

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

ICCAT Regional Observers Programme for eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna - Farms and traps

<i>Number</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>Request number</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Response/Explanation/Action taken by CPC</i>	<i>[Optional field] PNC confirmed by COC</i>
F1	EU-Malta	28/5/17	001EU0365	The inter farm transfer carried out the 05/05/2017 between two Maltese farms, no ITD has been issued nor signed by the regional observer. The regional observer received a copy of the video and provided an independent estimate within 10% limit with the farm estimate. She received only a copy of the inter farm authorisation provided by the national authorities.	The EU-Maltese authorities have analysed the matter and found no non-compliance with ICCAT Recommendation 14-04. All the provisions of ICCAT Recommendation 14-04 and mainly paragraph 84 were abided with.	No
F2	Morocco	5/5/17	001MA00371	On the video transmitted to the observer, the opening of the door is not visible, the door is not visible throughout the entire operation and the closing of the door is not filmed. The diver's position opposite the door makes it impossible to view the complete opening of the door.	The regional authorities have reported that the cage door was not filmed throughout the entire transfer operation. Indeed, the divers' position opposite the door has unwittingly hindered its recording. Therefore, this operation was cancelled and carried out again later with a better quality video recording, which enable the regional observer to perform the required checks. Subsequently, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD.	

F3	Morocco	13/5/17	001MA00371	<p>Following the transfer operations Nos.2 and 4 between the trap and the transport cage, the video was transmitted to the regional observer. The door was not fully visible on the video for part of the operation. In addition, visibility on the film is very poor at times and unclear in particular during the bluefin tuna's transition.</p>	<p>The regional authorities reported that visibility at times was very poor and unclear on the video recording of the transfer operation, in particular during the bluefin tuna's transition, which is due to very bad weather conditions during these periods of the year, resulting in unclear water. Therefore, this operation was cancelled and carried out again in favourable conditions with a better quality video recording which enabled the regional observer to perform the required checks. Subsequently, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD.</p>	
F4	EU-Italy	25/05/2017; 26/05/2017; 28/05/2017	002EU0011	<p>On the PTN, the towing vessel details are missing because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities. On the ITD issued following the transfer, the towing vessel details are missing and therefore the ITD WAS NOT signed by the regional observer; No eBCD reference number provided to the observer. Note: the receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed, a towing vessel, details of which were not known at the time, will come to collect the cage.</p>	<p>This is a specific type of operation implemented at this ITA trap, which is related to the distance to the farm (MLT). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions.</p>	No

F5	EU-Itlay	31/5/17	002EU0011	<p>According to the copy of the video of the transfer received late by the regional observer and a paper issued by national authorities, the transfer was recorded with a different authorisation number and ITD number. The observer was not informed of this change at the transfer stage.</p>	<p>AUT and ITD n. 014 have been duly canceled (because of bad weather conditions) and substituted by AUT and ITD n. 017. The above circumstance has been duly communicated to the operator concerned (misunderstanding as to why the R.O. has missed this information).</p>	No
F6	EU-Spain	2/6/17	001EU072	<p>On the 02/06/2017, the farm conducted a caging from the trap to the farm cage 4. No authorisation number was given for that caging operation. No stereoscopic camera was used to record the caging operation. The farm was constantly under official Spanish Inspection during the caging operation.</p>	<p>Due to technical problems detected in the Stereoscopic cameras (SC), it was not possible to conduct any caging operation, but, based on scientific advice (the presence of Orcas -Killer Whales- near the Trap), a reduction in the concentration of BFT in the trap was needed. EU-Spain authorized a temporary transfer to an empty space of the quantities pending to be caged, until the SC was operational again, and the caging operation could take place. The operation took place, as ROP stated, with the presence of the Spanish Inspection services, and Conventional videos have been used in order to estimate the quantities (number of BFT). This operation however could not be considered as a caging operation (that is why there is no number of caging authorization, and SC have not been used).</p>	No

