Original: English

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME FOR EAST ATLANTIC AND MEDITERRANEAN BLUEFIN TUNA

ICCAT Secretariat

The Regional Observer Programme for eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna (ROP-BFT) is carried out under the provisions of the *Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 13-07 by ICCAT to Establish a Multi-annual Recovery Plan for Bluefin Tuna in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean* [Rec. 14-04]. The provisions of this Recommendation stipulate that observers are to be placed by the Secretariat to ensure observer coverage of 100% of purse seine vessels during all the annual fishing season. In this respect, an observer shall be present during the fishing operation; and during all transfer of bluefin tuna to the cages and all harvest of fish from the cage; and during all transfers of bluefin tuna from traps to transport cages.

Implementation in 2017

Following a Call for tender for the implementation of the Programme and a review of tenders by the selection committee the Commission again awarded the contract to the consortium MRAG/COFREPECHE. The Report of this consortium, available as **Annex 1** (Executive Summary attached as Appendix 1), contains more details on the implementation of the programme.

There were a total of 133 observer deployments on purse seine vessel in 2017. Ten CPCs participated in the programme. The list of vessels participating in the programme is attached as **Table 1**.

Since 2009, 394¹ farm deployments and 12 trap deployments have been requested, as shown in **Table 2**. The list of farms participating in the programme (25 of the 61 authorised farms) is attached as **Table 3**, and a list of traps which were observed by regional observers contained in **Table 4**.

All observer reports have been made available to CPCs as Annex 1 and 2 to COC-305/17. The submissions from the CPCs involved in relation to any issues of non-compliance are contained in COC-305/17.

Implementation difficulties in 2017

Failure to follow the procedures of requesting deployments and extensions to approved deployments continues to cause difficulties in the implementation, e.g. requests after 96 hours – in some cases one day before - requests for observers are not accompanied by proof of payment. It should be noted that the Secretariat cannot process any requests for which payment has not been made.

Some requests and payments for vessels were also received late. Completion of the section of the request for with details for any reimbursement is important, as in future this will be taken as official information for reimbursement of remnants at the end of the year.

Once again, in 2017, requests for changes to disembark port were received, even though the Secretariat had made clear from before the start of the season that such practice is not acceptable, due to the logistical difficulties and the additional safety concerns.

With regard to the international aspect of the programme, non-nationals were deployed as far as possible, with the exception of Turkish vessels/farms given the provisions of bullet four, paragraph 5 of Annex 7 of Rec. 14-04, as despite a persistent search, the consortium has been able to recruit only one qualified Turkish-speaking non-Turkish national.

In some cases, eBCD was not completed at the time of the caging as farms awaited the results of stereoscopic camera analysis in order to complete the eBCD with the correct figures. In many cases, these results were not available until after the observer left, and hence the eBCDs could not be signed by the

_

¹ At 10 October 2017.

observers, who cannot carry out activities once their deployment period is finished. In order to avoid problems with trade, the eBCDs have been signed by the Secretariat, but will not continue to do so in the future. For the observers to be able to sign the eBCD, this must be presented during his/her deployment. The initial video figures can be entered, and these can be changed once the stereoscopic camera results are available. This was agreed by the Technical Working Group and the Commission has paid for a development within the system to allow this to happen.

Requests for clarification

The consortium has requested some clarification on ICCAT requirements in relation to observer deployment. As the Secretariat does not have the ability to interpret ICCAT conservation and management measures, clarification from Panel 2 is sought:

Topic	Clarification sought
Transfers	During the past season, we saw more at-sea transfer from the seine to two cages
	(or more) simultaneously.
	Can you please detail the official procedure to be followed in terms of PTN,
	video, ITD and eBCD production?
Group eBCDs	At the time of caging, relevant BCDs may be grouped as a "Grouped BCD" with a new BCD number in the following cases, provided that caging of all the fish is conducted on the same day and all the fish is caged in the same farming cage: a) Multiple catches made by the same vessel b) Catches made by JFO
	The Grouped BCD shall replace all the related original BCDs and be accompanied by the list of all the associated BCD numbers. The copies of such associated BCDs shall be made available upon request of CPCs.
	Is it correct to have two caging operations and only one eBCD? Or should it be one eBCD per caging operation?
	During this caging season, a big gap has been observed between the caging operations at sea and the issuing of the official document (eBCD and ICD when any) to the observer.
	Can you give a maximum number of days between the caging operation and the signature of the documentation by the observer, or is this bounded only by the length of requested deployment of that particular observer?
Caging authorisation information	Information in caging authorisations is often inconsistent with information in the ITDs and eBCDs. In these cases, should the observer sign the ICD/eBCD?
Caging authorisation	In Annex 8, of Rec. 14-04, the caging authorisation number is required to be shown. The assumption is that this authorisation number should follow the format of the transfer authorisation number set out in para 72 as no authorisation number format is established in the caging operations section (para 78-86).
	However, it is noted that several CPCs use different formats for caging authorisation which are completely differently to that described in para 72. Furthermore, one caging authorisation may be used to cover several different caging authorisations, including control cagings. Is this permissible?
Cage numbers	Rec. 14-04 states that: CPCs shall assign a unique number to all cages. Numbers shall be issued with a unique numbering system that includes at least the three letter CPC code followed by three numbers.
	Is the at least referring only to the 3 letter CPC code, or can the cage number also include more than 3 numbers? For example, several towing cages were noted to have an additional letter after
	the 3 numbers. Is this permissible?

Topic	Clarification sought
Transfers	During the past season, we saw more at-sea transfer from the seine to two cages (or more) simultaneously. Can you please detail the official procedure to be followed in terms of PTN, video, ITD and eBCD production?
Cage numbers	Following on from the above point, it was noted that cage numbers are often transferred from the donor cage to the receiving cage (which was unnumbered) following the operation. The implication is that the receiving cage does not have a unique number, or that this number is the same as the donor cage. Is this permissible? In these cases, it is permissible for the observer to sign the ICD and eBCD?
Intra farm transfers and control cagings	Intra-farm transfers are often carried out as control operations following inconclusive caging videos. However, as previously stated these often do not have a separate authorisation. In these cases, can the observer view this footage to verify the amount of tuna caged? Furthermore, can the observer sign the eBCD/ICD?

Future implementation

It should be recalled that with the eBCD system, the observers need electronic signatures to fill these eBCD sections. CPCs were reminded that the digital certificates for the signatures have to be prepared well in advance so as not to delay the validation of the eBCD by the government authority, and hence CPC cooperation is requested in sending accurate information on observer needs as far in advance as possible, especially for farms and traps. The dates of authorisation have been updated in the eBCD system following each request, either for new deployment or extension, and in most cases the observers were able to sign the eBCD.

Table 1. List of the 133 purse seiner vessels which participated in the ROP-BFT in 2017.

СРС	Vessel Details	
Albania	Rozafa 15	AT000ALB00008
Algeria	Beni Louma	AT000DZA00015
Algeria	Borhan	AT000DZA00384
Algeria	Braham	AT000DZA00014
Algeria	Echahid Mostefa Benboulaid	AT000DZA00017
Algeria	Elfadir	AT000DZA00010
Algeria	El Hadja Fatma	AT000DZA00383
Algeria	El Madina	AT000DZA00003
Algeria	Chahid Hasni Saidi	AT000DZA00009
Algeria	Neptune 6	AT000DZA00006
Algeria	Nouha	AT000DZA00332
Algeria	Sidi Maamar	AT000DZA00018
Algeria	Sidi Slimane	AT000DZA00001
Algeria	Younes 1	AT000DZA00007
Algeria	Younes 2	AT000DZA00008
Egypt	Seven Seas	AT000EGY00003
Egypt	Safinat Nooh	AT000EGY00010
EU-Croatia	Neptun I	ATEU0HRV00134
EU-Croatia	Neptun Ii	ATEU0HRV00140
EU-Croatia	Ponos	ATEU0HRV00058
EU-Croatia	Sardina I	ATEU0HRV00133
EU-Croatia	Sardina Ii	ATEU0HRV00161
EU-Croatia	Preko	ATEU0HRV00021
EU-Croatia	Tuljan Dva	ATEU0HRV00155
EU-Croatia	Tacoma	ATEU0HRV00164
EU-Croatia	Pelagos Ii	ATEU0HRV00017

