

**INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY SOME CPCs IN SECTION 5 OF THE ANNUAL REPORT**  
*Summary made with information received before 15 October 2017*

Section 5 of Part II of the Annual Report invites CPCs to inform the Commission of their main difficulties encountered in implementation of and compliance with ICCAT conservation and management measures.

The Secretariat has summarized the main issues. The complete sections 5 are reported in document **COC-301/2017** and its addenda. The summary might assist the Compliance Committee (COC) in considering if a technical assistance in Compliance matters might be useful to some Contracting Parties. It might also be considered if the Secretariat, based on the Recommendations adopted, has to explain differently to the ICCAT requirements and its forms and/or if the Commission could consider the need to train the person responsible of the Compliance issues in some CPCs. Following discussion and decision of the COC, the financial aspect will have to be raised at STACFAD in order to be able to finance this possible technical assistance.

**Main issues:**

1. Raised in particular, but not only, by small and/or developing countries: few personnel to comply with the many ICCAT requirements to be fulfilled (Albania, Belize, Liberia, Namibia/limited availability of resources and research vessels; Suriname/limited financial and human capacity; UK-OT, in particular in St. Helena/limited human and financial resources available), lack of specific expertise (Ghana/shark taxonomy) or lack of capital to finance ICCAT measures (St Vincent & the Grenadines).
2. Outdated fisheries legislation hampers compliance with ICCAT conservation and management measures: in particular in Port states measures (lack of capacity for monitoring, control and surveillance/Trinidad & Tobago; ongoing evaluation to establish a programme equivalent to that established by Port State Measures Agreement/El Salvador).
3. Difficulty to adapt to the new requirements and to the new forms (FAD types/Ghana, management plan/Senegal; eBCD/EU-Greece), to some specific requirements (SWO-MED catches/Algeria; control of fisheries and landings/EU-Greece) or too many ICCAT requirements (Tunisia).
4. Need to coordinate at national level among many departments: making it difficult to fulfil ICCAT requirements on time (Algeria, Senegal).
5. Need for technical assistance (Algeria/in particular for SWO-MED; Angola/for by-catch and sharks; Namibia/turtle and other by-catch species; Suriname/assistance to train the inspectors in accordance with Rec. 12-07; Syria; Tunisia/difficulties to fill out certain forms), difficulties to report by-catch or discards/Ch. Taipei), need for training to fulfil forms (Ghana/Task I and Task II).
6. Difficulty to implement some ICCAT Recommendations due to different legislation at national level (Iceland/no retention, landing or selling of fish species cannot be implemented as such in Icelandic regulations) or due to longer process in national law (requirements Bill 5002 and SHK 7005 yet to be legislatively processed/UK-OT; documentation not ready yet to implement requirements TRO 2006 and SWO 3001/UK-Bermuda).
7. Exceptional political situation to be able to fulfil ICCAT requirements on time (in particular for the BFT-ROP programme/Libya, Syria).