F7	EU-Spain	3/6/17	001EU072	On the 03/06/2017, the farm conducted a caging from the trap to the farm cage 4. No authorisation number was given for that caging operation. No stereoscopic camera was used to record the caging operation. The farm was constantly under official Spanish Inspection during the caging operation.	Due to technical problems detected in the Stereoscopic cameras (SC), it was not possible to conduct any caging operation, but, based on scientific advice (the presence of Orcas -Killer Whales- near the Trap), a reduction in the concentration of BFT in the trap was needed. EU-Spain authorized a temporary transfer to an empty space of the quantities pending to be caged, until the SC was operational again, and the caging operation could take place. The operation took place, as ROP stated, with the presence of the Spanish Inspection services, and Conventional videos have been used in order to estimate the quantities (number of BFT). This operation however could not be considered as a caging operation (that is why there is no number of caging authorization, and SC have not been used).	No
----	----------	--------	----------	--	--	----

F8	EU-Italy	9/6/17	002EU0011	<p>On the PTN, the towing vessel details are missing because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities On the ITD issued following the transfer, the towing vessel details are missing and therefore the ITD WAS NOT signed by the regional observer; No eBCD reference number provided to the observer. On the video provided to the observer, the authorisation number did not display and the overall low quality of the video did not allow the independent counting of the quantity of fish transferred. Note: the receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed, a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the time, will come to collect the cage.</p>	<p>As soon as EU-ITA received the ROP PNC, immediately informed the Control Services in Cagliari (Sardinia) in order to recover the video concerned and carry out a detailed analysis. The same evaluation was carried out in Rome.</p> <p>The following technical issues occurred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The original video was carried out by the same operator in 4K format.</li> <li>- The RO concerned analysed the video with his own PC that, most likely, was not fitted with specific software to read 4K format. 6 screenshots have been attached clearly showing the following:</li> <li>- (1): number of transport cage;</li> <li>- (2): number of authorization at the beginning: due to the effects of solar refraction, there are some visualization issues;</li> <li>- (3): door clearly opened;</li> <li>- (4): passage of tuna sample: the counting is possible;</li> <li>- (5): closing of the door;</li> <li>- (6): number of authorization at the end: sufficient quality (according to Annex 8 to ICCAT Rec. 14-04, this compensate the non-clear visualization at the video beginning).</li> <li>- (7): total nr. of frames: 27.373,</li> <li>- (8): total nr. of specimens counted: 2.098 (against 1.934 counted by the operator concerned),</li> <li>- (9): percentage difference +8,5%,</li> <li>- (10): video compliance and quality: in line with provisions of rec. 14-04</li> </ul>	No
----	----------	--------	-----------	--	--	----

					<p>On the basis of this analysis, the PNC raised by the RO concerned has no technical evidence. The investigations conducted concluded that: 1) no further investigations were needed; 2) no control transfer needed; 3) ITD signed in accordance with procedures in force and 4) duly.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

F9	EU-Spain	13/6/17	001EU0377	<p>The video of the Caging operation #1 doesn't show the ICCAT authorization number at the beginning or/and at the end of the video. This is because the flag State did not provide this number to the operator. The video record is not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna transferred. Here you have two screenshots of the video during the transfer of some tunas. Therefore the observer will not sign the ICD nor BCD.</p>	<p>The Recommendation 14-04 does not describe the format of the authorization number or the data that should appear in the authorization. The authorizations used were encoded with the code of name authorities and date of the fax, this reference number provides traceability and control of the authorizations. This number is recorded at the beginning and/or end of video recording following the requirements established at Annex 8 of Rec. 14-04. The EU-Spanish authorities were not able to estimate de BFT and the caging operation was repeated.</p>	Yes
----	----------	---------	-----------	--	---	-----

