#### Original: English/French Appendix 2

#### POTENTIAL NON-COMPLIANCES AND RESPONSES - BFT VESSELS 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 - Vessels

PNC No.	Request number	Date reported	СРС	PNC	Clarifications / corrective action reported by consortium	Response
1	000DZ146	27/5/18	Algeria	Missing information in the logbook (the name of the captain was missing)	Instructions were given to the vessel owner so that the master would take corrective measures and accurately complete the fishing logbook.	The vessel master had omitted to do this but measures were taken to address this issue.
2	000DZ149	28/5/18	Algeria	Wrong ICCAT Number for the vessel XXX in the logbook	A simple error occurred in transcription of the number in the fishing logbook on the date indicated.	It is merely a transcription error of the number.
3	000DZ148	28/5/18	Algeria	The vessel position has not been recorded in the logbook. The master has not signed the vessel page.	The master corrected the error after being alerted by the observer.	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.
4	000LY031	28/5/18	Libya	No estimate of the transfer was possible due to the bad quality of the video; several cuts occurred in the video; the Authorization Number was not readable on the video.		A control transfer was done on 30/06/2018 as per ICCAT Transfer Authorisation Number: MLT-2018-AUT- 013. The quality of the video was good and the observer signed the ITD.

5	000TR135	27/5/18	Turkey	The video does not show all of the transfer, it stops before the end	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and accompanying MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, MoAF did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities. It was also observed by the MoAF inspectors that inspite of all sea conditions the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
6	000TN096	29/5/18	Tunisia	The pages of the logbook are not numbered.	Insufficient knowledge despite the training sessions aimed at vessel masters participating in the bluefin tuna campaign. We will undertake more efforts to solve these problems of poor understanding.

7	00000124	20/5/10	<b>T</b> 1	mi i i i	
7	000TR134	29/5/18	Turkey	The video does not	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				show all of the transfer,	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				and an independent	investigation in respect to the PNC
				estimate would not	reported with an official notification to
				have been possible due	the concerned operator. The operator has
				to video quality	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				regardless	engage in making a detailed examination
					of the video footage presented by the
					operator though he was asked to do so.
					The video footages of the concerned
					transfer has been demanded from the
					operator and, in any case, without
					finalizing the investigation MoAF has
					instructed the operator to conduct "a
					control transfer" accompanying with
					MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
					result of detailed examination carried out
					by the MoAF inspectors on the related
					documents and the video footages of the
					relevant operation, MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
					observed by the MoAF inspectors that in
					spite of all sea conditions the transfer
					could be recorded ideally and fish passes
					could be seen and fish amount could be
					estimated. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					acter milled by Moril .
L	1	1	1	1	

8	000LY032	29/5/18	Libya	Following a catch taken by a vessel of its JFO, the master reported the fishing operation in the logbook but without stating "that no catch has been hauled onboard nor transferred to cages" as stipulated in annex II of 17/07; The six dead tunas were not deducted from their individual quotas in the logbook.		This was a mistake by the master of the vessel and the operator have notified him for this then later rectified, and reported in logbook ,the captain apologized for this mistake after being drew his attention to not repeated next time
9	000DZ142	30/5/18	Algeria	The ICCAT vessel No. was wrong in the logbook on the dates 25, 27 and 28/05.	The corrections have been made since then.	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.
10	000TR129	30/5/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, no logbook entry was made within time that day. In addition, for a transfer conducted on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, the video record of the transfer was not provided to the observer immediately.	The observer has confirmed that the video record was provided to observer after approximately 3 hours because the divers were initially on a different support vessel	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator indicated that the log book has been filled subsequently. The observer has confirmed that the video record was provided to observer after approximately 3 hours because the divers were initially on a different support vessel as also stated by the observer.

11	000TR116	1/6/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that for a transfer conducted on 30/05/2018, an accurate estimate of fish passing could not be made due to issues with the video record, specifically: over several short periods of time totaling 2 minutes and 24 seconds the edge of the door cage was not in view, at one point air bubbles produced by the diver obscured the view of the door, and at the end of the transfer as the video camera was moved towards the cage, the edges of the door could no longer be seen.		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, it is observed that there seems a short slip within the record where was not during the fish passes and fish could be counted. Also, since the bubbles produced by the diver was not during the fish passes so they did not obscure the estimation of the fish amount. Following the transfer, in order to show that the inside of the donor cage, to perform the necessary procedure. MoAF did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities. It is also observed by the MoAF inspectors that inspite of all sea conditions the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	--------	--------	---	--	---

12	000TR116	1/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
14	00011110	1/0/10	TUIKEy	conducted on 31 <sup>st</sup> May	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				that the inside of the	investigation in respect to the PNC
					reported with an official notification to
				receiving net was not	
				shown by the video	the concerned operator. The video
				record	footages of the concerned transfer has
					been demanded from the operator and, in
					any case, without finalizing the
					investigation, MoAF has instructed the
					operator to conduct "a control transfer"
					accompanying with MoAF inspectors
					before caging. As a result of detaied
					examination carried out by the MoAF
					inspectors on the related documents and
					the video footages of the relevant
					operation, it is observed that the inside of
					the receiving net and fishes inside seem
					clearly. It is also observed that the video
					quality was very good for estimation of
					fish amount. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF. MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities.
					support us of megal dout thesi

13	000TR121	4/6/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that for a transfer on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, approximately 3% of the door was already open at the beginning of the video and the record did not show the closing of the door. In addition, there was an interruption in the video record for approximately one second. In addition, the video record does not show one corner of the door.		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation, MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detaied examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, it is observed that the door was not open at the beginning of the video, the opening and closing of the door was shown clearly. It is also observed by the MoAF inspectors that inspite of all bad sea conditions, the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. MoAF did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	--------	--------	--	--	--

	00TR135	4/6/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that for a transfer on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, the closing of the door was not completely recorded in the video. The ITD was not signed. The observer has also reported that for a transfer on 2 <sup>nd</sup> June, the video record was not provided to the observer as soon as possible. The ITD was not signed.		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the operator though he was asked to do so. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, MoAF did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities. It is also observed by the MoAF inspectors that in spite of all sea conditions the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the
--	---------	--------	--------	---	--	---

15	000TR117	4/6/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that for two unsuccessful fishing operations, occurring on 27 <sup>th</sup> May and 29 <sup>th</sup> May, no logbook entries were made for the fishing operations. In addition, for two transfers, occurring on 31 <sup>st</sup> May and 1 <sup>st</sup> June, the observer has reported insufficient artificial lighting and very poor video quality. In neither case was the ITD signed.		During 2017 fishing season MoAF has scheduled a training programme on log- book obligations towards the skippers. While, as a result of those training such log- book failure has decreased, however the operator has confirmed this logbook failure to his own unintentional omission. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of his failure. Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the operator though he was asked to do so. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, it is confirmed that the video quality was not good. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	--------	--------	--	--	---

16	000TN096	6/6/18	Tunisia	Incomplete recording in the logbook 01/06/2018: Quantity and number of bluefin tuna individuals transferred not reported; transfer position not reported; destination farm and ICCAT number not reported	Insufficient knowledge despite the training sessions aimed at the vessel masters participating in the bluefin tuna campaign. We will undertake more efforts to resolve these problems of poor understanding.
17	000TN096	7/6/18	Tunisia	On the date 30/05/2018, the master changed the total weight of the catch taken by another vessel (164 706.588 kg instead of 164 700 Kg) but did not change the allocations	The difference of 6,588 kg is automatically generated by the eBCD system. Due to lack of attention.
18	000TN018	7/6/18	Tunisia	On the date 30/05/2018, the master changed the total weight of the catch taken by another vessel (164 706.588 kg instead of 164 700 Kg) but did not change the allocations	The difference of 6,588 kg is automatically generated by the eBCD system. Due to lack of attention

19	000TN017	7/6/18	Tunisia	On 26/05/2018, the tuna vessel XXX carried out a fishing operation followed by a transfer on 28/05/2018. No information has been recorded in the fishing logbook of the observer vessel following these operations. The master completed the page of 28/05 with the proper information on 02/06/2018	Insufficient knowledge despite the training sessions aimed at vessel masters participating in the bluefin tuna campaign. Will undertake more efforts to solve these problems of poor understanding.
20	000LY029	7/6/18	Libya	The logbook wasn't filled in for the day of 06/06/2018. The position at 12h00 and the captain signature were missing	This was a genuine mistake and was immediately corrected by the operator.

21	000TR117	7/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer occurring on 06/06/2018, the video quality and water visibility were very low so that the observer was unable to estimate the number of fish passing. The ITD was not signed		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the operator though he was asked to do so. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detaied examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, MoAF did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities. It is also observed by the MoAF inspectors that inspite of all sea conditions the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	--------	--------	---	--	---

22	000TR135	7/6/10	Turker	For a transfer on 7 <sup>th</sup>	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
22	0001K135	7/6/18	Turkey		
				June, one side of the	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation
				door was not visible in	in respect to the PNC reported with an
				the video. The ITD was	official notification to the concerned
				not signed.	operator. The operator has claimed that the
					observer did refuse to engage in making a
					detailed examination of the video footage
					presented by the operator though he was
					asked to do so. The video footages of the
					concerned transfer has been demanded
					from the operator and, in any case, without
					finalizing the investigation MoAF has
					instructed the operator to conduct "a
					control transfer" accompanying with MoAF
					inspectors before caging. As a result of
					detaied examination carried out by the
					MoAF inspectors on the related documents
					and the video footages of the relevant
					operation, MoAF did not conclude any
					serious infringements, suspicious or illegal
					activities. It is also observed by the MoAF
					inspectors that inspite of all sea conditions
					the transfer could be recorded ideally and
					fish passes could be seen. A control transfer
					under the supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging, no
					fish exceeding the declared quota/amount
					of fish transferred was determined by
					MoAF.
					MUAF.