СРС	Vessel Details	
EU-Croatia	Carica	ATEU0HRV00163
EU-Croatia	Kali	ATEU0HRV00037
EU-Croatia	Marlin	ATEU0HRV00156
EU-Cyprus	My Hendrika	ATEU0CYP00047
EU-France	Anne Antoine 2	ATEU0FRA00003
EU-France	Chrisderic Ii	ATEU0FRA00019
EU-France	Cisberlande V	ATEU0FRA00021
EU-France	Eric Marin	ATEU0FRA00087
EU-France	Gerald Jean Iii	ATEU0FRA00026
EU-France	Gerald Jean Iv	ATEU0FRA00093
EU-France	Gerard Luc Iv	ATEU0FRA00028
EU-France	Janvier Giordano	ATEU0FRA00037
EU-France	Janvier Louis Raphael	ATEU0FRA00083
EU-France	Jeanmarie Christian 4	ATEU0FRA00041
EU-France	Jean Marie Christian 6	ATEU0FRA00043
EU-France	Jean Marie Christian 7	ATEU0FRA00078
EU-France	Saint Sophie François 2	ATEU0FRA00064
EU-France	Saint Sophie François 3	ATEU0FRA00065
EU-France	Vent Du Nord II	ATEU0FRA00090
EU-France	Ville D'agde Iv	ATEU0FRA00089
EU-France	Ville D'arzew Ii	ATEU0FRA00077
EU-Italy	Maria Grazia	ATEU0ITA00694
EU-Italy	Angela Madre	ATEU0ITA00635
EU-Italy	Giuseppe Padre Secondo	ATEU0ITA00289
EU-Italy	Madonna Di Fatima	ATEU0ITA00348
EU-Italy	Vergine Del Rosario	ATEU0ITA00617
EU-Italy	Genevieve Prima	ATEU0ITA00654
EU-Italy	Sparviero Uno	ATEU0ITA00565
EU-Italy	Atlante	ATEU0ITA00065
EU-Italy	Maria Antonietta	ATEU0ITA00368
EU-Italy	Lucia Madre	ATEU0ITA00664
EU-Italy	Angelo Catania	ATEU0ITA00636
EU-Italy	Michelangelo	ATEU0ITA00671
EU-Malta	Ta' Mattew	ATEU0MLT00001
EU-Spain	Leonardo Brull Segon	ATEU0ESP00173
EU-Spain	La Frau Dos	ATEU0ESP00172
EU-Spain	Gepus	ATEU0ESP00119
EU-Spain	Nuevo Panchilleta	ATEU0ESP00276
EU-Spain	Nuevo Elorz	ATEU0ESP00250
EU-Spain	Tio Gel Segon	ATEU0ESP00394
Libya	Albahr Alhader	AT000LBY00077
Libya	Alamwaje Alhadere	AT000LBY00078
Libya	Nawasi Alkir 1	AT000LBY00015
Libya	Deela	AT000LBY00024
Libya	El Hader 2	AT000LBY00037
Libya	Al Hares 2	AT000LBY00074
Libya	Tayma	AT000LBY00083
Libya	Alssafa IV	AT000LBY00060
Libya	Apollonia	ATTOOOLBY00012
Libya	Tripolitania	ATTOOOLBY00013
Libya	Morina	ATTOOOLBY00028
Libya	Cyrene	ATTOOOLBY00010
Libya	Zarqa Alymama I	AT000LBY00064
Libya	Al-Mustakbel	ATTOOOLBY00085
Morocco	Azrou 1	AT000MAR00081
Morocco	Mediouna	ATTOOOMAR01418
Norway	Ms Bluefin	AT000NOR00004

