

**SECRETARIAT REPORT TO THE PERMANENT WORKING GROUP FOR
THE IMPROVEMENT OF ICCAT STATISTICS AND CONSERVATION MEASURES (PWG)**

ICCAT Secretariat

NOTE: This report is based on information and submission transmitted until **12 October 2018**. Any information received after that deadline will be brought to the attention of the PWG Chair. This additional information shall not be translated.

1. Statistics document, bluefin catch documentation programmes and other trade data

A comparison between statistical documents data (bi-annual swordfish and bigeye reports) and Task I nominal catch data is provided in document **PLE_105/18**.

Trade data in accordance with Rec. 06-13 are contained in Annex 1 of **COC_303/18** (electronic version only).

- Validation and other information required

Validation information on institutions and people authorised to validate the ICCAT statistical document is published on a password protected website: <https://www.iccat.int/en/SDPsummary.asp>

In accordance with Recs. 01-21 and 01-22, bi-annual Statistical Documents (SD) and/or Re-export Certificates (RC) of swordfish (SWO) and bigeye (BET), for the second semester of 2017 and first semester of 2018, were received by the Secretariat from the following CPCs: Canada, China, Côte d'Ivoire, EU, Ghana, Iceland, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Norway, Senegal, Trinidad & Tobago, Turkey, United States and Chinese Taipei. Algeria confirmed no imports of these species to report. No response to the Secretariat's requests for clarifications from Mexico has been received, for which reason the data provided by Mexico could not be incorporated into the ICCAT data base.

These reports reveal that some quantities of bigeye tuna continue to be imported from unclassified fishing flags making it difficult to distinguish whether or not these have submitted their validation information. They show also that bigeye imports continue to be made from fishing flags whose validation information has never been submitted to the Secretariat. To date, no validation information has yet been received from Grenada, and validation information is missing from Oman regarding bigeye only. The Secretariat has requested this information from Grenada and has contacted Oman to consider adding SDP validation information for bigeye.

Information on bi-annual reports is published on the password protected website:

<https://www.iccat.int/en/SDPsummary.asp>

In accordance with Rec. 11-20, a summary of the information received at the Secretariat related to the BCD is published on the ICCAT website: <https://www.iccat.int/en/BCD.asp>. Details are available on the password protected page that is accessible from that link.

- BCD annual reports

In accordance with Rec. 11-20, these reports have been published on a password protected website at: <https://www.iccat.int/en/BCD.asp> Several CPCs have reported their data through the eBCD system.

- BCDs and BFTRC submission and processing

The Secretariat received, between 14 October 2017 and 10 October 2018: 241 BCD splits and 424 re-export certificates.

The information from these documents is published on the web page at:
<https://www.iccat.int/en/BCD.asp>

- Implementation of the eBCD system

The number of eBCDs and BFTRCs recorded in the eBCD system from 17 October 2017 to 10 October 2018 was of 12087 BCDs and 852 re-exports.

The eBCD Technical Working Group (TWG) met in January 2018. No report from the meeting is available but the Chair of the TWG will present the developments of the system in document **PWG-403/18**.

Following the TWG, TRAGSA requested technical specifications to the Group or to the Secretariat for some remaining issues such as:

- changing the alert to inform CPC-Administrator of quota' excess;
- a list of plausible transformation of products;
- facilitating the access to the eBCD system to Non-CPCs;
- tracking the movement between different cages in a farm.

Another important issue which generated some serious discussion in the TWG was the following:

A CPC "A" sells his catch to a farm from a CPC "B". Before caging, CPC "B" re-trades part of it to a new farm from a CPC "C". The buyer of the remaining fish is still Farm B, however the system only provides users with the option to represent this as a trade between Farm B, as the seller, and again Farm B as the buyer. Currently, the system does not consider a second life trade without caging it before the live trade, and when it happens, an alert appears. Since there is no specific provision about this situation in the Recommendation 11-20, the Secretariat does not consider that operation as incorrect. To allow similar situations to be registered, the TWG might consider requesting TRAGSA to modify the system to contemplate cases like this one. While waiting for the modification of the system, TRAGSA has modified the eBCD eliminating the alert so that the CPC "B" was able to proceed further.