23	000TR126	7/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, the door was not always fully shown in the video and there were a number of times when water visibility was too poor to see the transfer clearly. The ITD was not signed. The observer has also reported that for a transfer on 2 <sup>nd</sup> June, no estimate was possible due to poor video quality, low light levels and diver's bubbles. The ITD was not signed.		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of transfer operation conducted on 26.05.2018, it is observed that for the video record was quite good for such a transfer performed in the night and the fish passes could be seen clearly. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of transfer operation conducted on 02.06.2018, the inspectors confirmed that the video quality was not good and it was not possible to estimate the number of fish. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	--------	--------	---	--	--

24	000TR130	7/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 3 <sup>rd</sup> June, the video did not show the bottom of the door for a short period. Although the observer does not consider that any fish were not	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in
				visible, the ITD was not signed.	any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of transfer operation,
					it is confirmed that depending since the transfer was conducted within night and depending on the conditions in the night, the bottom of the door moved out of the viewfinder during recording for a short period. It is also observed the video quality was good to estimate the amount of fish. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

		7/6/18	Turkey	conducted on 2 <sup>nd</sup> June, the original video record was not provided, but that almost a day after the operation a copy of the video record was provided. The cage door was not always in view during the video, with a total interruption time of approximately one minute. The ITD was not signed	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfer has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. It is confirmed by the operator that, depending on the bad sea conditions, intensive catching and transfer operations as well as the distances between the vessels, the video could not be provided to the observer immediately. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of transfer operation, it was observed that due to the water quality there exist a short unavoidable interruption which is not during fish passes and the cage door was in the view during the video. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
--	--	--------	--------	---	--

26	000LY031	8/6/18	Libya	The ITD number on the eBCD (N°LY-18900002- LT01) was noted LBY- 2018-ITD-202 instead of LBY-2018-ITD-102	We confirm the mistake made during the compilation of the EBCD. The error has now been rectified. We apologise for the mistake
27	000DZ139	8/6/18	Algeria	The vessel carried out a fishing and transfer operation on 01 June 2018, OPC 2018-011. The information recorded (catches allocated for each tuna vessel) does not comply with the ICCAT Recommendation (Annex 2 – Logbook requirements). There is no number or weight of allocated catch for each JFO vessel as described in the recommendation.	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures have been taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.

no number or weight of allocated catches for each vessel of the JFO as described in the
--

29	000DZ139	8/6/18	Algeria	The vessel carried out a fishing and transfer operation on 01 June 2018, JFC 2018-011. Once the eBCD had been received from the vessel master, the document was checked and the following errors were noted: • Section 3: the product description describes the total product and not the live weight (110112 kg instead of 109557 kg) and the total number of fish (live+dead) and not the number of live fish (992 instead of 987 individuals). • Section 4: the cage number is incorrect	According to our interpretation of Recommendation 14-04/17-07, in particular annex 11, section a) paragraph two, the amount of headings 3 and 4 should be the same as those declared under heading 2. In this fishery, the trade in fish is equal to the amount transferred (109557 kg / 987 specimens) plus the 5 dead individuals (555 kg), i.e. a total of 110112 kg (992 specimens), which corresponds to the amount reported in section 2. However, the eBCD system has not signalled any traceability issue
30	000DZ139	8/6/18	Algeria	The vessel carried out a fishing and transfer operation on 06 June 2018, JFO 2018-011. Once the eBCD had been received from the vessel master, the document was checked and the following errors were noted: Section 4 : The number of specimens and weight of the catch are recorded with the cage number.	Corrections have been made to section 4 of eBCD DZ18900006-LT01

31	000LY030	8/6/18	Libya	Following a Fishing operation undertake by the vessel XXX on the 02/06/2018, two transfers were done by this vessel the same day. Only one transfer were notify on the logbook of the vessel.	Due to intense pressure at the time the captain forgot to record the second catch on the log book. This was immediately notified to the captain and it was recorded immediately.
32	000DZ142	8/6/18	Algeria	The page of 07/06/2018 of the logbook was not signed	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.

33	000TR125	10/6/10	Turkov	The observer has	Turkich Ministry of Agriculture and
33	0001R125	10/6/18	Turkey		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				reported on the 9 <sup>th</sup> June	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				that for a transfer on	investigation in respect to the PNC
				26 <sup>th</sup> May, the video and	reported with an official notification to
				the record did not show	the concerned operator. The video
				all of the transfer. The	footages of the concerned transfer has
				ITD for this operation	been demanded from the operator and, in
				was not signed. The	any case, without finalizing the
				delay in reporting was	investigation MoAF has instructed the
				due to lack of	operator to conduct "a control transfer"
				communication	accompanying with MoAF inspectors
				systems available on	before caging. As a result of detaied
				board.	examination carried out by the MoAF
					inspectors on the related documents and
					the video footages of transfer operation,
					it was observed that depending on the
					poor water quality, it was not possible to
					estimate the number of fish transferred.
					A control transfer was conducted for the
					questioned transfer before caging. A
					control transfer under the supervision of
					an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
					inspectors has been conducted in the
					vicinity of the relevant BFT farming
					facility before the associated caging
					operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					,

24	00050125	10/0/10	<b>TT</b> 1	<b>701</b> 1 1	
34	000TR135	10/6/18	Turkey	The observer has	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				reported on the 10 <sup>th</sup>	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				June that for a transfer	investigation in respect to the PNC
				on 9 <sup>th</sup> June, the video	reported with an official notification to
				record was not of	the concerned operator. The operator
				sufficient quality for the	has claimed that the observer did refuse
				observer to be able to	to engage in making a detailed
				estimate the amount of	examination of the video footage
				fish transferred. The	presented by the operator though he was
				ITD for this operation	asked to do so. The video footages of the
				was not signed	concerned transfer has been demanded
					from the operator and, in any case,
					without finalizing the investigation MoAF
					has instructed the operator to conduct "a
					control transfer" accompanying with
					MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
					result of detaied examination carried out
					by the MoAF inspectors on the related
					documents and the video footages of the
					relevant operation, MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities. A control
					transfer under the supervision of an
					ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
					inspectors has been conducted in the
					vicinity of the relevant BFT farming
					facility before the associated caging
					operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.

35	000DZ139	10/6/18	Algeria	Each of the vessels XXX and YYY carried out a fishing operation on 01 June 2018, JFO 2018- 011. The information contained in the fishing logbook of YYY are incomplete. The ICCAT numbers of the vessels that carried out the fishing operations are missing.		Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.
----	----------	---------	---------	--	--	---

36	000TR131	10/6/18	Turkey	The observer has	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
50	00011(151	10/0/10	Turkey	reported on the 9 <sup>th</sup> June	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				that for a transfer on	investigation in respect to the PNC
				27 <sup>th</sup> May, the video	reported with an official notification to
				record did not show all	the concerned operator. The video
				of the transfer. The ITD	footages of the concerned transfer has
				for this operation was	been demanded from the operator and, in
				not signed. The	any case, without finalizing the
				observer has reported	investigation, MoAF has instructed the
				on the 9 <sup>th</sup> June that for	operator to conduct "a control transfer"
				a fishing operation	accompanying with MoAF inspectors
				conducted on the 5 <sup>th</sup>	
				June a single dead fish	before caging. As a result of detaied examination carried out by the MoAF
				was not correctly	inspectors on the related documents and
				recorded in the	the video footages of the relevant
				logbook. The delay in	operation, it was observed by the MoAF
				reporting was due to lack of communication	inspectors that in spite of all bad sea conditions, the transfer could be
				systems available on	,
				board.	recorded ideally and fish passes could be
				board.	seen and fish amount could be estimated.
					A control transfer under the supervision
					of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
					inspectors has been conducted in the
					vicinity of the relevant BFT farming
					facility before the associated caging
					operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF. It was confirmed
					by the operator that the dead fish has not
					been recorded in the logbook
					inadvertently, and the reported fish will
					be released and reduced from the
					allocated quota of the vessel.

37	000TR134	10/6/18	Turkey	The observer has	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
57	0001K134	10/0/18	титкеу	reported on the 10 <sup>th</sup>	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				June that for a transfer	investigation in respect to the PNC
				on the 27 <sup>th</sup> May, the	reported with an official notification to
				video record the video	the concerned operator. The operator has
				record did not show the	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				entirety of the transfer,	engage in making a detailed examination
				the video quality was	of the video footage presented by the
				also not of sufficient	operator though he was asked to do so.
				quality to allow an	The video footages of the concerned
				estimation. The ITD for	transfers has been demanded from the
				this operation was not	operator and, in any case, without
				signed. For a transfer	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
				on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> June, the	instructed the operator to conduct
				video record the video	"control transfers" accompanying with
				record did not show the	MoAF inspectors before caging. It was
				closing of the door, the	confirmed by the operator that
				video quality was also	depending on the poor water quality, it
				not of sufficient quality	was noy possible to estimate the number
				to allow an estimation.	of fish transferred for those operations.
				The ITD for this	As a result of detaied examination carried
				operation was not	out by the MoAF inspectors on the
				signed. For a transfer	related documents and the video footages
				on the 8 <sup>th</sup> June, the	of the relevant operations, MoAF did not
				video record was not of	conclude any serious infringements,
				sufficient quality to	suspicious or illegal activities. A control
				allow an estimation.	transfer under the supervision of an
				The ITD for this	ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
				operation was not	inspectors has been conducted in the
				signed.	vicinity of the relevant BFT farming
					facility before the associated caging
					operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					determined by MOAP.
	1	1	1		

38	000LY029	11/6/18	Libya	When a transfer occurred, the logbook did not show the name and ICCAT number of the farm destination. These information are missing for the days: 27/05/2018>page n°122; 1/06/2018 >page n°127; 02/06/2018>page n°128; 02/06/2018 >page n°129; 04/06/2018>page n°131	This information was recorded at a later stage on the log book. The captain apologised for this omission.
39	000TN022	11/6/18	Tunisia	The weight indicated in section 3 of the eBCD (No.TN18900004- LT01) is 120 000 kg instead of 120 004.8 kg	The difference of 4.8 kg is generated automatically by the eBCD system. Section 3 of the eBCD TN18900004 has been amended by the CPC administration.

40	000TR120	12/6/18	Turkey	The observer has reported that for a transfer conducted on 26 <sup>th</sup> May, the video record did not show 100% of the transfer. The observer has also reported that for a transfer conducted on 28 <sup>th</sup> May, the video record did not show 100% of the transfer		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfers has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "control transfers" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operations, within the video records of transfer conducted on 26.05.2018, no interruption was detected, and the fish passes shown clearly. Although the ITD for the operation has been signed by the Observer a control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
----	----------	---------	--------	--	--	---

				Regarding the transfer operation conducted on 28.05.2018, it was confirmed by the operator that depending on the sea conditions, there were a short uninventional split within the video which is not obstructing the recording of the fish passes. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operation, it was observed by the MoAF inspectors that in spite of all bad sea conditions, the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. Control transfers were conducted for the questioned transfers before caging. During the subsequent cagings, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
--	--	--	--	--

	0.000000 1.0.1	10/6/10		m) ) )	
41	000TR124	12/6/18	Turkey	The observer has	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				reported that on 28 <sup>th</sup>	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				May, one dead tuna was	investigation in respect to the PNC
				transhipped via a small	reported with an official notification to
				boat from [another	the concerned operator. The video
				vessel]. The dead fish	footages of the concerned transfers has
				was not recorded in the	been demanded from the operator and, in
				logbook or the BCD; the	any case, without finalizing the
				observer was only	investigation MoAF has instructed the
				provided with the video	operator to conduct "a control transfer"
				record after three	accompanying with MoAF inspectors
				hours; there were three	before caging. As a result of detailed
				interruptions on the	examination carried out by the MoAF
				video record, so that	inspectors on the related documents and
				the transfer was not	the video footages of the relevant
				100% recorded.	operations:
					1) It was confirmed by the operator that
					the reported dead BFT have not been
					observed by the crew; nevertheless, the
					reported fish amount will be reduced
					from the allocated quota before caging
					into farm by the operator.
					2) Within the video records of a transfer
					conducted on 28.05.2018, it was
					confirmed by the operator that video
					footages have been delivered to the
					Observer as soon as the transfer and
					related necessary safety operations
					completed, in spite of the bad sea
					conditions.