F11	EU-Spain	15/6/17	001EU0373	<p>The flag state has not issued an authorisation number for any caging operation (To date 7 have been carried out). Instead 2 faxes were sent which authorise 3 cagings in the first instance, and 5 in the second. Neither of these authorisations include an authorisation number or the destination cage. Furthermore, on three occasions, the towing vessel listed in the authorisation was not the towing vessel involved in the actual operation. As a consequence of the lack of a specific authorisation, the video does not show an authorisation number at the start and/or end of the video as required by Annex 8 of Rec. 14-04. On the 10/06, the observer also noted a control transfer being carried out between two transport cages outside of the farm. This involved the tuna being transferred between 2 towing cages with the same cage number. ICCAT Rec 14-04 article 71 requires the CPC to assign a unique number to all cages. On 13/06, two transfers were carried out within the farm facilities. Both transfers involved the transfer from a towing cage to a farm cage. However, after each transfer, the receiving cage was relabelled with the donor cage number (a towing cage number). The contents of each cage was then transferred into a previously un-numbered farm cage which was labelled with the receiving cage's number. The observer understands that the generic caging authorisation described above was used, rather than a specific transfer authorization as required for a transfer between two transport cages by article 73 of Rec. 14-04. The contents of these transport cages were later transferred into farm cages following an</p>	<p>The Recommendation 14-04 does not describe the format of the authorization number or the data that should appear in the authorization. The authorizations used were encoded with the code of name authorities and date of the fax, this reference number provides traceability and control of the authorizations. This number is recorded at the beginning and/or end of video recording following the requirements established at Annex 8 of Rec. 14-04. Regarding the use of cages with the same number or without number (NOVA TIA CINTA): In order to guarantee the traceability of the fish, the operator used an auxiliary cage previous the final caging because the final farm cage contained blue fin tuna from a previous caging. The movements of blue fin tuna from cage ESP010R and ESP004R were recorded and controlled according the REC 14-04. The Inspection Services were present during these caging operations.</p>	No
-----	----------	---------	-----------	---	--	----



				<p>caging operation on the same day under the same caging authorisation. Finally, the observer has reported that after reviewing the video, no estimate of the amount of tuna caged is possible for the amount of tuna caged during the transfer from towing vessel to the farm cage 12 on the 09/06 due to the poor quality of the video. A “control caging” has since been carried out although this did not use a separate caging authorisation, instead using the same caging authorisation used for the original operation.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

F12	EU-Malta	15/6/17	001EU0375	After the review of the transfer videos and the photos of the observers deployed on the JFO group, it appears that the cage numbering system used at sea by the farm was not in accordance with the article 71 of the recommendation 14-04. For all the 6 cages used at sea the cage number is only 2 letters instead of a number with a unique numbering system that includes at least the three letter CPC code followed by three numbers.	The EU-Maltese authorities acknowledge that the cage numbering of the mentioned cages are not totally in line with ICCAT Recommendation 14-04 and mainly paragraph 71. However after considering that each cage was labelled with the ICCAT number of the farm of destination, the name of the company and the cage number it was just a minor misinterpretation of the Recommendation that still made each cage number unique and identifiable.	No
F13	EU-Spain	16/6/17	001EU0377	Following the second caging operation carried out the 14/06/2017, the observer reported that the video record is not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna transferred. Therefore the observer will not sign the ICD nor BCD.	The inspection services consider that the videos were not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna, therefore the operation was repeated.	No
F14	EU-Spain	18/6/17	001EU0373	The observer has reported for a caging carried out on 15/06/2017, a similar procedure involving the change of cage numbers, which has been reported previously, was carried out. This involved the tuna from the transport cage being transferred into a farm cage (14). During this operation, another farm cage also had the number 14. Once the caging was complete, the recipient cage 14 was re-numbered, and the tuna was transferred from this cage into the other cage numbered 14. Subsequently two farm cages had the same ID. Due to the change and replication of cage numbering not clear which transfer is the caging operation of the tuna from a transport cage into a farm, and what the actual identity of each cage is. Furthermore, both of these transfers were performed under the same authorisation. In addition, the observer noted	In order to guarantee the traceability of the fish, the operator used an auxiliary cage previous the final caging because the final farm cage contained bluefin tuna from a previous caging. The movements of bluefin tuna from cage ESP 007R were recorded and controlled according the Rec. 14-04. The information in the ITD is consistent with the observations. The Inspection Services were present during these caging operations.	No

				that for four caging operations, the information contained in the ITD and the authorization is not consistent with the actual observations. Two of these cagings were carried out on 12/06.		
F15	EU-Spain	18/6/17	001EU0373	The cage number for two transfers at the transfer from the catching vessel was different from the cage numbers at the caging. The associated ITDs do not provide information on how or when these transfers occurred. The ITDs produced do not contain a field in further transfers in which to provide the information on the receiving cage, while the section on the further transfers has not been signed by the receiving Captain. The observer has signed the BCDs for both operations. One of these was a paper BCD number format, but was signed through the eBCD system.	All the transfers of BFT after the first transfer from PS to TW were registered into the log book on board to TW. So the traceability of the BFT was known at the moment of the caging by the Spanish control authorities.	No