СРС	Vessel Deta	ıils
Syria	Fesal	AT000SYR00019
Tunisia	Futuro 1	AT000TUN00065
Tunisia	Ghedir El Gholla	AT000TUN00030
Tunisia	Mohamed Sadok	AT000TUN00051
Tunisia	Mabrouk	AT000TUN00015
Tunisia	Yosri	AT000TUN00040
Tunisia	El Horchani	AT000TUN00009
Tunisia	Hadj Mokhtar	AT000TUN00025
Tunisia	Hadj Ahmed	AT000TUN00070
Tunisia	Mohamed Yassine	AT000TUN00045
Tunisia	Imen	AT000TUN00010
Tunisia	Jamel	AT000TUN00011
Tunisia	El Houssaine	AT000TUN00049
Tunisia	Jaouhar	AT000TUN00046
Tunisia	Abderrahmen	AT000TUN00047
Tunisia	El Khalij	AT000TUN00014
Tunisia	Hassen	AT000TUN00008
Tunisia	Saifallah	AT000TUN00043
Tunisia	Tapsus	AT000TUN00024
Tunisia	Tijani	AT000TUN00026
Tunisia	Hajhedi	AT000TUN00007
Tunisia	Sallem	AT000TUN00023
Tunisia	Ibn Rachiq	AT000TUN00037
Tunisia	Abouchamma	AT000TUN00002
Tunisia	Denphir 1	AT000TUN00479
Tunisia	Ghali	AT000TUN00036
Tunisia	Essaidajannet	AT000TUN00050
Tunisia	Mohamed Adem	AT000TUN00012
Turkey	Haci Mustafa Kuloğlu	AT000TUR00024
Turkey	Kul Balikçilik-1	AT000TUR00030
Turkey	Nursu-3	AT000TUR00104
Turkey	Tuncay Sagun-6	AT000TUR00040
Turkey	Cihan Cengiz Karadeniz	AT000TUR00450
Turkey	Tuncay Sagun 7	AT000TUR07658
Turkey	Geçiciler Balikçilik	AT000TUR00496
Turkey	Ağaoğullari-5	AT000TUR00182
Turkey	Tuncay Sagun-2	AT000TUR00455
Turkey	Fat Balikçilik	AT000TUR00020
Turkey	İbrahimreis-Iii	AT000TUR00026
Turkey	Mamuli Reis-Iii	AT000TUR00033
Turkey	Geçiciler Balikçilik 1	AT000TUR00220
Turkey	Mehmet Kaptan-7	AT000TUR00034
Turkey	Soydemirler	AT000TUR00043
Turkey	Sürsan-1	AT000TUR00407
Turkey	Dursun Çinaroğlu	AT000TUR00131
Turkey	Cevdet Karadeniz-1	AT000TUR00012
Turkey	Azizler-Ii	AT000TUR00004
Turkey	Margo Balikçilik	AT000TUR07659
Turkey	Zamkinoz İsmail 1	AT000TUR00302
Turkey	Akgün Balikçilik-A	AT000TUR00523

Table 2. Number of farm/trap deployments by year.

Year	Number of farm	Number of trap
	deployments	deployments
2009	10	
2010	52	
2011	54	
2012	50	
2013	47	2
2014	44	3
2015	56	3
2016	44	2
2017	37	2

^{*} At 10 October 2017.

Table 3. Farming facilities on which ICCAT Regional Observers were deployed in 2016/2017.

