

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

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

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F1	001EU0388	EU-Spain	24/10/2017	The farm carried out two harvest operations at the same time on the 23/10/2017. The observer could not observe all the harvest operations.	No response available at time of publishing
F2	001EU0391	EU-Portugal	22/09/2017	The release operation carried out the 21/09/2017 was recorder by 3 different cameras in different positions, however, on all these video the closure of the door is not shown and the whole door is not visible 100% of the time. Furthermore, the water visibility is very bad (high turbidity).	No response available at time of publishing

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F3	002MAR014	Morocco	05/06/2018	<p>Regarding a transfer that took place on 2 June: Impossible to estimate the quantity of tuna involved in the incident reported in relation to transfer operation 09. Three video sequences were recorded by three different video cameras. Natural visibility of water below 2 metres, inability to provide an estimate of tuna transferred in a video sequence; Less than 100% of the door shown in video sequence 2; Poor quality time display in video sequence 3; Regarding a transfer that took place on 3 June: It is not possible to estimate the quantity of tuna involved in the incident reported in relation to transfer operation 10. Two video sequences were recorded by two different cameras. Natural visibility of water below 2 metres, inability to provide an estimate of tuna transferred in video sequence 1; the door was already 100% open before the start of the transfer operation shown at the beginning of video recording 2; also possible to see the closing of the door before the start of the transfer. The time and date displayed in the two video sequences of the transfer operation have been compared and if the detailed information displayed is the same. The ITD has not been signed for this operation.</p>	<p>The trap operator reported that the poor quality of the video recording and the lack of visibility are mainly due to bad weather conditions. Therefore, a new transfer including the passage of all the bluefin tuna located in the receiving cage to an empty cage was carried out, which has enabled recording of a better quality video. Following this, the ICCAT Regional Observer signed the ITD.</p>

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F4	001EU0421	EU-Croatia	06/07/2018	For caging operation n°3, the video record quality doesn't allow the observer to estimate the number of BFT; The closing door isn't complete and the video doesn't include if the donor cage was empty	After analyzing the CC video, poor quality was determined, but it was possible to count the fish, and it was confirmed that the video doesn't show the closing of the door. CC video that doesn't display the entire transfer is considered as non-compliance, which is why the proposed penalty is proceeding by the court due to not complying with the provisions stated in Art. 35., Reg. (EU) 2016/1627. At the same time a video was available from two sets of SC, and both were of the very appropriate quality, so there was no need for a control transfer. It was also confirmed that the transport cage was empty after the end of caging.
F5	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity (transfer 12/06/2018)	Fisheries inspection services checked videos and confirmed the situation. An investigation was initiated on 15th June, farm Cage ESP-008 was blocked and the caging operation was repeated on the 19th of June.
F6	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 15/06/2018)	Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F7	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 16/06/2018)	Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F8	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 17/06/2018). The door is not always visible	Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F9	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	Observer estimation is more than 10% difference. The farm caging authorisation N ^o AUT030R for cage number ESP030R (Towing vessel XXX) is for 1050 fish while the observer estimation is 1366 fish. (transfer 18/06/2018)	Possible confusion by the ROP. In the PNC it is first mentioned cage number ESP030R and afterwards cage number ESP032R. XXX mentioned by the ROP it's ESP-001. Farm Cage Authorisation AUT030R was for cage number ESP030R towed by XXX for 1050 pieces. Caging operation from cage ESP030R was to farm cage ESP-004 (not farm cage ESP-001, as stated by the ROP). Fisheries inspection services checked videos and stated that the SC footage was not good enough to measure. An investigation was opened on 15th July, farm Cage ESP-004 was blocked and the caging operation was repeated on the 25th of July. See PNC 19 of this request 001EU0425. By today, initial results seem that the figures verified by the inspectors once the caging operation was repeated (1375 pieces) are in line with those reported by the ROP, showing a >10% different. Under investigation until all data is available.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F10	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 19/06/2018)	This caging is a repetition of a caging operation (on 15th June farm Cage ESP-008 was blocked in relation with cage ESP-038R, as previously explained, see the 1st PNC for the request 001EU0425). Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F11	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video recording devices were not provided "as soon as possible" to the observer accordingly to the recommendation 17-07. Sometimes our observer get the video record device only when he came back to the port 3 or 4 hours later the caging operation	It's difficult to measure what is "as soon as possible". We can just check that operators are working to provided video recording, but not explicit time after the operation can be guarantee.
