

Original: English/French/Spanish

Appendix 3

PNCs REPORTED BY ICCAT REGIONAL OBSERVERS DEPLOYED ON FARMS AND TRAPS
(September 2018 to September 2019)

Request No.	CPC	Date of event	Date reported	PNC	In potential contravention of	Response
001EU0443	EU-Malta	14/09/2018	20/09/2018	On 14/09/2018, a release operation was carried out approximately 3nm from the farm. The observer has reported that no CPC observer was onboard the towing vessel	Rec. 17-07, Para 88 and Annex 10	Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture Officer was always present during release operations. If Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture officer was not on-board the towing vessel towing the cage 3nm from the farm, he was present on the support/auxiliary vessel assisting the same operation.
001EU0443	EU-Malta	20/09/2018	21/09/2018	On 20/09/2018, a release operation was carried out approximately 3nm from the farm. The observer has reported that no CPC observer was onboard the towing vessel	Rec. 17-07, Para 88 and Annex 10	Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture Officer was always present during release operations. If Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture officer was not on-board the towing vessel towing the cage 3nm from the farm, he was present on the support/auxiliary vessel assisting the same operation.
001EU0435	EU-Spain	21/09/2018	21/09/2018	On 21/09/2018, a release operation was carried approximately 15nm from the farm. The observer has reported that no CPC observer was onboard the towing vessel	Rec. 17-07, Para 88 and Annex 10	There was not a release operation from transport cages where they should be present a national observer. There were two release operations carried out by the farm due to an excess of capture. The third one (22/11/2018) was the remaining fish after the completion of the harvesting operations.
001EU0443	EU-Malta	16/09/2018	24/09/2018	A release operation was carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	These release operations were from farming cages, and according to Annex 10 of Rec. 17-07 in these cases they should be observed by an ICCAT regional observer, which indeed was present. The cage was

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						transported away from the farm as an additional measure to guarantee that the release operation takes place at the most appropriate place to increase the probability of the fish going back to the stock.
001EU0433	EU-Malta	24/09/2018	24/09/2018	A release operation was carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	According to Para 102 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 a caging operation is not complete until a potential investigation and release are also completed. Release was completed within 3 weeks from the receipt of the respective release order by the catching vessel flag state authorities.
001EU0435	EU-Spain	30/09/2018	01/10/2018	A release operation was carried out approximately 12nm from the farm. The observer has reported that no CPC observer was onboard the towing vessel	Rec. 17-07, Para 88 and Annex 10	There was not a release operation from transport cages where they should be present a national observer. There were two release operations carried out by the farm due to an excess of capture. The third one (22/11/2018) was the remaining fish after the completion of the harvesting operations.
001EU0451	EU-Malta	08/10/2018	08/10/2018	A release operation was carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	According to Para 102 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 a caging operation is not complete until a potential investigation and release are also completed. Release was completed within 3 weeks from the receipt of the respective release order by the catching vessel flag state authorities.
001EU0435	EU-Spain	23/10/2018	23/10/2018	197 bluefin tuna weighing an estimated 45,964kg were harvested from a cage to the carrier vessel. The eBCD had a different cage number recorded in section 6. The farm was unable to provide the observer with either: verification	Rec. 17-07, Para 84	The fish were harvested from a cage different from the one that they were caged in. This difference of cage numbers is due to repetition of the caging operation and not an intra-farm transfer that was authorized and observed by national