The Secretariat, with the profile of ICCAT Administrator in the eBCD system, would like to make the following observations:

Since it is the third operational year, fewer requests from CPCs for assistance with different functions of the application were registered compared to 2017, as well as with editing and correction of information that CPCs recorded. However, the Secretariat and TRAGSA continue to assist CPCs with tasks which their administrators are authorised to carry out. These tasks (such as for example renewing the permit of eBCD users of their CPC flag) should be done by the CPC-Administrators and would speed up the access to the eBCD for the users. The Secretariat has also noticed that some CPC-Administrators reply several days after the reception of a user request when the system is expected to speed up transactions.

Due to a new security function implemented by TRAGSA, a user connection has a limited duration, and this generates a high number of request for unblocking all type of users. The Secretariat understands that all issues related to security are needed but in this case it also has slowed down the interaction between the system and the users, due to the increasingly need of unblocking them several times per day.

Regarding digital certificates, this year the users have been provided with a new way of requesting renewals and digital certificates. This function has great assisted the Secretariat. Several errors were detected, such as: duplicate requests, requests for certificates prior to changing emails (i.e.: with an incorrect email). The Secretariat would also like to point out that on some occasions the requests have been treated with delay by The Server Labs.

In terms of the quantity of digital certificates, the Secretary will need to know an approximate estimate of the number of certificates envisaged when the next budget is negotiated with the consortium.

Additional development and future user support/maintenance might require more funding over and beyond the amounts already set aside from the Working Capital Fund.

2. ICCAT Regional Observer Programmes

Document **PWG_402/18** contains the report on ICCAT Regional Observer Programme on transshipment, and document **PA2_601/18** a report on the implementation of the ICCAT Regional Observer Programme for eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna (ROP-BFT).

3. At-sea and in-port transshipment requirements

CPC reports on transshipment (at sea and in port) are contained in Annex 1 and Annex 2 to **PWG_402/18**, Appendix 2 which contains the comprehensive reports assessing the content and conclusions of observer reports. It is unclear to the Secretariat why there are different dates for the reporting of transshipment reports (at-sea and in-port). The Secretariat suggests combining these to 15 September in both cases.

4. Rules for chartering and other fishing arrangements

The summary reports on chartering submitted in 2018 by the European Union for EU-Spain and by South Africa are related to 2017 data. The reports are contained in Appendix 2 to **COC_303/18**. The information received by the Secretariat, in accordance with paragraph 13 of Rec. 13-14 is presented in Table 11 to **COC_303/18**.

In accordance with Rec. 14-07, the summary of access agreements reported by CPCs is available in **Annex 9** to **COC_303/18**. No new access agreement has been communicated to the Secretariat in 2018.

5. At-sea vessel sighting and inspection programs

As far as inspection programs are concerned, the Secretariat has prepared a summary table with the main findings of the inspections reports carried out by Tunisia and Turkey under Rec. 16-05, Annex 1 and Rec. 17-07, Annex 7 (available as Table 3 to **COC_303/2018**).

6. Port inspection schemes and other port State measures

The *Recommendation by ICCAT for an ICCAT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port* [Rec. 12-07] imposes several obligations on CPCs.

The list of ports into which foreign vessels may enter, has been published on <https://iccat.int/en/Ports.asp> together with contacts and prior-entry request times.

