if the dead fish died before LT, it should be discounted from LT as shown in the table. Besides, if other fish died after the LT (during or after the TF, but before CG), this would be added to the field 'Dead fish' in the TF section. The data would therefore be as follows:

	<i>No. Fish</i>	<i>Kilos</i>	<i>Dead No. Fish</i>	<i>Dead kilos</i>
CA	538	74008,772	1	90
LT	537	73918,772		
TF	536	73828,772	1	90
CG	536	73828,772		

For the system, the data of this table implies that there was one dead fish of 90 kg before LT, therefore, the number of fish is one less in the LT and also 90 kg less. There was another dead fish of 90 kg after LT, therefore, this fish is included in the dead fish fields in the transfer, therefore in the description of the cage there must be one less fish and the corresponding 90 kilos (in this case) less.

The diagram below includes information with this data and shows the possibilities for the data in the system in the event that the dead fish is tradeable:



As stated in the ICCAT Recommendation 21-08, paragraph 5: 'The total quantities reported in Sections 3 and 4 shall be equal to the quantities reported in Section 2, after deductions of all the mortalities observed between the catch and completion of the transfer'. We understand that the system it is not working, as specified in this paragraph.

After the explanation on how the system is working, therefore before doing a proposal of the discussion made of this matter on the WG, we prefer to let you know how it is the system working right now with dead fishes. As for doing a proposal analysis on how to include the declaration of dead fishes during transport operations or during caging, this is the base from which it would be proposed.

- Report section No. / Reference in "i2022 eBCD TWG"-report: Button for deleting active user sessions/cookies. It was decided to request a time/cost estimation of this analysis.

Referring to this analysis, we would like to emphasize that by erasing the cookies of the browser, the problem disappears. It appears that United States seem to have a big problem with this issue, and we would like to understand the circumstances of this problem.

We would be grateful if these questions might be answered before conducting a cost time analysis:

- Has it been detected that the problem occurs with a specific profile?
  - Have specific users/companies encountering this problem been detected?
  - Do users encountering this problem use the 'Logout' button of the system when they have finished using the system?
  - In which Browsers does this usually occur?
  - Do users have problems to access after deleting the cookies in the browser as explained in the document 'eBCD Session\_blocking\_information\_v2'?
  - When do these episodes usually occur (when actively using the system, after using it and leaving the sessions open, etc.)?
  - Have there been incidents that the USA received support regarding this issue? We would be grateful if some examples could be sent to us.
- Report section Reference/No. 5.4.2: Cross-checks the total catch's average weight and the samplings average weight -4. Tagging.

We need to know what kind of cross checks need to be done in the system, to meet the correct criteria. With this information, we can do a proposal of the implementation in the system.

- Report section Reference/No. 27: 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.

With this paragraph, our doubts concern growth rates, as there are no growth rates included in the system. Therefore, before analysing how to inform the SCRS of this discrepancy, we need to analyse how to include growth rates into the system.

Therefore, we would like to confirm if this is what is expected, and that if this is the case, we will need information related to the growth rates, to try to define how to include them in the system.

- Report section Reference/No. 138: If following an inspection at sea or an investigation, the number of fish is found to be more than 10% different to that declared in the ITD and eBCD, the eBCD shall be amended by the CPC competent authority of the donor operator to reflect the result of the investigation.

Referring to this paragraph, in this analysis we would like to know if it will be necessary to inform of this fact when there is an inconsistency in the eBCD, or is it necessary to include anything else in the eBCD to alert of this issue?

Will it be an informative inconsistency, or will it be necessary to restrict the actions on the eBCD when this discrepancy appears?

<p>Fish that die during caging</p> <p>Rec. 22-08 Para. 167 Annex 11 Rec. 18-13</p>	<p>Para 167 and Annex 11 of Rec. 22-08 require that fish that die during caging operations shall be reported in the relevant field in section 6 of the eBCD. However, section 6, as outlined in Rec. 18-13, does not yet have a relevant field for reporting dead fish, only live fish caged.</p> <p>Currently the consortium understand that this dead fish shall be recorded in the comments section of section 6. Can the consortium clarify if this fish shall also be included in section 7 and/or 8 of the eBCD?</p>
--	--

eBCD Plausible Transformations