		3) Within the video records of a transfer operation conducted on 28.05.2018, a 1 second interruption was detected depending on the camera type (GoPro Camera) used recording which is not during the fish passes. It was also observed that the video quality was quite enough for estimation of fish amount. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

42	000TN017	12/6/18	Tunisia	On 10/06/2018, the tuna vessel XXX carried out a transfer operation and to date the observer has not yet received the transfer video (more than 49 hours after the transfer). In accordance with regulation 17-07, our observer has not signed the ITD and even if he does receive the video shortly, he will not sign the ITD. We apology for the delay in reporting	It is the last catch of the JFO 2018-002 before reaching the allocated quota. However, the transfer video was not accepted by the regional observer due to it poor quality. The operator does not have an empty cage on the high sea to carry out immediately a control transfer. We have reported closure of the JFO and ordered a control transfer which was carried out on 09/07/2018 in the presence of Tunisian inspectors before the caging operation. Therefore, the data reported by the master and recorded on the eBCD TN18900017 were considered acceptable and validated.
43	000TN095	13/6/18	Tunisia	which is due to the fact that the vessel endured bad weather conditions. On 11/06/2018, the tuna vessel carried out a transfer operation and to date the observer has not yet received the transfer video (more than 30 hours after the transfer). In accordance with regulation 17-07, our observer has not signed the ITD and even if he receives it shortly, he will not sign the ITD.	A control transfer with number TUN- 2018AUT024 was ordered and carried out on 21/06/2018. Therefore, the data reported by the master and recorded on eBCD TN18900019 were considered acceptable and validated. At the end of this operation, the ITD was signed by the regional observer.

L					
000LY032	13/6/18	Libya			This information was recorded at a later
					stage on the log book. The captain
					apologized for this omission.
			27/05/2018; TOP n°3		
			of the 01/06/2018;		
			TOP n°4 of the		
			02/06/2018; TOP n°5		
			TOP n°6 of the		
			04/06/2018; TOP n°7		
			the information relative		
			to the position of the		
000LY031	13/6/18	Libya	The year for several transfer video was wrong: TOP n°4, ITD (LBY-2018- 103-ITD). The date on the video was 02/06/2017 instead of 02/06/2018; TOP n°5, ITD (LBY-2018- 104-ITD). The date on the video was 04/06/2017 instead of 04/06/2018; TOP n°6, ITD (LBY-2018- 105-ITD). The date on the video was 10/06/2017 instead of 10/06/2018; TOP n°7, ITD (LBY-2018- 106-ITD). The date on the video was 12/06/2017 instead of 12/06/2018. The observer did not see the mistake until 13/06/2018		This was a genuine mistake by the Farm operator who was in possession of the video camera. At the beginning of each video the Transfer Authorisation is filmed showing the date of 2018 and also the Transfer Authorisation Number.
	000LY032 000LY031			000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was 04/06/2018; TOP n°5. ITD (LBY-2018-100-400)000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was wrong; TOP n°4. TTD (LBY-2018-100-400)000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was wrong; TOP n°5. TTD (LBY-2018-100-400)000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was wrong; TOP n°5. TTD (LBY-2018-100-400)000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was wrong; TOP n°5. TTD (LBY-2018-100-400)000LY03113/6/18LibyaThe year for several transfer video was wrong; TOP n°5. TTD (LBY-2018-100-400)103-ITD). The date on the video was 02/06/2017Instead of 02/06/2018; TOP n°5. TTD (LBY-2018-104-17D). The date on the video was 10/06/2017104-ITD). The date on the video was 10/06/2018; TOP n°7. TTD (LBY-2018-106-17D). The date on the video was 10/06/2017105-ITD). The date on the video was 10/06/2018; TOP n°7. TTD (LBY-2018-106-17D). The date on the video was 10/06/2017105-ITD). The date on the video was 12/06/2017105-ITD). The date on the video was 12/06/2017106-ITD). The date on the video was 12/06/2017107-170. The date on the video was 12/06/2018; TOP n°7. ITD (LBY-2018-106-ITD). The date on the video was 12/06/2017	000LY031 13/6/18 Libya   14 Tenser for several   Top n°4, TrD (LBV-2018-   103-TD). The date on the   video was 02/06/2017   instead of 04/06/2018;   TOP n°5, TTD (LBV-2018-   106-TD). The date on the   video was 10/06/2018;   TOP n°7, TTD (LBV-2018-   106-TD). Th

46 000LY093	15/6/18 Lil	ibya The vessel did a transfer operation on the 10/06/2018, following this transfer our observer see that the number of tuna in the ITD (n=2210) is different than the number of tuna in the eBCD (n=2200). The vessel also generated two eBCD with two different numbers, one for the live tunas and the second one for the dead tuna.	The Libyan eBCD LY18900007, corresponding to the catch of Hanibal on the 09/06/2018 was amended on the 18/06/2018. Both the number of tuna on the eBCD and the ITD equal 2210 pieces. The eBCD LY18900008 was generated to declare 10 dead tuna.
-------------	-------------	--	--

47	00070121	10///10	Turlease	Ear a transfor on 5th	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
47	000TR121	18/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 5 <sup>th</sup>	
				June, the video record	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation
				did not show the donor	in respect to the PNC reported with an
				net clearly after	official notification to the concerned
				completion of transfer.	operator. The video footages of the
				The observer	concerned transfers has been demanded
				considered that the BFT	from the operator and, in any case, without
				could be counted	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
				without difficulty and	instructed the operator to conduct "control
				the ITD was signed. In	transfers" accompanying with MoAF
				addition, the observer	inspectors before caging. As a result of
				has reported that for a	detailed examination carried out by the
				transfer on 12 <sup>th</sup> June,	MoAF inspectors on the related documents
				the top of the door was	and the video footages of the relevant
				not completely tied at	operations, it was observed by the MoAF
				the end of the transfer.	inspectors that in spite of all bad sea
					conditions, the transfers could be recorded
				The observer	ideally and fish passes could be seen and
				considered that the BFT	fish amount could be estimated. MoAF did
				could be counted	not conclude any serious infringements,
				without difficulty and	suspicious or illegal activities. A control
				the ITD was signed.	transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT
					regional observer and MoAF inspectors has
					been conducted in the vicinity of the
					relevant BFT farming facility before the
					associated caging operation took place.
					During the subsequent control transfer and
					caging, no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					P.S: It should also be noted that our
					authority has been informed via an e-mail
					dated 04.07.2018, stating that reviewing
					the videos during briefing, it seemed that
					the video records for those transfers can be
					considered compliant.

			-		
48	000TR135	18/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 14 <sup>th</sup> June, the video quality was poor and the opening of the door was not clear. Counting of BFT was very difficult. The ITD was not signed.	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the operator though he was asked to do so. The video footages of the concerned transfers has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the video footages of the relevant operation, it was confirmed that the visibility conditions was poor for estimation of the fish amount. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

49	Withdrawn				Having consulted the observer and watched the video during debriefing, fish counts were possible with care and effort despite the quality of the video. This PNC can be considered retracted and will not appear in the final report.	
50	000TR114	18/6/18	Turkey	No logbook entry was made on 16 <sup>th</sup> June		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator confirmed that the log book has been filled within the same day but with a short delay. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of his failure.
51	000TN099	19/6/18	Tunisia	On 11/06/2018, the tuna vessel carried out a transfer operation after which the observer signed the ITD. On signing the eBCD number was generated but the paper document was only submitted to him on return to the port with another number. The remainder of the information was correct. Following this problem, a new ITD with a new number and containing the information of the new eBCD was issued. The observer did not sign it.		eBCD No. TN18900015 was issued by the vessel representative with an erroneous catch date, due to lack of attention. As it was a locked field, the CPC administration decided to delete this eBCD and issue a new eBCD with the correct date (eBCD No. TN18900018).
52	000DZ136 18/6/18	Algeria	The Algerian authorities reported to our observer that their vessel did not belong to the JFO 2018-011, contrary to what is indicated in the guidelines received from ICCAT (official document attached).		Indeed, the fishing administration e- mailed the operator of the tuna vessel XXX asking him to justify the reasons for the vessel not going out to sea and actively participating in the fishing operations with its joint fishing group. The controller of the ROP-BFT programme misinterpreted the e-mail and thought that the vessel did not belong to the joint fishing group. Misinterpretation of an e-mail on internal management of fishing operations.	
----	------------------	---------	--	--	--	
----	------------------	---------	--	--	--	

	000000105	10/11/10	-		
53	000TR132	18/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer occurring	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				on 28 <sup>th</sup> May, the door	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				was not covered by the	investigation in respect to the PNC
				camera for	reported with an official notification to
				approximately three	the concerned operator. The operator has
				seconds whilst the door	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				was opening. Fora	engage in making a detailed examination
				transfer occurring on	of the video footage presented by the
				2 <sup>nd</sup> June, the video	operator though he was asked to do so.
				didn't show 100% of	The video footages of the concerned
				the transfer.	transfer has been demanded from the
					operator and, in any case, without
					finalizing the investigation MoAF has
					instructed the operator to conduct "
					control transfers" accompanying with
					MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
					result of detailed examination carried out
					by the MoAF inspectors on the related
					documents and the video footages of the
					relevant operation, MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities. It is also
					observed by the MoAF inspectors that
					inspite of all sea conditions the transfer
					could be recorded ideally and fish passes
					could be seen and fish amount could be
					estimated. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					······································