F12	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 20/06/2018)	Possible misunderstanding by the ROP. In the PNC it's mentioned XXX as towing vessel of cage number ESP028R, which is wrong. Actually, Cage ESP-028R was towed by YYY. Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged.
F13	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The ITD number UE-FRA-2018/1101/ITD corresponding to the cage ESP-028R does not conform to Rec. 17-07 (only 3 sequential number)	Cage ESP-028R was towed by a vessel other than that reported by observer

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F14	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 22/06/2018). The ITD number UE-FRA-2018/2051/ITD Corresponding to the cage ESP-026R is not conform to Rec. 17-07 (only three sequential number).	It's mentioned that cage ESP028R is towed by XXX vessel, which is wrong. Actually, Cage ESP-028R was towed by YYY. The ITD is French; we understand it is France the one that could provide the appropriate comments on how they produce the codification of their ITD's.
F15	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 23/06/2018)	PNC Report 11 and PNC 12, are the same PNC (both refer the same fact, for the same caging operation). This is received as PNC11: This is the eleventh PNC reported during this deployment. The observer has reported the 23/06/2018 the following PNCs relative to the caging transfer undertake on the 23/06/2018 from the cage ESP024R (Towing vessel XXX) to cage ESP-006: The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish. Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F16	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 24/06/2018)	Just explained. It's repeated. See PNC11 and PNC12.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F17	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	Video record of caging did not show the correct caging Authorisation number at beginning or end of the video; it showed authorization number is AUT023R while the correct one must be UE-ESP/2018/AUT023R	Caging authorization numbers are issued by Spanish Authorities for each caging operation, according to a national code. ICCAT REC does not describe the format of the authorization number nor the data that should appear in the authorization. This issue also happened in 2017 and in 2018 was clarified to Consortium. In this case, Authorization number issued by Spain for the operation was AUT023R.
F18	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/07/2018	The video quality is not good enough to allow the observer to have an estimation of the quantity of fish (transfer 29/06/2018)	Spain acknowledges two email communication received on the 1st of July regarding PNC a (named "PNC report 13" and "PNC report 14"). However, we would like to inform that these are the first PNC received so far referring to this farm. No reference is made in the communication to the cages involved. However and taking into account the caging date mentioned, it should be referred to authorisation AUT023R, from cage ESP-023R to farm cage ESP-006. Fisheries inspection services checked videos and confirmed the situation. An investigation was opened on 2nd July, farm Cage ESP-006 was blocked and the caging operation was repeated on the 3th of July.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F19	001EU0425	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	For the caging operation realized from cage ESP-006 to cage ESP-021R (authorisation AUT023R) the video quality didn't allowed the observer to do an estimation	This caging is a repetition of a caging operation (on 3rd July farm Cage ESP-006 was blocked in relation with cage ESP-023R, as explained above). Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F20	001EU0430	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	Caging transfer undertaken on the 22/06/2018: The video is very bad quality (bad visibility) so observer cannot count fish. On the beginning of video, diver did not film the receiving cage, and after closing the door of receiving cage, he didn't film the donor cage to show that is empty after transfer. The observer didn't received any document with authorisation number	Fisheries inspection services checked the video footage and confirmed that the donor cage was not filmed after the operation. Apparent Infringement IR ESP192948. However fisheries inspection services checked that video quality allows the estimation of the fish caged (SC footage). We do not consider according to ICCAT's recommendation that is mandatory to provide the ROP with the authorization document. The operation occurred with the authorization are issued by Spanish Authorities. Caging authorization numbers are issued by Spanish Authorities for each caging operation, according to a national code. ICCAT REC does not describe the format of the authorization number nor the data that should appear in the authorization. This issue also happened in 2017 and in 2018 was clarified to Consortium. In this case, Authorization number showed on the video was the one issued by Spain for the operation.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F21	001EU0430	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	Caging transfer undertake on the 22/06/2018: The video is very bad quality (bad visibility) so observer cannot count fish. On the beginning of video, diver did not film receiving cage, and after closing the door of receiving cage, he didn't film donor cage to show that is empty after transfer. The observer didn't received any document with authorisation number. The authorization number shown on the video is not valid.	Same text as for F 20