In accordance with paragraph 20 of Rec. 12-07, the Secretariat has received copies of inspection reports from Morocco, Namibia, Senegal, South Africa and Tunisia. The Secretariat has not posted these reports on the ICCAT website, as no infractions were reported. South Africa, which is a Contracting Party to both ICCAT and IOTC is using the electronic Port State Measures reporting system implemented by IOTC. Since mid-2017, the IOTC has kindly incorporated the relevant ICCAT referentials into their system to allow South Africa to use this system to also report to ICCAT. Due to a minor technical problem, reports were received slightly late this year, rather than in real time, but this problem now seems to have been solved.

Three infringements were published on the password protected area of the ICCAT website as required by Rec. 12-07. In one case, a fine was issued by the Port State. In the other two cases, the CPC investigated the allegations but found no infringement.

The Port Inspection Expert Group met in Madrid, 18-19 September 2018. If available, the report will be circulated as **PWG-406/18**.

Request for clarification: Given the requirement in Rec. 12-07, paragraph 20, to receive copies of all inspection reports, the Secretariat would appreciate guidance regarding what should be done with the reports which do not contain infraction.

7. Vessel registration requirements and CLAV requirements (Consolidated list of authorised vessels)

Following the recommendations made by the tuna RFMOs on the Consolidated list of authorised vessels (CLAV, details contained in document **PLE_105/18**), the ICCAT vessel database contains the IMO number (or any other international registration number), provided that it is supplied.

For the current state of the ICCAT Record of Vessels, please see the summary contained in **Table 1**. The ICCAT Record of Vessels database is now an integrated system that manages:

- a) Any information from a total of eleven ICCAT vessel authorisation lists: the positive list – LOA \geq 20M [P20m], the four vessel lists whose authorisations are associated with the P20m list (North and South Atlantic swordfish: SWOn and SWOs; North and South Atlantic albacore: ALBn and ALBs), the Mediterranean swordfish vessels list [SWOm], the Mediterranean albacore vessels list [ALBm], the E-BFT catching vessels list [BFTc], the “E-BFT”-other vessels list [BFTo], the carrier vessels list [Carr] and the tropical fishing vessels list [Trop]);
- b) Vessels subject to chartering agreements;
- c) Longliners [LSPLVs] authorised to tranship to carrier vessels;
- d) The list of vessels that have carried out fishing operations in the previous year in the TROP, SWO-M and BFT fisheries (information also shared with Task I fishing fleet characteristics, used by the SCRS to manage the remainder ICCAT fisheries presented in Table 1 of **PLE-105/18**).

The ICCAT vessel database continues to grow substantially. The total number of vessels registered has reached 52,244 of which 45.2% are active, 52.3% are inactive, and 2.5% are inoperative (either destroyed, scrapped, sunk or delisted).

Although improving when compared to the previous years, the reporting issues still persist, such as incomplete reporting of vessel characteristics, in particular, those identified as mandatory. Table 2 provides detailed information by CPC in this regard.

The figures contained in Table 3 show that all the 3,961 vessels (3,845 in the positive lists and 116 in the carrier/support vessels list) with a length of 20 metres or greater that are active in one or several of the eleven ICCAT Record of Authorisation Lists, now comply with paragraphs 5bis/5tris of Rec. 13-13, as long as they have been allocated an International Registration Number (IMO, LRN, JUS or WOD). They are distributed as follows: 45.6% IMO, 0.8% LRN, 29.3% JUS, and 24.3% WOD. Only for two active vessels this information is “unknown”.

Since the Commission authorised the Secretariat to deactivate each vessel whose authorisation/s have expired, by more than 45 days, in one or several lists, a number of vessels with expired authorisations are regularly moved to the ICCAT Record of Inactive Vessels. This rule does not cover carrier vessels for which the Secretariat requests, whenever it is necessary to do so, confirmation from CPCs with vessels with expired authorisations (\geq 45 days).

Request for clarification: Rec. 16-01 stipulates that fishing vessels on this list should be 20m or greater. The size limit for support vessels is not so clear to the Secretariat. Clarification is sought as to whether all support vessels, regardless of size, should be included, or whether only support vessels of 20 m or greater need be reported.