June, part of the door was not visible in the video record. The ITD was not signed Forestry (MoAP) initiated an im in respect to the PNC reported v official notification to the conce operator. The video footages of concerned transfers has been do from the operator and, in any ca finalizing the investigation MoA instructed the operator to condu- control transfer* accompanying inspectors before caging. As ar detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that to transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this trans simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observer and M inspectors observer and M inspectors observer and M inspectors basen conducted operation, it was detected that to transfer and the cage out of the view of the spassing. M inspectors observer and M inspectors observer and M inspectors observer and M inspectors observer and M inspectors basen conducted op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co control transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount fish the super inclusion of the relevant BFT for before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co transfer and caging, no fish exect declared quota/anount of fish the co			10/11/1	- 1		
was not visible in the video record. The ITD was not signed was not signed	54	000TR121	19/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 14 <sup>th</sup>	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
video record. The ITD was not signed was not signed was not signed was not signed operator. The video footages of concred transfers has been d from the operator and, in any co- finalizing the investigation MoA instructed the operator to cond control transfer" accompanying inspectors before caging. As a re detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. N inspectors baserved that the tra- be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be control transfer under the supe I CCAT regional observer and M inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging no fish expective declared quota/amount of fish the						
via not signed was not signed operator. The video footages of concerned transfers has been d from the operator and, in any ca finalizing the investigation MoA instructed the operator to cond control transfer "accompanying inspectors before caping. As a re detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that o transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish pass possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the e entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra- be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the supe ICCAT regional observer and MA inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BTF farm before the associated caging pop place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging no fish execu- declared quota/amount of fish the						
concerned transfers has been de from the operator and, in any ca finalizing the investigation MoA instructed the operator to condi control transfer" accompanying inspectors before caging. As a re detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that c transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICGAT regional observer and M inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce					video record. The ITD	
concerned transfers has been dd   from the operator and, in any ca   finalizing the investigation MoA   instructed the operator to cond   control transfer" accompanying   inspectors before caging, As are   detailed examination carried ou   MoAF inspectors on the related   and the video footages of the rel   operation, it was detected that t   transfer a small area of the cage   out of the view where fish passe   possible. It was indicated by the   that video footage for this tran   recorded by a second camera   simultaneously was provided to   Observer which is is passing. M   inspectors observed that the tra   be recorded ideally and fish pass   control transfer under the supei   ICCAT regional observer and M   inspectors herever and Fish amount could be e   control transfer under the supei   ICCAT regional observer and M   inspectors has been conducted   vicinity of the relevant BFT farm   before the associated caging op   place. During the subsequent co   transfer and caging, no fish exce   declared quota/amount of fish txece					was not signed	
finalizing the investigation MoA instructed the operator to cond control transfer" accompanying inspectors before caging. As a re detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that to transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the e entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and M inspectors has been conducted I vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce					5	concerned transfers has been demanded
instructed the operator to condu- control transfer" accompanying inspectors before caging. As a re- detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be control transfer under the supe ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exec declared quota/amount of fish t						from the operator and, in any case, without
control transfer <sup>*</sup> accompanying inspectors before caging. As a re detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and M inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farn before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						finalizing the investigation MoAF has
inspectors before caging. As a re- detailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the e entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra- be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the supe ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excet declared quota/amount of fish texet						instructed the operator to conduct "a
defailed examination carried ou MoAF inspectors on the related and the view of for ages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the of entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be entirely could be entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observe and M inspectors abserved and the trap be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be entirely could be entirely and no fish start the trap be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be entirely and passed in the super ICCAT regional observer and M inspectors has been conducted in vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish the						control transfer" accompanying with MoAF
MoAF inspectors on the related and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the supel ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excer declared quota/amount of fish t						inspectors before caging. As a result of
and the video footages of the rel operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second campoint of Observer which is showing the entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish ext						detailed examination carried out by the
operation, it was detected that of transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the of entirely and no fish is passing. be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excert declared quota/amount of fish t						MoAF inspectors on the related documents
transfer a small area of the cage out of the view where fish passes possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the c entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						and the video footages of the relevant
out of the view where fish passe possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the d entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tran be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mc inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish the						operation, it was detected that during the
possible. It was indicated by the that a video footage for this tran- recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the d entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Md inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						transfer a small area of the cage door was
that a video footage for this tran- recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the o entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging op place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excer declared quota/amount of fish t						out of the view where fish passes are not
recorded by a second camera simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the of entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the trad be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be end control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mod inspectors has been conducted in vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging oper place. During the subsequent con transfer and caging, no fish excert declared quota/amount of fish the						possible. It was indicated by the operator
simultaneously was provided to Observer which is showing the orentirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the trad be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and MO inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						that a video footage for this transfer
Observer which is showing the operatively and no fish is passing. More that the transpectors observed that the transpectors observed that the transpectors observed ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be ended to control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and More inspectors has been conducted in vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging oper place. During the subsequent contransfer and caging, no fish exceed declared quota/amount of fish the transfer and caging.						recorded by a second camera
entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						simultaneously was provided to the
entirely and no fish is passing. M inspectors observed that the tra be recorded ideally and fish pas seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						Observer which is showing the cage
be recorded ideally and fish pass seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						entirely and no fish is passing. MoAF
seen and fish amount could be e control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						inspectors observed that the transfer could
control transfer under the super ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						be recorded ideally and fish passes could be
ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted in vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excer declared quota/amount of fish t						seen and fish amount could be estimated. A
ICCAT regional observer and Mo inspectors has been conducted in vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish excer declared quota/amount of fish t						control transfer under the supervision of an
inspectors has been conducted i vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
vicinity of the relevant BFT farm before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						inspectors has been conducted in the
before the associated caging ope place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility
place. During the subsequent co transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						before the associated caging operation took
transfer and caging, no fish exce declared quota/amount of fish t						place. During the subsequent control
declared quota/amount of fish t						transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the
						declared quota/amount of fish transferred
was determined by MoAF.						was determined by MoAF.

55	000TR123 19/6/18	Turkey	After a transfer on 28 <sup>th</sup> May, one dead tuna (119cm, 45kg) was transhipped via a small boat to [another purse seiner] This tuna was not adequately recorded in the logbook		This PNC issue has been reported for the vessel XXX as well. Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents, it was confirmed by the operator that the reported dead BFT have not been observed by the crew; nevertheless, the reported fish amount will be reduced from the allocated quota of the vessel XXX before caging into farm by the operator.
----	------------------	--------	--	--	---

56	000TR127	19/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 19 <sup>th</sup>	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
20	0001R127	19/0/18	Тигкеу		
				June, the artificial	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				lighting was insufficient	investigation in respect to the PNC
				and the sides of the	reported with an official notification to
				door were not visible. A	the concerned operator. The video
				fish count was not	footages of the concerned transfers has
				possible and the ITD	been demanded from the operator and, in
				was not signed.	any case, without finalizing the
					investigation MoAF has instructed the
					operator to conduct "a control transfer"
					accompanying with MoAF inspectors
					before caging. The operator indicated
					that since the BFTs has spawn during the
					transfer operation, the visibility has
					decreased accordingly. As a result of
					detailed examination carried out by the
					MoAF inspectors on the video footages of
					the relevant operation, it was confirmed
					that the visibility conditions was poor for
					estimation of the fish amount. A control
					transfer under the supervision of an
					ICCAT regional observer and MoAF
					inspectors has been conducted in the
					vicinity of the relevant BFT farming
					facility before the associated caging
					operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.
					acterimited by Moril.

57	000LY089	20/6/18	Libya	After the transfer	We would like to confirm that the issue
				operation of the	made by the observer on the difference
				10/06/2018, when the	of the Nb of fish registered on the
				vessel came back to the	ITD and on the eBCD, show the
				port, the observer saw	difference on the 3 dead fish (1500p on
				the eBCD and reported	the ITD, 1497p on the section Nb 4 of the
				that the number of fish	eBCD). It's obvious that captain of Zarqa
				on the eBCD (1497) and	Alyamama1 has made recording error on
				the ITD (1500) was	the ITD, since dead fish must be deducted
				different.	from the total Nb of fish.

58	000TR133	20///10	Tumber	1) For a transfor on 20th	 Turbiah Miniatur of Agriculture or -
58	00018133	20/6/18	Turkey	1) For a transfer on 29 <sup>th</sup>	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				May, no independent	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				estimate of the transfer	investigation in respect to the PNC
				amount was possible	reported with an official notification to
				due to the video quality	the concerned operator. The operator has
				2) For a transfer	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				occurring on 30 <sup>th</sup> May,	engage in making a detailed examination
				the door opening was	of the video footage presented by the
				not fully shown, the	operator though he was asked to do so.
				video record of the	The video footages of the concerned
				transfer did not show	transfer has been demanded from the
				the receiving and donor	operator and, in any case, without
				cage interiors	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
				before/after transfer,	instructed the operator to conduct "a
				and that a video of the	control transfer" accompanying with
				transfer was not	MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
				provided to the	result of detailed examination carried out
				observer immediately.	by the MoAF inspectors on the related
				The observer believes	documents and the video footages of the
				the video provided may	relevant operation, MoAF did not
				not be the original 3)	conclude any serious infringements,
				For a transfer occurring	suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
				on 1 <sup>st</sup> June, no	observed by the MoAF inspectors that
				independent estimate	inspite of all sea conditions the transfer
				of the transfer amount	could be recorded ideally and fish passes
				was possible due to the	could be seen and fish amount could be
				video quality, and the	estimated. A control transfer under the
				video record of the	supervision of an ICCAT regional
				transfer did not show	observer and MoAF inspectors has been
				the receiving and donor	conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
				cage interiors	BFT farming facility before the associated
				before/after transfer.	caging operation took place. During the
				4) For a transfer	subsequent control transfer and caging,
				occurring on 3 <sup>rd</sup> June,	no fish exceeding the declared
				the video record did	quota/amount of fish transferred was
				not show the entire	determined by MoAF.
				transfer due to	-

1	[	
	interruptions, and the	
	video record of the	
	transfer did not show	
	the receiving and donor	
	cage interiors	
	before/after transfer.	
	5) For a transfer	
	occurring on 5 <sup>th</sup> June,	
	the video record did	
	not show the entire	
	transfer due to	
	interruptions, and the	
	video record was not	
	provided to the	
	observer as soon as	
	possible after the	
	transfer was complete.	
	6) For a transfer	
	occurring on 13 <sup>th</sup> June,	
	the closing of the door	
	was not fully shown.	