F22	001EU0430	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	Caging transfer undertake on the 23/06/2018: The video is very bad quality (bad visibility) so observer cannot count fish. On the beginning of video, diver did not film receiving cage, and after closing the door of receiving cage, he didn't film donor cage to show that is empty after transfer. The observer didn't receive any document with authorisation number. The authorization number shown on the video is not valid.	Fisheries inspection services checked the video footage and confirmed that the donor cage was not filmed after the operation. Apparent Infringement IR ESP192938. However fisheries inspection services checked that video quality allows the estimation of the fish caged (SC footage). We do not consider according to ICCAT's recommendation that is mandatory to provide the ROP with the authorization document. The operation occurred with the authorization are issued by Spanish Authorities. Caging authorization numbers are issued by Spanish Authorities for each caging operation, according to a national code. ICCAT REC does not describe the format of the authorization number nor the data that should appear in the authorization. This issue also happened in 2017 and in 2018 was clarified to Consortium. In this case, Authorization number showed on the video was the one issued by Spain for the operation.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F23	001EU0430	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	Caging transfer undertake on the 24/06/2018: The video is very bad quality (bad visibility) so observer cannot count fish. On the beginning of video, diver did not film receiving cage, and after closing the door of receiving cage, he didn't film donor cage to show that is empty after transfer. The observer didn't receive any document with authorisation number. ITD number is wrong.	Fisheries inspection services checked the video footage and confirmed that the donor cage was not filmed after the operation. Apparent Infringement IR ESP190292. However fisheries inspection services checked that video quality allows the estimation of the fish caged (SC footage). We do not consider according to ICCAT's recommendation that is mandatory to provide the ROP with the authorization document. The operation occurred with the authorization are issued by Spanish Authorities. The ITD is French; we understand it is France the one that could provide the appropriate comments on how they produce the codification of their ITD's.
F24	001EU0430	EU-Spain	04/07/2018	Caging transfer undertake on the 25/06/2018: The video is very bad quality (bad visibility) so observer cannot count fish. On the beginning of video, diver did not film receiving cage, and after closing the door of receiving cage, he didn't film donor cage to show that is empty after transfer. The observer didn't receive any document with authorisation number.	Fisheries inspection services checked the video footage and confirmed that the donor cage was not filmed after the operation. Apparent Infringement IR ESP192947. However, fisheries inspection services checked that video quality allows the estimation of the fish caged (SC footage). We do not consider according to ICCAT's recommendation that is mandatory to provide the ROP with the authorization document. The operation occurred with the authorization are issued by Spanish Authorities.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F25	001EU0432	EU-Portugal	06/07/2018	For a caging from the trap to a farm cage of on the 5 th of July, the video record did not show the entire closing of the door. The observer has not been presented with an eBCD or ICD to sign. The observer understands a control transfer will be carried out over the next few days.	The reference to the video is contested: the national inspectors present during the caging operation has considered that the minimum video standards stated for caging operations were in accordance with Annex 7 of Regulation (EU) 2016/1627, which transposes the ICCAT BFT Rec. Consequently, the inspector has validated both the video and the caging operation. The farm operator presented both e-BCD and ICD to the ROP on time, but the ROP declined to sign because the video record did not show the entire closing of the door in one time.
F26	001EU0428	EU-Malta	09/07/2018	The estimation of the observer in number of tuna is -12.7% different from the farm estimation reported in the eBCD. Observer= 883 and farm= 1012	The results are still pending due to finalisation of entire JFO.
F27	001EU0428	EU-Malta	09/07/2018	The estimation of the observer in number of tuna is -16.07% different from the farm estimation reported in the eBCD. Observer= 1525 and farm= 1817	The results are still pending due to finalisation of entire JFO.
F28	001EU0428	EU-Malta	09/07/2018	The estimation of the observer in number of tuna is -27.7% different from the farm estimation reported in the eBCD. Observer= 1591 and farm= 2200	The results are still pending due to finalisation of entire JFO.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F29	000TR0431	Turkey	09/07/2018	For a caging operation on 8 th July, the observer was unable to count the fish due to poor video quality. A control transfer has been requested.	For the mentioned and delayed reported PNC, already a control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoA) 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. In accordance with the control transfer, the related documents belonging this operation have been signed by the Observer.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F30	000TR0426	Turkey	09/07/2018	For a caging operation on 7 th July, due to poor video quality the observer was unable to count the fish. The BCD was not signed and a control transfer requested. For two other caging operations on 7 th July, the reference number for the farming cage and the donor cage were the same. The observer realised this after the BCD had already been signed.	For the mentioned and delayed reported PNC, already a control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (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. In accordance with the control transfer, the related documents belonging this operation have been signed by the Observer. MoAF initiated an investigation in respect to the delayed reported PNC regarding the same reference numbers of donor and farming cages. As a result of the investigation, it was confirmed that the inadvertently wrong recorded numbers have been corrected immediately after realizing by the Operator at the time of caging. The related sections have been approved by the Observer in e-BCD and Caging Declaration for this caging operation. During the caging, no fish exceeding the declared quota/amount of fish transferred was determined by MoAF.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F31	000TR0434	Turkey	10/07/2018	For a caging operation occurring on 10 th July, the observer was not able to estimate the amount of transferred BFT due to poor video quality.	For the mentioned and delayed reported PNC, already a control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoA) 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. In accordance with the control transfer, the related documents belonging this operation have been signed by the Observer.