F16	EU-Spain	18/6/17	001EU0373	<p>For the first caging of the day (Caging Op 6), at the time of transfer from the catching vessel, the towing vessel was xxx while the cage number was xxx. At the caging, the cage was yyy and the towing vessel was zzz. However, the associated ITD does not provide information on the transfer of the cage between the two towing vessels, while the caging authorisation also lists xxx as the towing vessel. There is no information on how the catch was transferred to cage yyy in the ITD. Due to these inconsistencies, the observer has not signed the BCDs. For the second caging of the day (Caging Op 7), at the time of transfer from the catching vessel, the towing vessel was aaa while the cage number was aaa. At the caging, the cage was bbb and the towing vessel was zzz. However, while the associated ITD does provide information on a transfer to the zzz, and because a split caging operation had previously occurred, it is not clear which cage was transferred to the zzz. Due to these inconsistencies, the observer has not signed the BCDs.</p>	<p>Regarding the use of cages with the same number or without number In order to guarantee the traceability of the fish, the operator used an auxiliary cage previous the final caging because the final farm cage contained bluefin tuna from a previous caging. The movements of bluefin tuna from cage xxx and yyy were recorded and controlled according the Rec 14-04. The Inspection Services were present during these caging operations.</p>	No
-----	----------	---------	-----------	---	--	----

F17	EU-Spain	18/6/17	001EU0373	<p>The observer has also noted that a “control caging” was carried out on 14/06 for the cage 12 (Following caging Op. 2 on 09/06). No estimate had been possible for this caging due to poor water quality. However, the subsequent caging was carried out under the original authorization, with no separate authorization issued for this control transfer by the flag state authorities. As no separate authorization was issued, the observer has not signed the associated eBCDs . To note, the flag state is continuing to issue caging authorizations which do not meet the requirements of ICCAT Rec. 14-04, in that they do not contain a caging authorisation number as specified by article 71 and Annex 8.</p>	<p>The Recommendation 14-04 does not describe the format of the authorization number nor the data that should appear in the authorization. The authorizations used were encoded with the code of name authorities and date of the fax, this reference number provides traceability and control of the authorizations. This number is recorded at the beginning and/or end of video recording following the requirements established at Annex 8 of Rec. 14-04. This case is a repetition of the initial caging operations, so there is no need for another caging authorization</p>	No
F18	Turkey	4/7/17	001TR0380	<p>For a caging operation on 03/07/2017, the video record finished whilst approximately 5 to 7% of the door was still open. However, the observer considers that the BFT could be counted accurately, and that as the video record shows the donor cage is empty, that no BFT passed without being seen</p>	<p>Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MoFAL) inspectors have executed a subsequent verification in regard to BFT contents of farm cages at the farming facility AT001TUR00014. As a result of the examinations and cross-checks made by the inspectors, MoFAL did not conclude any serious infringement, suspicious or illegal activity of the operators in regard to catching, transferring and caging of BFT within the scope of request no. 001TR0380</p>	No