59	000LY034	20/6/18	Libya	In the logbook on the page of the 27/05/2018, information relative to the date and port of departure were missing.	We have investigated the missing information and determined that "port of departure" on logbook ,was not written inadvertently by the captain. The captain was informed and his attention was drawn strongly. Accordingly, necessary follow up by our company will be made strictly with our captain in order to avoid repeating such a mistake in future seasons.
60	000TR115	21/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer on 20 <sup>th</sup> June, an independent estimate of the transfer amount was not possible due to low water visibility and poor video quality	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfers has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. The operator indicated that since the BFTs has spawn during the transfer operation, the visibility has decreased accordingly. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the video footages of the relevant operation, it was confirmed that the visibility conditions was poor for estimation of the fish amount. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

61	000TN025	22/6/18	Tunisia	The non-compliance concerns all the vessels of the JFO 2018-03. Following the transfer of another JFO vessel carried out 02/06/2018, the onboard observer did not sign the ITD but the masters of all the JFO vessels had reached the allocations on their logbooks. The same masters then deleted the transfer data and completed their logbooks according to the result of the control transfer carried out on 18/06/2018.	Obviously, the masters completed their logbooks after the transfer by mistake believing that all the procedures had been followed. Following the control transfer, the data were updated and the regional observer signed the ITD
62	000LY035	22/6/18	Libya	The captain didn't note the dimension of the fishing gear as requested in the rec17- 07 annex 2.	Fishing gear is 1880 M
63	000LY092	23/6/18	Libya	Following a transfer operation on the 16/06/218, the eBCD n°LY-18900914 was generated. The weight noted in the section 3 "trade information for live fish trade" is wrong 25 200kg instead of 25 000kg (there is 200kg of dead fish).	There is no mistake in Section 4 of the validated eBCD LY18900014 Sectiion 4 of the eBCD clearly indicates Cage EU.MLT-019-FF with 250 pieces totalling 25 000kg WHILE Section 2 indicates 252 pieces for a total of 25,200kg

63_bis	000LY092	23/6/18	Libya	Following a transfer operation on the 19/06/218, the eBCD n°LY-18900017 was generated. The weight and number of pieces noted in the section 3 "trade information for live fish trade" are wrong with 129960 kg and 1083 No. of fish (as the section 2) but there are 3 dead fish with a total weight of 360 kg.	There is no mistake in Section 4 of the validated eBCD LY18900017 Section4 of the eBCD clearly indicates Cage EU.MLT-017-FF with 1080 pieces totalling 129,600kg WHILE Section 2 indicates a catch of 1083 pieces for a total of 129,960kg
64	000LY091	23/6/18	Libya	Following a transfer operation on the 12/06/218, the quality of the video wasn't good enough to estimate the number of fish	Due to bad quality of the transfer video, a control transfer was requested to Libyan authorities. The control tranfer was granted and carried out on the 13/06/2018.
65	000LY091	23/6/18	Libya	Following a control transfer operation, the quality of the video wasn't good enough to estimate the number of fish. The observer didn't sign the ITD but the national observer on-board the towing vessel did.	After the control transfer carried out on the 13/06/2018, the regional observer onboard XXX did not sign the ITD and neither did the national observer onboard the towing vessel as it is not responsible for any signature on the ITD as per ICCAT Rec. 2017-07. The ITD (LBY-2018-160-ITD), was however signed by the receiving tug boat Captain, XXX. Another control transfer was requested to CPC-Libya and as a result of it the ITD "LBY- 2018-164-ITD" was superseded by another Control Transfer effected 31/07/2018

66	000DZ139	23/6/18	Algeria	The data recorded (the allocated catches for each tuna vessel) do not comply with ICCAT Recommendation 17- 07 (Annex 2 – Logbook requirements). There is no number or weight of allocated catches for each JFO vessel as described in the recommendation. The total quantity of catch (dead+live fish) does not appear in the logbook. (2 cases of the same PNC for this	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions. Improvement have been made in the design and information to be provided in the logbook. However, some gaps have been noted. The fisheries administration undertakes to improve the logbook in the upcoming campaigns to facilitate its completion.
67	000DZ139	24/6/18	Algeria	vessel) Our observer onboard this vessel reported the following PNC once the eBCD had been received from the master, on return to the port. The eBCD followed a transfer operation carried out on 11/06/2018 : • Section 3 "Trade information for trade of live fish", the product description describes the total product and not the live product (they have recorded 138073.99 kg instead of 136400 kg and 2227 fish instead of 2200 fish).	According to our interpretation of Recommendation 14-04/17-07, in particular annex 11, section a) paragraph two, the amount of headings 3 and 4 should be the same as those declared under heading 2.

68	000DZ139	24/6/18	Algeria	The eBCD was received from the master, after returning to port. The eBCD follows a transfer operation carried out on 20/06/2018. Section 3 "Trade information for trade of live fish", the product description describes the total product and not the live product (66200,001 kg were recorded instead of 65761,2 kg and 604 fish instead of 600 fish).	According to our interpretation of Recommendation 14-04/17-07, in particular annex 11, section a) paragraph two, the amount of headings 3 and 4 should be the same as those declared under heading 2.
69	000DZ139	24/6/18	Algeria	The quantity transferred to the cage recorded in the logbook is 66200 kg while the actual quantity is 65761.2 kg. The data recorded (the allocated catches for each tuna vessel) does not comply with ICCAT Recommendation 17- 07 (Annex 2 – Logbook requirements). There is no number of weight of allocated catches for each JFO vessel as described in the recommendation.	Information gaps have been observed in the fishing logbook. Measures will be taken to improve the logbook and its completion to improve the quality of the information in accordance with the relevant ICCAT provisions.

70	000LY091	24/6/18	Libya	After a control transfer occurred on the 13/06/2018, the quality of the video wasn't good enough to estimate the number of fish and did not show the entire door during the record.	Due to bad quality of the first control transfer video, a second control transfer was requested to Libyan authorities. The second control transfer was granted and carried out on the 31/07/2018. ITD "LBY-2018-164-ITD" was generated by the CPC-Libya.
71	000DZ149	24/6/18	Algeria	The departure port indicated in the logbook on the page of 10/06 is La Valetta instead of Licata. The departure port indicated in the logbook on the page of 16/06 is Licata instead of La Valetta.	These are transcription errors. Next year, the fisheries administration will organise training for better use of the fishing logbook and prevention of recording errors.
72	000LY090	25/6/18	Libya	The captain of the vessel didn't recorded in his logbook the transfer activity N°2 of the vessel XXX undertook on the 23/06.	The fact that the transfer operation carried out by a another vessel in JFO is not recorded in the logbook is an oversight and Master's attention has been drawn to it.

73	000TR135	25/6/18	Tumberry	For a transfer on 10 <sup>th</sup>	Tunkich Minister of Acriculture and
/3	00018135	25/6/18	Turkey		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				June, the video quality	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				was poor, although the	investigation in respect to the PNC
				observer considered a	reported with an official notification to
				count was possible.	the concerned operator. The operator has
				However, the observer	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				estimate had a	engage in making a detailed examination
				difference of greater	of the video footage presented by the
				than 10% from the	operator though he was asked to do so.
				vessel's estimate. The	The video footages of the concerned
				ITD was not signed.	transfer has been demanded from the
					operator and, in any case, without
					finalizing the investigation MoAF has
					instructed the operator to conduct "a
					control transfer" accompanying with
					MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
					result of detailed examination carried out
					by the MoAF inspectors on the related
					documents and the video footages of the
					relevant operation, MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
					observed by the MoAF inspectors that in
					spite of all sea conditions the transfer
					could be recorded ideally and fish passes
					could be seen and fish amount could be
					estimated. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					5
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.

	000000445	05/6/40	<b>m</b> 1		
74	000TR117	25/6/18	Turkey	An unsuccessful fishing	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				operation on 7 <sup>th</sup> June,	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				and two unsuccessful	investigation in respect to the PNC
				fishing operations	reported with an official notification to
				on 9 <sup>th</sup> June, were not	the concerned operator. The operator has
				recorded in the	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				logbook. For a transfer	engage in making a detailed examination
				occurring on 11 <sup>th</sup> June,	of the video footage presented by the
				the video record did	operator though he was asked to do so.
				not show 100% of the	The video footages of the concerned
				door. For a transfer	transfer has been demanded from the
				occurring on 15 <sup>th</sup> June,	operator and, in any case, without
				the video record did	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
				not show 100% of the	instructed the operator to conduct "a
				door and did not show	control transfer" accompanying with
				the door opening, and	MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
				that for a transfer	result of detailed examination carried out
				occurring on 16 <sup>th</sup> June	by the MoAF inspectors on the related
				the video record did	documents and the video footages of the
				not show 100% of the	relevant operations, MoAF did not
				transfer, and the video	conclude any serious infringements,
				record was not	suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
				provided to the	observed by the MoAF inspectors that in
				observer immediately	spite of all sea conditions the transfer
				after transfer. For each	could be recorded ideally and fish passes
				of the above mentioned	could be seen and fish amount could be
				transfers, an	estimated. A control transfer under the
				independent observer	supervision of an ICCAT regional
				estimate of transfer	observer and MoAF inspectors has been
				amount was not	conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
				possible.	BFT farming facility before the associated
				•	caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.

75	000TN097	25/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 02/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (481 fish weighing 43290,217 kg instead of 480 fish weighing 43200,217 kg)	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded.
76	000TR125	25/6/18	Turkey	On 16 <sup>th</sup> June, an incomplete logbook entry was made – catch weight was not entered	During 2017 fishing season MoAF has scheduled a training programme on log- book obligations towards the skippers. While, as a result of those training such log-book failure has decreased, however the operator has confirmed this logbook failure to his own unintentional omission. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of his failure.

Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
investigation in respect to the PNC
reported with an official notification to
the concerned operator. The video
footages of the concerned transfers has
been demanded from the operator and, in
any case, without finalizing the
investigation MoAF has instructed the
operator to conduct "a control transfer"
accompanying with MoAF inspectors
before caging. As a result of detailed
examination carried out by the MoAF
inspectors on the related documents and
the video footages of the relevant
operations:
1) The operator confirmed that due to
bad weather conditions, it could not
possible to reach the fishing vessel after
the transfer. The information was given
to and approved by the Observer. The
video footages could not be delivered to
the Observer immediately after the
transfer. However, the video footages
were provided to the Observer at the
earliest opportunity not reaching 6 hours.
2) It was confirmed by the operator that
the reported dead BFTs have not been
observed by the crew. No information
was given by the Observer. MoAF did not
conclude any serious infringements,
suspicious or illegal activities
3) It was observed by the in spite of all
sea conditions the transfer in the night
could be recorded ideally and fish passes
could be seen and fish amount could be
estimated.