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
				that an intra-farm transfer of bluefin tuna between the original cage and the subsequent harvest cage had been authorized by the concerned CPC and had occurred in the presence of farm State control authorities, as required per para 84 of Rec. 17-07; or verification that compensation between cages took place with the explicit consent and authorization of the farming CPC. The only documentation provided, was a <i>Record of Inspection</i> 192936, that recorded a control transfer. As no verification explaining this difference in cages was provided, the observer dated and saved the BCD, but did not sign it.		authorities as is reported in the inspection reports 192675 and 192936.
001EU0453	EU-Malta	29/10/2018	29/10/2018	Two release operations were carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	According to Para 102 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 a caging operation is not complete until a potential investigation and release are also completed. Release was completed after 3 weeks from the receipt of the respective release order by the catching vessel flag state authorities.
001EU0451	EU-Malta	06/11/2018	07/11/2018	Two release operations were carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	According to Para 102 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 a caging operation is not complete until a potential investigation and release are also completed. Release was completed within 3 weeks from the receipt of the respective release order by the catching vessel flag state authorities.
001EU0450	EU-Spain	06/11/2018	08/11/2018	The farm harvested 19 fish on 29/10/2018. In the eBCD related, the cage number was different from	Not specified by Consortium, we	The fish were harvested from the cage ESP026. On the 21 July, the farm carried out an intra-farm transfer or split of a

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
				that on the cage from which the fish were taken.	believe it is Rec. 17-07, paras 80- 84].	cage. The donor cage was ESP025 and the receiving cage was ESP026. That operation was authorised with date 17/07/2018, and inspected by the Spanish authorities (Inspection report 192952). The ROP nº 197 was present during the intra-farm transfer.
001EU0448	EU-Malta	07/11/2018	08/11/2018	Two release operations were carried out more than 3 week after caging	Rec. 17-07, Annex 10	According to Para 102 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 a caging operation is not complete until a potential investigation and release are also completed. Release was completed within 3 weeks from the receipt of the respective release order by the catching vessel flag state authorities.
001EU0450	EU-Spain	26/11/2018	26/11/2018	On 22/11/2018, a release operation was carried out approximately 12m from the farm. The observer has reported that no CPC observer was onboard the towing vessel	Rec. 17-07, Para 88 and Annex 10	The fish were harvested from the cage ESP026. On 21 July, the farm carried out an intra-farm transfer or split of a cage. The donor cage was ESP025 and the receiving was ESP026. That operation was authorised with date 17/07/2018, and inspected by the Spanish authorities (Inspection report 192952). The ROP nº 197 was present during the intra-farm transfer.
001EU0480	EU-Spain	21/06/2019	21/06/2019	Following the caging operation carried out on 19 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference by number between the estimates made by the observer and that registered by the DCA. The operation took place between the donour cage ESP010R and the receiving cage JC10.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02 / Article 81 of Rec. 17-07.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was invalid and the caging was repeated on 19 June.

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001EU0482	EU-Croatia	22/06/2019	24/06/2019	Following a caging operation performed on 13/06, there was a difference of more than 10% between the estimate made by the observer and the estimate declared in the eBCD for the number of tuna transferred. As a consequence, the observer has not signed the eBCD. The observer understands that the estimate within the eBCD was a provisional estimate and will be amended with the stereoscopical estimates once these are complete.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02 / Article 81 of Rec. 17-07	Croatian control authorities finished with analysis of stereoscopic camera video and on 22 June 2019, those numbers were compared with the number of bluefin tuna caged with the Regional observer, after that she agreed with figures in accordance with Rec. 18-02, and Caging report was signed by operator, and those numbers were put in relevant eBCD. Finally, eBCD No XXX was validated on 26 June 2019 by Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries – Farming.
000EU0488	EU-Spain	15/06/2019	24/06/2019	After the first caging operations from the towing cage to the farm cage, there was a difference of more than 10% between the estimate made by the observer and the number in the eBCD. The eBCDs were not signed.	Rec. 18-02, Para 98	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining less than a 10% difference.
000EU0488	EU-Spain	20/06/2019	24/06/2019	After the fifth caging operations from the towing cage to the farm cage, there was a difference of more than 10% between the estimate made by the observer and the number in the eBCD. The eBCDs were not signed.	Rec. 18-02, Para 98	Once the video was reviewed by the inspectors, more than a 10% difference was observed for this caging. Once all the cagings from this JFO were considered and applying the compensation criteria between cages, more than a 10% difference was observed. A release of excess catch from this JFO was carried out.
000EU0488	EU-Spain	15/06/2019	24/06/2019	After the third caging operation from the towing cage to the farm cage, it was not possible for the observer to make an independent estimation of the number of fish transferred due to the bad quality	Rec. 18-02, Annex 8 viii	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was invalid and the caging was repeated on 5 July.