F32	000TR0434	Turkey	16/07/2018	For a caging operation occurring on 15 th July, the observer was not able to estimate the amount of transferred BFT due to poor video quality.	For the mentioned and delayed reported PNC, already a control transfer under the supervision of an ICCAT regional observer and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoA) 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. In accordance with the control transfer, the related documents belonging this operation have been signed by the Observer.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F33	001EU0425	EU-Spain	17/07/2018	For caging operation n°12 undertaken on the 10/07/2018: the video quality didn't allowed the observer to do an estimation, and, the ITD number (UE-FRA-2018/2026/ITD) is not conform to ICCAT Recommendation.	No reference is made in the PNC communication to the cages involved. However and taking into account the caging date mentioned, it should be referred to authorisation AUT037R. Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage). The ITD is French; we understand it Is France the one that could provide the appropriate comments on how they produce the codification of their ITD's.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F34	001EU0424	EU-Spain	17/07/2018	<p>This is the first PNC related to this deployment. Our observer deployed on the farm has reported the following: On the Friday 22/06/2018, a part of the warehouse of [the] farm suffered of a devastating fire. Fortunately there were no wounded but more than 60% of the surface has been burned. However the activity of the farm didn't stop. After the fire and because the company will be not able to freeze lot of fishes at the moment, the operator asked to the Ministry of Madrid to consider all the dying tunas of the year 2018 as if they were of the cage 12. In this way they can sell the fishes instead to throw them away, Spanish national authorities are aware about this exceptional situation after the fire incident happened to the farm on the 22/06/2018 that reduced its freeze capacity and they accepted the request.</p>	<p>We do not consider that this is reporting a PNC but for the sake of transparency we provide an explanation of the situation occurred: As we have point out several times, for the period between physical caging operations and the presentation of caging data, if BFT died, there's not an option foreseen in the regulation (eBCD are blocked until data of the all JFO is introduced). So far, our instructions to operators are that the dead fish found in the period while SC videos are being analysed and until the caging is validated, is to freeze this fish until the validation of the eBCD. In this case, and due to the fire at the operators warehouse, this possibility could not be applied. To avoid the loss of commercial fish (it only was applied to BFT from 2018 campaign), one caging data operation (the one that took place into Farm cage 12) was introduced and eBCDs validated. By doing this, the operator could register dead tuna into the eBCD system, though found in any farm cage but declaring as it belong to farm cage 12. This situation was exceptional and temporal (until the rest of caging data could be presented and eBCD validated).</p>

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F35	001EU0428	EU-Malta	17/07/2018	This PNC on the 16/07/2018 relative to the caging transfer undertaken on the 11/07/2018 (cage EU.MLT-006-FF to the cage EU.MLT-030-FF): Despite the full compliance to the rec 17-07 of the caging, the farm never send the eBCD to our observer for a signature. She couldn't sign or confirm her presence during the caging transfer.	Regarding the caging carried out on the 11/07/2018, corresponding to part of the Italian eBCD, with caging authorisation MLT-2018-AUT-040 and recorded on the eBCD system, an issue was encountered with the eBCD system, not allowing the ICCAT regional observer to access the mentioned eBCD and thus the observer has not been able to verify her presence during the caging nor sign the eBCD. The observer's deployment 000EU0428 ended on the 15/07/2018 and although she reported the problem to the ROP consortium, issue was not solved prior to her end of deployment. ICCAT were also subsequently informed through the respective Authorities and the ICCAT Secretariat have signed on behalf of the observer.