				4) It was observed by the MoAF inspectors that in spite of the low turbidity of the water, the transfer could be recorded ideally and fish passes could be seen and fish amount could be estimated. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.
--	--	--	--	---

78	000TN097	25/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 11/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (718 fish weighing 68010,339 kg instead of 715 fish weighing 67725,339 kg).	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded.
79	000TN0008	25/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 02/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (820 fish weighing 82000.41 kg instead of 805 fish weighing 80800.41kg)	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded

80	000TN102	25/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 02/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (932 fish weighing 111840,558 kg instead of 924 fish weighing 110880,558 kg)	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded
81	000TN102	25/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 02/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (505 fish weighing 47975,239 kg instead of 504 fish weighing 47880,239 kg)	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded
82	000LY089	26/6/18	Libya	After the second transfer of the vessel, the number of live fish record in the logbook isn't the same than the one recorded in the ITD (1000 instead of 998)	The number of fish recorded in the logbook is the number of fish before the transfer: 1000p, but the number of fish recorded in the ITD is the number of fish deducted from 2 dead fish after the transfer: 998

83	000DZ145	26/6/18	Algeria	The logbook is not signed on 21/06.	Errors due to lack of attention, training course will be held to prevent these problems
84	000LY090	26/6/18	Libya	After the second transfer, the captain did not notice the dead tuna in the logbook	The fact that the dead tuna taken on board by another vessel in the JFO after a transfer operation is not recorded in the logbook is an oversight and Master's attention has been drawn to it.
85	000TN009	26/6/18	Tunisia	Following a transfer operation that took place on 01/06, section 3 "trade information for trade of live fish" of the eBCD indicates the weight and total number of fish caught, not only the live catch (932 fish weighing 111840,558 kg instead of 924 fish weighing 110880,558 kg)	Error due to lack of attention. Following validation of the eBCD, the section in question was amended by the CPC administration and now shows the portion of live fish traded.

0(	0000100	27/6/40	т 1		
86	00TR132	27/6/18	Turkey	The fishing logbook	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and
				was not completed for	Forestry (MoAF) initiated an
				4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> June. The	investigation in respect to the PNC
				observer has also	reported with an official notification to
				reported that, for a	the concerned operator. The operator has
				transfer occurring on	claimed that the observer did refuse to
				24 <sup>th</sup> June, although he	engage in making a detailed examination
				observer considered	of the video footage presented by the
				the fish could possibly	operator though he was asked to do so.
				be counted, due to the	The video footages of the concerned
				turbidity and low video	transfer has been demanded from the
				quality, the ITD was not	operator and, in any case, without
				signed.	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
					instructed the operator to conduct "a
					control transfer" accompanying with
					MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
					result of detailed examination carried out
					by the MoAF inspectors on the related
					documents and the video footages of the
					relevant operations, MoAF did not
					conclude any serious infringements,
					suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
					observed by the MoAF inspectors that in
					spite of all sea conditions the transfer
					could be recorded ideally and fish passes
					could be seen and fish amount could be
					estimated. A control transfer under the
					supervision of an ICCAT regional
					observer and MoAF inspectors has been
					conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
					BFT farming facility before the associated
					caging operation took place. During the
					subsequent control transfer and caging,
					no fish exceeding the declared
					quota/amount of fish transferred was
					determined by MoAF.

		During 2017 fishing season MoAF has scheduled a training programme on log- book obligations towards the skippers. While, as a result of those training such log-book failure has decreased, however the operator has confirmed this logbook failure to his own unintentional omission. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of his failure.

87 000TR134 27/6/18 Turkey For a transfer on 11 <sup>th</sup> June, the closing of the door was not fully recording, whilst the cameraman is showing the inside of the donor	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
door was not fully recording, whilst the cameraman is showing the inside of the donor	investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
recording, whilst the cameraman is showing the inside of the donor	reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
cameraman is showing the inside of the donor	the concerned operator. The operator has claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
the inside of the donor	claimed that the observer did refuse to engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
	engage in making a detailed examination of the video footage presented by the
	of the video footage presented by the
net. However, the net	
appeared empty so it is	
unlikely that any fish	operator though he was asked to do so.
were not counted. In	The video footages of the concerned
addition, for a transfer	transfer has been demanded from the
occurring on 18 <sup>th</sup> June,	operator and, in any case, without
the observer estimate	finalizing the investigation MoAF has
differed by more than	instructed the operator to conduct "a
10% from the vessel's	control transfer" accompanying with
estimate; the observer	MoAF inspectors before caging. As a
has further reported for	result of detaied examination carried out
transfers occurring on	by the MoAF inspectors on the related
27 <sup>th</sup> May, 2 <sup>nd</sup> June and	documents and the video footages of the
8 <sup>th</sup> June that the video	relevant operations, MoAF did not
record did not show the	conclude any serious infringements,
receiving cage before	suspicious or illegal activities. It was also
the transfer.	observed by the MoAF inspectors that in
	spite of all sea conditions the transfer
	could be recorded ideally and fish passes
	could be seen and fish amount could be
	estimated. A control transfer under the
	supervision of an ICCAT regional
	observer and MoAF inspectors has been
	conducted in the vicinity of the relevant
	BFT farming facility before the associated
	caging operation took place. During the
	subsequent control transfer and caging,
	no fish exceeding the declared
	quota/amount of fish transferred was
	determined by MoAF.

88	000TN099	27/6/18	Tunisia	On 11/06/2018, the tuna vessel carried out a transfer operation following which 5 dead tuna were observed. Only two dead tuna were reported in the fishing logbook.		Following receipt of the regional observer report, some contradictory data should be highlighted: Table 9 of the ROP shows 5 dead fish while 3 dead tuna are reported in paragraph PNC 1, page 9. Following an enquiry, the master had only reported the 2 dead specimens that were not released alive into the water during the transfer operation (eBCD TN189000018).
89	Withdrawn				Retracted by consortium 1 July	
90	000TR131	27/6/18	Turkey	For a transfer occurring on 5 <sup>th</sup> June, an independent observer estimate was not possible due to low light levels, camera movements and the view being sometimes obscured by diver's air bubbles or groups of fish. The ITD was not initially signed, but was signed after a count was obtained from the video record of a control transfer.		Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfers has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. The operator indicated that since the BFTs has spawn during the transfer operation, the visibility has decreased accordingly. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the video footages of the relevant operation, it was confirmed that the visibility conditions was poor for estimation of the fish amount. A control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and MoAF inspectors has been conducted in the vicinity of the relevant BFT farming facility before the associated caging operation took place. During the subsequent control transfer and caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

91	000LY033	27/6/18	Libya	A transfer operation occurred on the 20/06, our observer reported that the date displayed on the video was wrong (2014 instead of 2018). The observer didn't signed the ITD and the vessel did a control transfer the day after on the 21/06.	The transfer made according to the flag state transfer authorization numbered ( <i>LBY-2018/AUT/111</i> ) by XXX vessel ( <i>ICCAT Reg Number:</i> <i>AT000LBY00060</i> ) on 20 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 was correctly filmed but the date displayed on the video was wrong 2014 instead of 2018 The regional observer did not signed the ITD, the captain requested a control transfer, and the CPC (Libya) gave authorization for a control transfer numbered LBY- 2018/AUT CONTROL/111. The control transfer that took place on 21th June 2018, it was good filmed with correct date. The regional observer verified and signed the ITD numbered LBY-2018/111/ITD
92	000DZ141	28/6/18	Algeria	When a JPO vessel carried out a transfer on 04/06/2018, the time of transfer was not recorded in the vessel logbook.	These are transcription errors. Next year the fisheries administration will organize training courses for better use of logbooks and prevention of recording errors.
93	000DZ147	29/6/18	Algeria	A vessel of JFO 2018- 010 carried out a transfer on 04/06. The time of transfer was not recorded in the fishing logbook (p13)	These are transcription errors. Next year the fisheries administration will organize training courses for better use of the fishing logbook and prevention of recording errors.

94	000LY092	29/6/18	Libya	Following a transfer operation on the 17/06/218, two eBCDs were created : one for the live fish (n°LY- 18900015) and one for the dead fish (n°LY- 18900016). All the dead fish are listed in the section 2 "catch information".	The catch of the 17/06/2018 by XXX vessel, was recorded in two eBCDs, one for live fish LY18900015 with section 2 (catch), section 3 (live trade) and section 4 (transfer); and another eBCD for the dead ones in the vessel net, LY18900016 with only section 2 (catch).
95	000LY092	29/6/18	Libya	Following a transfer operation on the 20/06/218, two eBCDs were created : one for the live fish (n°LY- 18900020) and one for the dead fish (n°LY- 18900021). All the dead fish are listed in the section 2 "catch information".	The catch of the 20/06/2018 by XXX vessel, was recorded in two eBCDs, one for live fish LY18900020 with section 2 (catch), section 3 (live trade) and section 4 (transfer); and another eBCD for the dead ones in the vessel net, LY18900021 with only section 2 (catch).
96	000DZ147	1/7/18	Algeria	On page 33 of the fishing logbook (22/06/2018), the ICCAT number of a[nother] vessel is wrong.	These are transcription errors. Next year the fisheries administration will organise training courses for better use of the fishing logbook and prevention of recording errors.

97	000TR124	4/7/18	Turkey	The observer reported that three interruptions were seen on the video for a transfer occurring on 28 <sup>th</sup> May, and the ITD as not signed. The observer has now been consulted and the video watched during debriefing. To clarify, for one of the interruptions, occurring about 6 minutes and 11 seconds into the video record, the net appears to shift briefly in a way that indicates the video record may not be continuous, although there is no interruption to the time stamp on the video at that time. This may indicate the video has been edited.	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator. The video footages of the concerned transfers has been demanded from the operator and, in any case, without finalizing the investigation MoAF has instructed the operator to conduct "a control transfer" accompanying with MoAF inspectors before caging. As a result of detailed examination carried out by the MoAF inspectors on the related documents and the video footages of the relevant operations: 1) Within the video records of a transfer conducted on 28.05.2018, it was confirmed by the operator that video footages have been delivered to the Observer as soon as the transfer and related necessary safety operations. 2) Within the video records of a transfer operation conducted on 28.05.2018, a 1 second interruption was detected depending on the camera type (GoPro Camera) used recording which is not during the fish passes. It was also observed that the video quality was quite enough for estimation of fish amount. As confirmed by the operator, no edition has been detected within the video. A control transfer under the supervision of an
				to the time stamp on the video at that time. This may indicate the	on the camera type (GoPro Camera) used recording which is not during the fish passes. It was also observed that the video quality was quite enough for estimation of fish amount. As confirmed by the operator, no edition has been detected within the video.

98	000DZ143	8/7/18	Algeria	On the page of 22/06/2018 of the fishing logbook, the quota allocated to the vessel recorded in the logbook is 205750.11 kg instead of 20571.522 kg as indicated in the eBCD.	These are transcription errors. Next year the fisheries administration will organise training courses for better use of the fishing logbook and prevention of recording errors.
99	000LY093	10/7/18	Libya	On the 02/06/2018 the captain didn't note his name in the logbook	The fact that the name of the Master is not recorded in the logbook is an oversight and Master's attention has been drawn to it.
100	000DZ149	11/7/18	Algeria	The number and weight of fish reported in section 3 (trade information on live fish) includes both live and dead fish instead of only indicating live fish (2017 fish weighing 71 190,001 kg instead of 2012 fish weighing 70 840,001)	According to our interpretation of Recommendation 14-04/17-07, in particular annex 11, section a) paragraph two, the amount of headings 3 and 4 should be the same as those declared under heading 2.