F19	EU-Spain	21/6/17	001EU0373	For caging operations carried out on 19/06/2017 and 20/06/2017 between towing vessels and the cages, no estimate of the amount of tuna caged was possible due to poor video quality. For a caging on 19/06/2017, tuna caught from 2016 were in the same caged. Furthermore, the towing vessel listed in the ITD was not the same as the towing vessel involved in the caging operation. No eBCD has been presented to the observer.	In both cases the transfers were repeated and good quality of the videos were obtained for doing the estimations of the tuna caged. The towing vessel involved in the caging operation was the same that the towing vessel named in the caging authorization. Regarding the The towing vessel with BFT from 2016 took the cage from the Balfegó Farm as a part of a project research about the reproductive behaviour of blue fin tuna caged. Accordingly, information in the ITD on board to the towing vessel has not to be the same than the information registered during the caging operation. This information should be in the log book on board of the TW. The eBCD were on board to TW.	No
F20	EU-Itlay	21/6/17	002EU0011	Relative to the transfer n°4 from trap to cage carried out on the 21/06/2017: On the PTN, the towing vessel details are missing because no towing vessel is present with the receiving cage. The PTN was accepted and authorized by the EU-Italian authorities; on the ITD issued following the transfer, the towing vessel details are missing and therefore the ITD was not signed by the regional observer; No eBCD reference number provided to the observer. (For your comprehension the receiving cage is anchored to the sea bed in position at the end of the trap and connected to the trap using a tunnel net. The cage will be in this position until the completion of all transfers. Once completed a towing vessel, details of which are not known at the present time, will come to collect the cage.)	This is a specific type of operation implemented at this ITA trap, which is related to the distance to the farm (MLT). A cage is anchored next to the trap and partial transfers are being made into it. As soon as the final transfer is completed (meaning the concerned transport cage is full and the concerned towing vessel is going to take it), ITA issues a duly completed eBCD, in accordance with the current ICCAT provisions.	No

F21	EU-Malta	3/7/17	001EU0376	Caging operation 8 carried out the 29/06/2017: Video record of transfers did not show transfer authorisation number at beginning or end of the video.	As the EU-Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.	No
F22	EU-Malta	6/7/17	001EU0375	Caging operation 1 carried out the 05/07/2017: Independent observer estimate of amount caged was not possible due to video quality. The amount of tuna in the authorisation is 1800.	As the EU-Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.	No
F23	EU-Malta	12/7/17	001EU0375	Caging operation 4 carried out the 10/07/2017: Part of the door does not appear in the first minutes. Lost visibility because of the bubbles at 12:19 for about 5 seconds with tuna passing	As the EU-Maltese Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.	No
F24	EU-Malta	20/7/17	001EU0375	Caging operation 5 carried out the 12/07/2017: Video record of transfer did not show all the closing of door at the end of the transfer, bad video quality, parts of the door are missing in some parts.	As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.	No

F25	EU-Spain	17/7/17	001EU0379	Control caging operation 1 carried out the 16/07/2017 : 1/ The video of the control caging operation #1 doesn't show an unique ICCAT authorization number at the beginning or/and at the end of the video. 2/ The video record is not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna transferred. Control caging operation 2 carried out the 16/07: 1/ The video of the control caging operation #2 doesn't show an unique ICCAT authorization number at the beginning or/and at the end of the video 2/ The video record is not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna transferred. Therefore the observer will not sign the ICD nor BCD. Note: The Spanish fisheries inspectors and their stereoscopic camera stopped filming at the middle of the control transfer operation 1 and they decided to make another one (control transfer operation 2).	Both operations were a repetition of the initial caging operation, accordingly there was no need for a different authorization. Regarding the quality of the videos, the inspection services consider that the videos were not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna, therefore the operation was repeated.	Yes
F26	EU-Spain	10/7/17	001EU0373	On the 4th of July, the farm carried out two intra farm transfers as "control transfers" for cagings 11 and 12 from farm cages 18 to 17; and 20 to 19 respectively. However, these transfers had no separate authorization instead operating as a repetition of the original authorization for the repetition of Caging 12; and for the repetition of Caging 11). As such the observer has recorded these as intra farm transfers. In the case of the first control transfer, no estimation was possible as the camera was too far from the door. In the case of the second transfer an estimation was possible. In both cases no eBCD or ITD has been signed yet due to the lack of an individual transfer authorization specific to the operation.	Both operations were a repetition of the initial caging operation, accordingly there was no need for a different authorization. The estimation of BFT caged was possible with the use of the stereoscopic cameras and the distance the camera form the door was not a problem for the control authorities.	No