Duplication of vessels: Mindful of the integrity of the ICCAT Record of Vessels, the Secretariat continues to request collaboration from CPCs each time that duplications of vessels are identified. These duplications are essentially caused by inactive vessels on the ICCAT Record. CPCs, when making submissions in relation to their different vessels (for modification, updates or inclusion/reactivation) do not take into account the lists of inactive vessels. This can affect the quality of the ICCAT vessel database, in relation to which great efforts have been made in recent years in collaboration with the CLAV and other organisations (RFMOs and others). In addition, duplicate vessels can cause difficulties with the eBCD system.

Recalling the recommendation made at the 12th IMM WG, for this purpose, the Secretariat requests that CPCs provide more support, in particular by paying attention to and using the lists of inactive vessels which are extracted from the ICCAT Record and provided to them on request. It is the best way to eliminate vessel duplicates each time they are identified by the Secretariat.

Vessel characteristics: Those which are missing should be completed, in particular, the National Registration Number (NatRegNo), the International Radio Call Signs (IRCS), the fishing vessel types (ISSCFV), the fishing gear types (ISSCFG) and tonnage. It is also important to complete the previous flag field, in order to assist with the detection of possible duplicates.

Vessel names should be always in Latin script as stated in the "*Guidelines for submission of data and information required by ICCAT*": https://iccat.int/Documents/Comply/Guidelines_ENG.pdf

The integrity of the ICCAT Record of Vessels depends on the following three conditions:

1. Completeness of the information submitted on vessels,
2. Mandatory information that is missing,
3. Compliance with the stated rules on deactivation of vessels with expired authorisation periods.

Information on ICCAT Record of Vessels is published on the website: <https://iccat.int/en/vesselsrecord.asp>

For information pertaining to lists of vessels which actively fished in the previous year, please refer to Table 1 of **PLE_105/18** and **COC-303/18** - Annex 5.

8. Vessel Monitoring System requirements

Information on the VMS messages received at the Secretariat is contained in document **COC_303/18**. To date, the system has been working well but is now ten years old and an extensive upgrade to the system has been made in 2018 in order to ensure continued service. Please, see paragraph 3.4.3 of **PLE_105/18** for a more detailed explanation.

9. Flag State responsibilities

Rec. 03-12 does not require the submission of specific information. Within the framework of the ROP programme for transshipment, Contracting Parties are sometimes informed of marking and identification not correctly displayed on the LSPLV (refer to document **PWG_402/18**, Appendix 1).

10. Review and establishment of the IUU vessel list

The WCPFC informed the Secretariat that compared to its 2017 IUU list, its 2018 IUU list had no changes. This information was circulated by the Secretariat to all CPCs. The Secretariat received the 2018 IUU lists from IATTC and IOTC. IATTC informed that there were no change since the IUU 2014 list and IOTC reported five additional vessels. The IOTC IUU list, as well as its supporting information, was transmitted to the CPCs for comments. The draft ICCAT IUU list, was distributed to CPCs for comment. Compared to the ICCAT 2017 IUU list, the draft IUU list included several edits informed by IATTC (in particular concerning names and addresses of owner or operators), the request of Bolivia to list the vessel *KIM SENG DENG 3* as “unknown” flag State, the request of Chinese Taipei to list the vessel *YU FONG 168* under “unknown” flag State and the information of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines certifying that the vessel *ASIAN WARRIOR* (ex *KUNLUN*) was de-listed of its registry in February 2016. The Secretariat did not receive any comment to that draft ICCAT IUU list but a CPC requesting more information concerning the IOTC IUU list. Additional information was requested to the IOTC Secretariat and the web links transmitted by IOTC were made available to all CPCs through a Circular.

The provisional list, for consideration and possible adoption by the Commission, is contained in document **PWG_405/18** with some background information provided by WCPFC and by IOTC.