101	000LY032	11/7/18	Libya	The vessel left the port of Mahdia on the 27/06 to reach Libya before the end of the last control transfer (occurred on the 30/06/2018). On the 27 <sup>th</sup> of June, they left the logbook in their agency in Mahdia, meaning the logbook wasn't on-board from the 27 <sup>th</sup> to the 30 <sup>th</sup> of June (the end of the	The master made this mistake, however the transfer operation carried out by a another vessel in JFO is not recorded in the logbook is an oversight and Master's attention has been drawn to it.
102	000LY091	6/8/18	Libya	deployment). For a second transfer control on the 31th of July, the video fulfilled the recommendation 17-07. The observer signed the ITD but he never received the eBCD (just the eBCD number).	The eBCD LY18900013 containing the final figures resulting from the second control transfer on the 31/07/2018, was not available by the ending of the regional observer deployment. CPC-Libya adminstrator amended the eBCD accordingly.

103	000LY092; 000LY093 and 000LY027	12/7/18	Libya	The fourth vessel of the JFO 2018-020 s still waiting for a cage in order to undertake a control transfer. In the meantime, the three other vessels decided to release the observers and finish the deployment (on the 30 <sup>th</sup> of June for the vessels XXX and YYY and on the 03 <sup>rd</sup> of July for the vessel ZZZ). Considering this, none of them can update the logbook with the data of the control transfer	The control transfer of the [fourth] vessel was carried out on the 31/07/2018 so the other vessels in JFO could not insert any data of the transfer on their respective logbooks until that date.
104	000NO094	24/8/48	Norway	The vessel did not record a logbook entry on the 15 <sup>th</sup> , 16 <sup>th</sup> , 17 <sup>th</sup> , 18 <sup>th</sup> and 19 <sup>th</sup> of August 2018, while the vessel was on standby in port.	
105	000NO064	24/8/48	Norway	The vessel did not record an entry for the 22/08/2018 while the vessel was on standby	

106	000N0064	7/0/17	Norway	For a fishing operation	It is correct that the electronic logbook
106	00010004	7/9/17	Norway	conducted on	does not allow for the registration of
				05/09/2018, the vessel did not include the	number of pieces caught. However:
					Norwegian vessels are required to
				number of pieces	contact the Norwegian Fisheries
				caught in the record of	Monitoring Centre (FMC) at the
				catches as required by	Directorate of Fisheries (which is open
				Annex 2 of Rec. 17-07.	24/7) if they catch bluefin tuna, whether
				The observer has	it is bycatch or in a directed fishery. They
				reported that this is	must then inform the FMC of the number
				due to the electronic	of pieces caught, the estimated weight of
				logbook not allowing	the fish and when and where they are
				this information to be	planning on landing the fish. The FMC
				recorded.	will register this information in the FMC's
					logging system, and forward this
					information to the officers responsible
					for the follow up of the bluefin tuna
					fishery at the Directorate of Fisheries.
					Furthermore, a minimum of 30 % of the
					landings of bluefin tuna by the vessels
					targeting this species will be inspected by
					inspectors from the Norwegian
					Directorate of Fisheries. These
					inspections will be carried out as full
					inspections, whereby the inspectors shall
					monitor the entire landing. This includes
					monitoring the entire weighing of the
					fish, cross-checking this against the prior
					notice of port entry, the VMS, the
					electronic logbook as well as the landing
					and sales notes. Furthermore, the
					inspectors shall ensure that there is no
					fish left onboard once the landing is
					completed and the landing or sales notes
					are signed.

107	000N0094	7/9/17	Norway	For a fishing operation	It is correct that the electronic logbook
-		, . ,		conducted on	does not allow for the registration of
				05/09/2018, the vessel	number of pieces caught. However:
				did not include the	Norwegian vessels are required to
				number of pieces	contact the Norwegian Fisheries
				caught in the record of	Monitoring Centre (FMC) at the
				catches as required by	Directorate of Fisheries (which is open
				Annex 2 of Rec. 17-07.	24/7) if they catch bluefin tuna, whether
				The observer has	it is bycatch or in a directed fishery. They
				reported that this is	must then inform the FMC of the number
				due to the electronic	of pieces caught, the estimated weight of
				logbook not allowing	the fish and when and where they are
				this information to be	planning on landing the fish. The FMC
				recorded.	will register this information in the FMC's
					logging system, and forward this
					information to the officers responsible
					for the follow up of the bluefin tuna
					fishery at the Directorate of Fisheries.
					Furthermore, a minimum of 30 % of the
					landings of bluefin tuna by the vessels
					targeting this species will be inspected by
					inspectors from the Norwegian
					Directorate of Fisheries. These
					inspections will be carried out as full
					inspections, whereby the inspectors shall
					monitor the entire landing. This includes
					monitoring the entire weighing of the
					fish, cross-checking this against the prior
					notice of port entry, the VMS, the
					electronic logbook as well as the landing
					and sales notes. Furthermore, the
					inspectors shall ensure that there is no
					fish left onboard once the landing is
					completed and the landing or sales notes
					are signed.
					~

108	000NO064	9/9/17	Norway	1) For a landing conducted on 07/09/2018, the vessel did not include the number of pieces landed as required by Annex 2 of Rec. 17-07. The observer has reported that this is due to the electronic	
				logbook not allowing this information to be recorded; 2) The vessel entered Port Husoy at 01:15 on 08/09/2018. No logbook entry was completed for this day.	
109	000NO094	9/9/17	Norway	For a landing conducted on 07/09/2018, the vessel did not include the number of pieces landed as required by Annex 2 of Rec. 17-07. The observer has reported that this is due to the electronic logbook not allowing this information to be recorded.	

HZ1	000EU054	27/5/18	EU- Croatia	The video did not show all of the door throughout the transfer, large sections of the door were lost from the video on a number of occasions. The ITD for this operation was not signed. The operators are intending to carry out a control transfer of these fish later today	The operators are intending to carry out a control transfer of these fish later today	Control transfer was conducted next day from towing cage to second empty towing cage resulting with video showing complete door and transfer of all fish after which observer signed the ITD.
HZ2	000EU055	27/5/18	EU- Croatia	The was a transhipment of approximately 5-7 dead fish from the vessel to the skiff of a supporting vessel; No estimate of the transfer was possible due to the mixing of large numbers of fish that were in the cage prior to transfer with the fish that were being transferred; No ITD has been provided to the observer for this operation; No eBCD or serial number of an eBCD has been provided to the observer for this operation; The fishing logbook was also not fully completed for yesterday.		It was found that a transhipment was carried out as reported by the observer. Despite the assertion that the assessment of the number of the fish is not possible, during inspection on board inspection found that e-BCD and ITD were completed and the observer has signed ITD. It is confirmed that there is technical failure of the electronic recording, so the master of the vessel sent the data to the authority in an alternative way according to Control regulation. However, the operator sent the incorrect information (did not correctly indicate the mortality and reported the incorrect date of the transfer). National authority (fisheries inspection) imposed a sanction for transshipment – referred to Annex VIII, Article (1) (q) Regulation (EU) 2016/1627, and for an inadequate logbook record- referred to Article I (1) (b) in Annex VIII Regulation (EU) 2016/1627.
HZ3	000EU055	27/5/18	EU- Croatia	The observer was subjected very aggressive behaviour and intimidation which passed the bounds of acceptable behaviour towards the observer. This situation stemmed from the fact that an estimate from the video was not possible and the ITD was therefore not going to be signed. The observer has stated that she is in fear for her safety on the vessel and as such we will seek to remove her from the vessel as soon as possible. [additional info 31/05]	The Croatian Ministry scheduled an inspection vessel of the vessel to conduct an investigation and bring the observer back to port. A new observer was sent the next day.	The Croatian Ministry scheduled an inspection vessel of the vessel to conduct an investigation and bring the observer back to port. A new observer was sent the next day. After receiving the information national authorities immediately contacted vessel operator and scheduled vessels for inspection on board. Observer was taken on the vessels and which was order to return to port. During the inspection the observer did not provide any information to the Croatian authorities, but the afterwards letter from the consortium has been taken as valid proof. After the end of investigation national authority (fisheries inspection) imposed a sanctions in according to Article I (1) (k) in Annex VIII to Reg. (EU) 2016/1627.
-----	----------	---------	----------------	---	---	--
CY1	000EU026	28/5/18	EU- Cyprus	The vessel logbook does not record exact daily positions in degrees and minutes for the midday position. Furthermore, the logbook does not record the ICCAT number of the vessel as per the minimum standard information required by Annex 2 of Rec. 17-07.		The ERS system self-records positions at regular intervals but does not send these positions unless there is a declaration to be sent. The ICCAT number can be seen when the button for a report is pressed and all the details of the vessel can be seen.

FR1	000EU054	27/5/18	EU- France	The Transfer Authorisation number is not visible on the video, an attempt had been made to film the number prior to the start of the transfer but on review of the video it is not readable	With regard to the conformity of the video concerning the possibility of estimating the number of tunas and the absence of 10% gap in the estimation, we will not be opening an investigation on that matter. However we are going to make view the video by inspectors in order to find the infringement. In the inspection report of the [vessel] which had made a transfer with [this fishing vessel] on May 26th cage ESP-009R for which there had been a PNC, as well as in the complementary report after viewing of the video, the inspectors found a presumed infringement for impossibility to identify clearly the number of authorization of transfer ICCAT as specified to the appendix 8 of the recommendation ICCAT 17-07 in the video recorded during the realized transfer 27/05 of the fishing vessel J in the cage ESP-009R dragged by the [towing] vessel.
ES1	000EU006	27/5/18	EU- Spain	No transfer authorisation number was displayed on the video	Investigation opened on 27th May. PNC confirmed by inspectors at sea. On the video, instead of authorisation number, it was displayed ITD number. Apparent Infringement IR ESP192919

ES2	000EU006	28/5/18	EU- Spain	No estimate of the amount of tuna transferred was possible as the video coverage lost sight of the open door for a significant period of time	Investigation opened on 28th May. PNC confirmed by inspectors at sea. Apparent Infringement IR ESP192925. On the 31rd of May a Control Transfer was requested. It took place on the 4th of June with the presence of inspectors and the video recording was compliant.
IT1	000EU044	29/5/18	EU-Italy	Vessel without an ICCAT number involved in fishing operations the vessel XXX undertook a Fishing Operationthe same day, three small speed boats surrounded the vessel. After the transfer operation, people from one speed boat approach the xxx and then get on-board. The captain of the vessel declare six dead tunas but five of them were stolen by the speed boats crew	Our relevant Control Authorities (Coast Guard) immediately launched a duly investigation, by involving also other Police Bodies, at local level. The final outcome is still pending. In any case, we assure and confirm that our PS vessels concerned were not involved in this PNC.