F27	Turkey	7/7/17	001TR0380	During a caging operation on 6th July 2017, the video record ended whilst approximately 6 to 7 percent of the door was still open. The observer saw that the donor cage was empty and considers that no fish passed after the video ended.	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MoFAL) inspectors have executed a subsequent verification in regard to BFT contents of farm cages at the farming facility. As a result of the examinations and cross-checks made by the inspectors, MoFAL did not conclude any serious infringement, suspicious or illegal activity of the operators in regard to catching, transferring and caging of BFT within the scope of request no. 001TR0380	No
F28	Turkey	10/7/17	001TR0380	During a caging operation on 8th July 2017, the video record ended whilst approximately 2 to 3 percent of the door was still open. The observer saw that the donor cage was empty and considers that no fish passed after the video ended.	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MoFAL) inspectors have executed a subsequent verification in regard to BFT contents of farm cages at the farming facility. As a result of the examinations and cross-checks made by the inspectors, MoFAL did not conclude any serious infringement, suspicious or illegal activity of the operators in regard to catching, transferring and caging of BFT within the scope of request no. 001TR0380	No
F29	EU-Malta	24/7/17	001EU0376	Caging operation 13 carried out the 21/07/2017: The number of tuna passing through the door at the same moment is too big to be counted. The observer will not sign the ICD and the eBCD.	As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.	No

F30	EU-Spain	24/7/17	001EU0379	Control caging operation 3 carried out the 22/07/2017: 1/ The video of the control caging operation #3 doesn't show an unique ICCAT authorization number at the beginning or/and at the end of the video.2/ The video record is not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna transferred. Control caging operation 4 carried out the 22/07/2017:1/ The video of the control caging operation #4 doesn't show an unique ICCAT authorization number at the beginning or/and at the end of the video. Therefore the observer will not sign the ICD nor BCD. [Note: the Spanish fisheries inspectors and their stereoscopic camera stopped to filming at the middle of the control caging operation 3 and they decided to make another one (control caging operation 4)].	Both operations were a repetition of the initial caging operation, accordingly there was no need for a different authorization. Regarding the quality of the videos, the inspection services consider that the videos were not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna, therefore the operation was repeated.	Yes
F31	EU-Portugal	7/8/17	001EU0382	The transfer authorisation issued by the flag state did not follow the format established by Rec. 14-04. The ITD number did not follow the format established by Rec. 14-04.	It is a format/numbering system mistake that will be corrected for 2018.	Yes
F32	EU-Portugal	10/8/17	001EU0382	For the transfer conducted from the trap to a transport cage, no video record was produced and provided to the observer. The tuna had already been transferred to the transport cage prior to the arrival of the observer (on the 26/08/2017), although the date of the transfer listed on the ITD was 27/07/2017.	The requested and authorized caging operation did not require any transfer operation. A video recording of the caging operation was produced and handed over to the regional observer.	No

F33	EU- Portugal	14/8/17	001EU0382	<p>Following the caging operation carried out on 27/07/2017, the observer was not provided with a copy of the video record, as required by Rec. 14-04, para 81, and Annex 8, Caging Operations, para iii. The observer was able to review the stereoscopic video record, and able to estimate the number (but not the weight) of tuna transferred, with this video record also complying with all other requirements of Annex 8. A copy of the stereoscopic video record was also provided to the observer.</p>	<p>The caging operation occurred on 27/07/17 that was previously authorized by the authorities, occurred without any constraints.</p> <p>The entire operation was registered using the stereoscopic camera and at the end of it, still on board the vessel, a copy of the video record was given to the observer and another to the inspectors. All measures imposed for this operation were respected by the operator and duly confirmed by the inspection team and by the observer who accompanied the operation. The Observer only analyzed the number of BFT caged and not the BFT weight. The inspectors and company officials, at different days and locations, analyzed the video recording of the entire caging operation, counting the number and weight of the BFT.</p>	No
-----	-----------------	---------	-----------	---	---	----