CPC	2016	2017
EU-Croatia	ATEU1HRV00003	ATEU1HRV00003
EU-Croatia	ATEU1HRV00006	ATEU1HRV00006
EU-Croatia	ATEU1HRV00008	ATEU1HRV00008
EU-Croatia	ATEU1HRV00011	ATEU1HRV00011
		ATEU1HRV00012
		ATEU1HRV00015
EU-Malta	ATEU1MLT00001	ATEU1MLT00001
EU-Malta	ATEU1MLT00003	ATEU1MLT00002
EU-Malta	ATEU1MLT00004	ATEU1MLT00003
EU-Malta	ATEU1MLT00007	ATEU1MLT00004
EU-Malta	ATEU1MLT00008	ATEU1MLT00007
		ATEU1MLT00008
EU-Portugal		ATEU1PRT00002
EU-Spain	ATEU1ESP00001	ATEU1ESP00001
EU-Spain		ATEU1ESP00003
EU-Spain	ATEU1ESP00004	ATEU1ESP00004
EU-Spain	ATEU1ESP00005	ATEU1ESP00005
Morocco	AT001MAR00002	AT001MAR00002
Tunisia	AT001TUN00001	
Tunisia	AT001TUN00004	AT001TUN00004
Turkey	AT001TUR00004	AT001TUR00004
Turkey	AT001TUR00005	AT001TUR00005
Turkey	AT001TUR00010	AT001TUR00010
Turkey	AT001TUR00011	AT001TUR00011
Turkey	AT001TUR00013	AT001TUR00013
Turkey	AT001TUR00014	AT001TUR00014

Table 4. Traps observed under the ICCAT Regional Observers Programme in 2016/2017.

CPC	2016	2017
EU-Italy	ATEU2ITA00003	ATEU2ITA00003
EU-Italy	ATEU2ITA00009	ATEU2ITA00009
EU-Portugal		ATEU2PRT00002
Morocco		AT002MAR00002
Morocco		AT002MAR00003
Morocco		AT002MAR00005
Morocco		AT002MAR00011

CONSORTIUM'S REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ROP-BFT

Executive Summary

The service provider for implementing year eight (April 2017/March 2018) of the ICCAT ROP-BFT comprises of a consortium led by MRAG based in London and COFREPECHE in Paris assisted by regional partners located around the Mediterranean. This is the eighth year that the Consortium has been awarded the contract to implement the ROP-BFT and experience gained in previous years has been used to enhance systems in place for recruitment, training and deployment of observers and overall performance of the Programme.

The ROP-BFT allows the Commission to assess compliance with the regulatory framework. During year eight of the ROP-BFT 145 observers have been trained, equipped and mobilised for 134 purse seine deployments, of which one was cancelled, 17 completed and 12 current deployments on farms to date, achieving 100% observer coverage on authorised purse seiners, farms and traps within the remit of the programme, which included monitoring all fishing, transfer, caging and harvesting activities.

This report describes the key issues faced in assessing compliance with the regulatory framework during implementation of year eight of the ROP-BFT divided into operational and technical categories and focuses on issues that affect the observer role during deployments.

Estimating tuna transfers from video records: The key technical issue across all deployment types (on purse seiners and farms) was the inability to consistently estimate the amount of tuna transferred from video records. This was mainly a result of poor quality video records and/or viewing facilities (on vessels) or video availability immediately following the transfer operation. Some operators repeated transfers during caging operations because the initial video record was unsuitable for providing a means of accurately estimating the amount of tuna. Therefore further research/investigation is required to recommend a minimum standard of camera and viewing equipment for at sea conditions. Such an investigation should also produce recommendations on procedures that should be followed by operators so that the video record covers the entire transfer process and produce a video record that could be provided to the observer immediately following the transfer to ensure they have sufficient time to review the footage during their deployment. It can also be very difficult for an observer to determine if video footage has been tampered with when cuts in the video are hidden by cross fades. This problem is most likely when observers are not provided the video of the transfer immediately.

Improved consultation between CPCs, Secretariat, SCRS and ROP-BFT Consortium: During 2016 no meeting was held between CPCs, the Secretariat, SCRS and the Consortium. In previous years, meetings were held which proved to be constructive in improving the Programme and the Consortium would propose that they be continued prior to the next fishing season.