F36	001EU0433	EU-Malta	24/07/2018	Caging transfer undertake on the 13/07/2018: The video of caging operation shows that one tuna (at least) remain in the towing cage at the end of the operation, not following the ICCAT recommendation.	Any tuna remaining in the towing cage at the end of the caging transfer will be recorded within the caging report and included within the stereoscopic camera estimation for the total biomass caged for the particular caging operation.
F37	001EU0433	EU-Malta	24/07/2018	Caging transfer undertaken on the 13/07/2018: The difference between observer and Farm Operator is more than 10% (Observer estimate: 2,168; Farm Estimate: 1514). He didn't sign the eBCD.	Stereoscopic Camera (SC) analysed 2177pcs.
F38	001EU0425	EU-Spain	30/07/2018	For intrafarm transfer operation n°5 (from the cage ESP037R to the cage ESP040)	Fisheries inspection services present during the operation and after reviewing the video footage confirmed that, although

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
				undertake on the 19/07/2018 : The time recorded on the video isn't correct	the time showed at the begging of the recording remains still, it is coherent with the operation and there is a chronometer that keeps counting. The recording is considered valid.
F39	001EU0433	EU-Malta	30/07/2018	The difference between observer and Farm Operator is more than 10% (Observer estimate: 1470 ; Farm Estimate: 1730). The observer didn't sign the eBCD	SC analysed 1507pcs.
F40	001EU0433	EU-Malta	30/07/2018	The difference between observer and Farm Operator is more than 10% (Observer estimate: 1386; Farm Estimate: 1708). The observer didn't sign the eBCD.	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.
F41	001EU0433	EU-Malta	01/08/2018	The difference between observer and Farm Operator is more than 10% (Observer estimate: 1015; Farm Estimate: 1500).	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.
F42	001EU0425	EU-Spain	02/08/2018	No observer estimation was possible due to the bad video quality and the other side of the door wasn't visible.	This caging is a repetition of a caging operation (on 15th July farm Cage ESP-004 was blocked in relation with cage ESP-030R, as previously explained, see the 5th PNC for the request 001EU0425). Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage).
F43	001TN0438	Tunisia	10/08/2018	Inconsistency between the farm name and its ICCAT number: according to the record available on the ICCAT website, the name of farm corresponding to the number [is different].	The name of the farm is correct. The ICCAT record has been corrected by the Secretariat following our submission of form CP09 on 7 August 2018 (well before the date of the PNC).
F44	001TN0438	Tunisia	10/08/2018	Following caging operation No. 1 carried out on 09/08/2018 and after a technical problem, it was not possible to deliver a	An unauthorised caging has been carried out on 17/08 at 8 h.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
				video to our observer. Therefore, the eBCD was not signed.	
F45	001EU0433	EU-Malta	10/08/2018	Caging transfer n°8 undertaken on the 01/08/2018 from the cage MLT-001 to the cage MLT-038: The video provided to the observer didn't show 100% of the door during the transfer, at several moments only half of the door is visible. The observer didn't sign the eBCD.	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.
F46	001TN0438	Tunisia	16/08/208	There is an interruption in the caging video, the observer is unable to view the full video.	A control transfer was carried out on 16/08/2018 to overcome this technical problem.
F47	001TN0438	Tunisia	17/08/208	An unauthorised caging was carried out on 17/08 at 8 h.	All the cagings carried out by the farm XXX (from 11 to 17 August 2018) have been authorised by the competent authority. Exceedance of the date of 15 August was notified to the Consortium and to the ICCAT Secretariat with the necessary supporting documents.
F48	001EU0427	EU-Malta	21/08/2018	The 19th caging during the deployment took place after the 15th of August. The observer had not signed the BCDs due to a discrepancy in the estimates of amount of tuna caged.	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging. Caging operation carried out after the 15/08/2017 due to force majeure. Extension was requested accordingly in due time.
F49	001EU0433	EU-Malta	21/08/2018	Three PNCs issued for a total of seven caging operations carried out after 15 August	Caging operation carried out after the 15/08/2017 due to force majeure. Extension was requested accordingly in due time.
F50	001EU0433	EU-Malta	23/08/2018	The Observer estimate is more than 10% different than Farm's	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F51	001EU0439	EU-Spain	23/08/2018	The farm produced 6 eBCD of tuna “moribundos” harvested in June during the deployment of the previous observer (request 001EU0424 who took end on the 17/08/2018). From now the farm sent these eBCD to the newly deployed observer for a signature, but because the observer changed last week with the new request, she will not sign the eBCD	We do not consider that this as a PNC
F52	001EU0433	EU-Malta	24/08/2018	The Observer estimate is more than 10% different than Farm’s	Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.