F34	EU- Portugal	19/8/17	002EU012	<p>For the transfer operation carried out on 16/08/2017 from the trap to a transport cage, the cage number of the transport cage did not follow the format established by para. 71 of Rec 14-04., which states that it shall have at least the 3 letter code followed by 3 numbers. The observer was not provided with the electronic storage device as soon as possible after the transfer, as the diver did not have a micro SD converter with which to access and initialise the video. However, the observer is confident that no further manipulation of the video occurred between this point and arrival on land when the video was finally able to be initialized. The observer has not yet been presented with the ITD to sign.</p>	<p>The entire transfer operation was monitored by the national authorities and the ICCAT Regional observer. At the end of the operation the diver made available to both the regional observer and the inspectors the camera used in the operation and the respective video record stored on a micro SD card. However, the regional observer was not equipped with an equipment that would convert the data from the SD card to a card whose format would allow the video to be viewed on your computer. Nevertheless, the conventional camera and the SD card inserted in it were always kept on deck in view of the inspectors and the regional observer. Upon arrival at the port, the video was immediately initialized in the presence of the regional observer and inspectors, and again made available for copying by the inspectors. It was thus possible to ensure that the copy of the video delivered to the inspectors and to the Regional observer was not tampered with, as they kept the camera under direct surveillance at all times. The authorities and observer watched the SD card removed from the inside of the camera as well as the initialization of the video and the making of the copies that were immediately delivered to them. It is not correct that the video was not made available to the regional observer immediately after the completion of the transfer operation, nor is it legally legitimate for the regional observer to require that the format of the card made available by the diver be directly compatible with the format</p>	No
-----	-----------------	---------	----------	--	--	----

					of cards whose reading is supported on his/her personal computer. On the contrary, it was up to the regional observer to present himself with equipment that could directly view or convert data stored on a micro SD card.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

F35	EU-Malta	29/8/17	001EU0375	<p>Caging operation 6 carried out the 17/07/2017 : Video record of transfer did not show all the closing of door at the end of the transfer, bad video quality, parts of the door are missing in some parts; Caging operation 8 carried out the 21/07/2017 : Video record of transfer did not show all the closing of door at the end of the transfer, bad video quality, parts of the door are missing in some parts; Caging operation 10 carried out the 23/07/2017 : Video record of transfer did not show all the closing of door at the end of the transfer, bad video quality, parts of the door are missing in some parts; Caging operation 13 carried out the 01/08/2017 : Video record of transfer did not show all the closing of door at the end of the transfer, bad video quality, parts of the door are missing in some parts.</p>	<p>As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required.</p>	No
-----	----------	---------	-----------	--	---	----

F36	EU-Malta	25/8/17	001EU0375	<p>Caging operation 15 carried out on the 23/07/2017 : The number of tuna passing through the door at the same moment is too big to be counted. The observer did not sign the eBCD; Caging operation 24 carried out on the 16/08/2017 : The number of tuna passing through the door at the same moment is too big to be counted. The observer did not sign the eBCD. Moreover, the caging operation occurs on the 16/08/2017, on day after the deadline; Caging operation 4 carried out on the 29/06/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 5 carried out on the 01/07/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 7 carried out on the 06/07/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 12 carried out on the 19/07/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 16 carried out on the 29/07/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 17 carried out on the 30/07/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 18 carried out on the 01/08/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 20 carried out on the 04/08/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10%</p>	<p>Caging Operations 15 and 24: As the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 14-04 and has no similar issues with the Stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular cagings do not consider this as a PNC, thus no further action is required. Caging Operations 5, 7 and 12: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging. Caging Operations 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging Caging operation carried out after the 16/08/2017 due to force majeure.</p>	No
-----	----------	---------	-----------	---	--	----

				different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 21 carried out on the 07/08/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; Caging operation 22 carried out on the 15/08/2017 : The amount of tuna showed on the eBCD is more than 10% different from the observer estimation; For the 24 caging the observer did not received the ICDs.		
F37	EU-Spain	31/8/17	001EU0389	On the 30/08/2017, the farm conducted a caging operation. Because of bad visibility it is not possible for the observer to count fish. Diver who filmed the caging operation moves camera a lot so in some moment all door of the cage is not visible at 100%.	The inspection services consider that the videos were not of sufficient quality to estimate the number of Bluefin tuna, therefore the operation was repeated on the 2017/09/26.	Yes