IT2	000EU044;	29/05/20	EU-Italy	There was an error in	Reported 30/05/2018: After	We will not be opening an investigation
	000EU039;	18 and		the math of the logbook	detecting an error of the logbook in	on that matter since, in accordance with
	000EU150;	30/05/20		evolving the weight of	the day 28/05/2018 where there	paragraph 76 of ICCAT Rec. 17-07, the
	000EU037	18		the live tuna for one	was a mistake in the quota	operator asked French authorities to
				fishing operation with a	discounted of the ship (PNC2), they	proceed to a voluntary transfer which
				difference of 76.62kg	contact the ministry and following	was authorized. He will provide the
				with the correct live	its indications corrects the error	corresponding video recording to the
				weight. it was revealed	changing the quantity in the	regional observer as expected by the
				that a mistake was	logbook. This change takes place in	regulations.
				made in all JFOs	the day 29/05/2018 and it is simply	
				logbooks and that they	a correction of quantity passing of	
				wrote down that the	assigning to the [catching] vessel	
				sum of all live fish was	15812,80 kg to 15736,17 kg. This	
				102.751,62 kg instead	change is in agreement with the	
				of 102.675 kg	quantities declared in the eBCD.H14	
				0		
FR2	000EU070	30/5/18	EU-	The transfer video did		The vessel didn't well anticipate the
			France	not show the closing of		duration of the transfer that was longer
				the door		than he expected due to the size of the
						catch. The battery would have been
						insufficient to end the video. We will not
						be opening an investigation on that
						matter since, in accordance with
						paragraph 76 of ICCAT rec. 17-07, the
						operator asked French authorities to
						proceed to a voluntary transfer which
						was authorized. He will provide the
						corresponding video recording to the
						regional observer as expected by the
1		1	1			
						regulations

FR3	000EU070	30/5/18	EU- France	For a control transfer that was carried out this morning (30/05) following the transfer carried out yesterday. The observer was not present at the control transfer, and therefore was unable to corroborate that information contained within the ITD was consistent with her own observations.		Regarding the voluntary transfer, the presence of the regional observer is not mandatory. Furthermore, all the operations of the voluntary transfer were realized under the supervision of a CPC inspector, who didn't find any irregularity in the procedures. The voluntary transfer was also realized under the supervision of the national observer aboard the concerned tug boat. Therefore, we will not be opening an investigation on that matter
IT3	000EU039	30/5/18	EU-Italy	The vessel undertook a transfer operation; all the technical aspects of this transfer were done by the divers of a support vessel [flagged to Malta]. After the transfer, our observer watched the video and can clearly see at the end of the video a dead tuna with a rope. This rope goes directly to the [support] vessel. The crew of the [fishing vessel] (including our observer) didn't see the moment where the crew of [support vessel] took on-board the dead fish but they know they actually have it on- board.	The captain of the [fishing vessel] will declare the dead fish (around 200kg) but they clearly didn't know and didn't agree with this action.	In our opinion [that of Italian authorities], any eventual PNC (where the case) should be referred more properly to the Maltese support vessel, taking into account that the ITD concerned was duly signed by the RO concerned.

IT4	000EU047	3/6/18	EU-Italy	During the first transfer operation undertook on the 02/06/2018, the observer did not sign the ITD, considering that 1) the ICCAT number of the towing vessel was incorrect and 2) the position was incorrect.	The CPC/Flag state generated another ITD with correct data, then the observer sign the ITD	The CPC/Flag state generated another ITD with correct data, then the observer sign the ITD
IT5	000EU151	4/6/18	EU-Italy	For the day 03/06/2018, no position was written in the logbook		According to our further verification the position is duly reported on the log-sheet concerned.
FR4	000EU075	1/6/18	EU- France	The video did not show the door for approximately six seconds during the transfer. The ITD for this operation was not signed. French Inspectors were present during the transfer operation		A control transfer had been conducted. The video was viewed by our inspectors in order to raise an infringement.
IT6	000EU150	6/6/18	EU-Italy	The day 05/06/2018 at 17:00, the crew showed the eBCD of one catch carried out by the vessel XXX. There was an error in the total number of pieces alive pointed in the logbook in comparison with the eBCD (Logbook = 919; eBCD = 920).	This was corrected 05/06/2018 at 17:30 h.	We confirm material mistakes duly corrected by the operator concerned.

IT7	000EU043	7/6/17	EU-Italy	The vessel XXX has just finished a FOP and TOP with 2 dead fish not recorded on the vessel logbook and BCD. However, in the XXX vessel are two students of University of Genova doing research on BFT with otoliths and other parts of BFT. They have an ICCAT RMA (Research Mortality Allowance) document signed by ICCAT for this research which enable the vessel to not discount that dead fish of the quota of the vessel, reporting research issues. In this way, they didn't report dead fish attending to that RMA document so our observer on board reported a PNC event to be transparent with ICCAT policy.	We confirm material mistakes duly corrected by the operator concerned.
FR5	000EU075	6/6/18	EU- France	Following a transfer on the 2nd of June, no eBCD was generated.	Regarding the transfer of the 2nd of June, the vessel met a technical problem with eBCD, which was solved yesterday evening with the help of TRAGSA. As soon as the problem was resolved, the eBCD was generated [].

FR5bis	000EU075	6/6/18	EU- France	Following a transfer on the 6th of June, the poor video quality meant that the observer was unable to estimate the amount of tuna transferred.	A control transfer had been conducted.
IT7	000EU043	10/6/18	EU-Italy	The observer noted that on the transfer authorisation, the towing vessel's ICCAT number was: XXX. However on the ITD the vessel's ICCAT number was: YYY, this number corresponded to the ICCAT number of the vessel involved in the transfer operation. The observer signed the ITD as the information contained within it was correct.	We confirm material mistakes duly corrected by the operator concerned.

IT8	000EU046	10/6/18	EU-Italy	This PNC was reported independently by four of our observers currently deployed on the Italian fleet : Even if they reach their quota, the vessel [other vessel] came back in the same area with all the other Italian vessel and some Libyan vessel (picture attached). It appears that they steam closely with some Libyan vessels and they are obviously looking for fish.		Our relevant Control Authorities (Coast Guard) immediately launched a duly investigation and, finally, the PS concerned was duly sanctioned according to our own legislation.
IT9	000EU047	11/6/18	EU-Italy	From the 06/06/2018 to 09/06/2018, the vessel stayed in the port due to the bad weather conditions. During these days, the logbook was never filled.		Within the current ICCAT framework, there is no specific provision imposing log-book completion during any port- stop. In any case the PS concerned duly submitted daily catching declarations.
IT10	000EU041	11/6/18	EU-Italy	The captain did sign the logbook for the days 08/06 and 09/06.	This mistake was corrected one day after.	We confirm material mistakes duly corrected by the operator concerned.

IT11	000EU041	12/6/18	EU-Italy	The captain didn't fill the logbook for the days 09/06 and 10/06.	He filled the logbook for these days on the 11/06.	We confirm material mistakes duly corrected by the operator concerned.
HZ4	000EU058	12/6/18	EU- Croatia	The observer has reported today that for a transfer conducted yesterday it was not possible to make an independent estimate due to video quality, this was due to the transfer being conducted at night. The ITD for this operation was not signed. The ITD number is HRV- 2018/356/ITD, the towing vessel XXX and cage number EUHRV013		National authority (fisheries inspection) ordered a control transfer of BFT from cage EU HRV 013 into the empty transport cage. After the control transfer on 15.06.2018, BFT have been counted and ITD was signed by Croatian inspector. In order to avoid similar situations in future, it is considered to introduce a daily time limitation for conducting transfers at sea (e.g. by 7 p.m.) into the Ordinance governing fishing, farming and marketing of tuna.
IT12	000EU047	13/6/18	EU-Italy	The vessel did a transfer operation on the 12/06/2018 in a cage containing fish from a previous fishing operation. Due to the bad weather, the video quality was not enough to estimate the number of fish.		According to the combined ICCAT and EFCA provisions a control transfer was ordered. All the relevant documents were duly completed and delivered on the basis of the final outcome of the above additional transfer.

FR6	000EU074	13/06/20 18	EU- France	For a transfer carried out on the 12/06, the observer was unable to make an estimate of the amount of tuna transferred due to the poor quality of the video. The observer has not signed the ITD.	A control transfer had been conducted.
FR7	000EU086	14/6/18	EU- France	Following a fishing operation on the 28th of May, and the subsequent transfer operation on the 29th of May (Authorisation number FRA-2018- AUT-0024), the fish was voluntarily released from the towing cage (on the 30th of May). Neither the fishing operation nor the transfer operation was recorded in the logbook. No ITD or eBCD was produced.	All the stages were respected regarding this fishing operation on the 28th of May. The fishing operation was recorded in the logbook, you can find attached the FAR 0 which was done in order to best reflect the absence of actual catch at the end (otherwise it would have been deducted from the quota). Indeed the catch was released because of to many undersized fishes. The entire procedure was supervised and outlined. The release was observed by the national observer on board the tug and filmed. The video has been kept on board the [fishing vessel] and a copy on board of the tug. The national observer has to send a report to the control authorities of his CPC

			[		
IT13	000EU038	20/6/18	EU-Italy	The vessel did a	We confirm material mistakes duly
				transfer operation on	corrected by the competent Authority.
				the 11/06/2018 and	
				then generated an	
				eBCD and an ITD. The	
				eBCD number on the	
				ITD was wrong	
				(IT18900532 instead of	
				IT18900533) and the	
				ITD number recorded	
				on the eBCD section 4	
				was wrong (ITA-2018-	
				049-ITD instead of ITA-	
				2018-048-ITD).	
				2010 010 1125	
FR8	000EU075	28/6/18	EU-	The observer reported	[See FR4 above] A control transfer had
		, ,	France	that following the	been conducted. The video was viewed
				control transfer	by our inspectors in order to raise an
				conducted, the vessels	infringement.
				estimate was more than	
				10% different to the	
				observers. As such the	
				observer did not sign	
				the ITD (UE-FRA-	
				2018/776/ITD). The	
				vessel later amended	
				the estimate, and put	
		1	1	838 pieces and	
				135,000T.	