F53	001EU0433	EU-Malta	24/08/2018	The Observer estimate is more than 10% different than Farm’s: Observer estimate: 778 Farm Estimate: 925: Difference -15.89%: This caging operation also occurred after the 15th of August.	No response available at time of publishing

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F54	001EU0435	EU-Spain	27/08/2018	<p>1) For a caging conducted on the 24th of August, the amount of tuna caged could not be estimated due to poor video quality. The observer stated that the caging would be repeated due to technical issues with the stereoscopic camera. No corresponding eBCD or ICD had been presented to the observer at the time of reporting. 2) For the caging carried out on the 26th of August, the amount of tuna caged could not be estimated due to poor video quality. No corresponding eBCD or ICD had been presented to the observer at the time of reporting; 3) Both the caging and control caging were carried out after 15th of August.</p>	<p>No1: Caging was conducted on the 24th of August, the consortium has sent a communication clarifying this issue. Fisheries inspection services checked videos and confirmed the situation. An investigation was opened on 28th August, farm Cage ESP-037 was blocked and the caging operation repeated on the 1st of September. No2: This operation was not a control caging, the consortium has sent a communication clarifying this issue. Fisheries inspection services checked that all the operation was properly recorded and they were able to estimate the fish caged (SC footage). No3: According to para 79 REC17-07, caging operations undertook after 15th can take place if valid reasons are provided by the farm CPC (when submitting caging report). However, at this stage (though the caging report is not submitted yet) we can provide the explanation: BFT involved in both operations was initially supposed to be caged in other Member State farms (XXX). However, by mid-July a change in farm destination happened, being XXX their final destination. Since then, the TW are steaming towards Spain (Cartagena) but strong sea currents delayed their arrival and Caging operations have been done after 15th August.</p>

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F55	001EU0429	EU-Malta	28/08/2018	1) The observer has reported that for a caging carried out on 11/07/2018, the estimates of the amount caged by the farm was more than 10% different than the observer's estimate. The observer has not signed the eBCDs. The observer was presented with the eBCDs today (28/08/2018). No ICD has been presented to the observer for this for this operation. 2) The observer has reported that for a caging carried out on 21/07/2018, the estimates of the amount caged by the farm was more than 10% different than the observer's estimate. The observer has not signed the eBCD. The observer was presented with the eBCD today (28/08/2018). No ICD has been presented to the observer for this operation.	PNC N°1: SC analysed 536pcs. PNC N°2: Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging.
F56	001EU0435	EU-Spain	02/09/2018	1) The observer was unable to estimate the amount of tuna transferred during the first control caging from cage ESP037 to MLT001 due to video quality; 2) The observer was unable to estimate the amount of tuna transferred during the second control caging from cage MLT001 to ESP037 due to the amount of tuna being transferred simultaneously.	Fisheries inspection services checked that video quality allows the estimation of the fish caged
F57	01EU0441	EU-Spain	03/09/2018	The observer has reported that a caging occurred on 3rd September, i.e. after 15th August	BFT catch came from Portugal. It was caught on 24th August by Portuguese trap. Then, it was not possible caging before 15th August.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>Responses</i>
F58	001EU0427	EU-Malta	20/08/2018	For the 2 nd caging of this deployment on 03/07/2018, the 4 th caging of this deployment on 04/07/2018, the 5 th caging on 05/07/2018, the 7 th caging on 11/07/2018, 9 th caging on 19/07/2018, the 10 th caging on 21/07/2018, 14 th caging of this deployment on 28/07/2018; 16 th caging of this deployment on 31/07/2018; 17 th caging of this deployment on 01/08/2018 and 19 th caging of this deployment on 16/08/2018, the observer reported that his estimates are more than 10% different to the farms. [in addition, last caging after 15 August - see F48]	PNC N°2: SC analysed 1522pcs. PNC N°4: The results are still pending due to finalisation of entire JFO. PNC N°5: Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging. PNC N°7: The results are still pending due to finalisation of entire JFO. PNC N°9: Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging. PNC N°10: Pending: Awaiting Stereoscopic Camera Results at caging. Caging operation carried out after the 15/08/2017 due to force majeure. Extension was requested accordingly in due time.