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
				of the video. The eBCDs were not signed.		
001EU0485	EU-Malta	28/06/2019	29/06/2019	Following a caging operation performed on 28/06, the opening of the door was not shown on the video. As a consequence, the observer will not sign the corresponding eBCD.	Article 97 and Annex 8 of Rec. 18-02	The Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture is fully compliant with Annex 9 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02 and has no similar issues with the stereoscopic camera footage and stereoscopic camera estimations for this particular caging. No further action is thus required.
001EU0489	EU-Malta	06/09/2019	07/09/2019	For two caging operations that occurred on 06/09/2019, the caging operations 11 and 12 were done after the 22 August.	Article 97 and Annex 8 of Rec. 18-02	Caging operation carried out after the 22/08/2017 due to force majeure. Reasons for this delay will accompany the caging reports when submitted as required through Para. 95 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02.
001EU0486	EU-Malta	27/06/2019	12/07/2019	For a caging operation that occurred on 27/06/2019, the observer estimate was more than 10% different to the number of tuna declared in the eBCD. Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Final stereoscopic camera results for this caging operation confirmed the more than 10% difference from the number of tuna declared in the eBCD. This potential non-compliance raised by the Regional Observer will thus continue to be followed in cooperation with the CPC of the catching vessel as indicated through Para. 98 of ICCAT Rec. 18-02.
001EU0486	EU-Malta	29/06/2019	12/07/2019	For a caging operation that occurred on 29/06/2019, the observer estimate was more than 10% different to the number of tuna declared in the eBCD. This is a potential non-compliance with Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Final stereoscopic camera results for this caging operation did not exceed the 10% difference from the number of tuna declared in the eBCD. The potential non-compliance raised by the Regional Observer does not apply with respect to the number of BFT pieces estimated by the stereoscopic camera.
001EU0480	EU-Spain	11/06/2019	13/06/2019	After the caging operation on 11 June, the observer was unable to	Article 97; Annex 8 Rec. 18-02 /	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
				estimate the tuna transferred. The operation was carried out from the donour cage ESP011R and the recipient cage 3. As a result, the observer has not signed the BCDs.	Article 81; Annex 8 Rec. 17-07	that the video was invalid and the caging was repeated on 19 June.
001EU0480	EU-Spain	15/06/2019	16/06/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 13 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate made by the observer and the number in the BCD. The operation took place between the donour cage ESP013R and the receiving cage 14.	Article 98; Rec. 18-02 / Article 81 Rec. 17-07	Once the video was reviewed by the inspectors, more than a 10% difference was observed for this caging. Once all the cagings from this JFO were considered and applying the compensation criteria between cages, more than a 10% difference was observed. A release of excess catch from this JFO was carried out.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	22/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 22 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	23/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 23 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	24/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 24 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Once the video was reviewed by the inspectors, more than a 10% difference was observed for this caging. Once all the cagings from this JFO were considered and applying the compensation criteria between cages, more than a 10% difference was observed. A release of excess catch from this JFO was carried out

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001EU0495	EU-Spain	25/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 25 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	30/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 30 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD (caging # 6).	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Once the video was reviewed by the inspectors, more than a 10% difference was observed for this caging. Once all the cagings from this JFO were considered and applying the compensation criteria between cages, more than a 10% difference was observed. A release of excess catch from this JFO was carried out.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	30/06/2019	15/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 30 June 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD (caging # 7).	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Caging to cage ESP-049 took place on 1 July 2019. Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	07/08/2019	08/08/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 7 August 2019, the video recording was of insufficient quality to estimate the number of tunas transferred. As a result of this the Observer did not sign the BCDs.	Article 97 and Annex 8 of Recommendation 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, an investigation has been opened and it was concluded that a transfer to verify the number of caged tuna is required.

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001EU0495	EU-Spain	02/07/2019	18/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 2 July 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Recommendation 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	03/07/2019	18/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 3 July 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Following the review of the video by the inspection services, it was determined that the video was valid obtaining a difference of less than 10%.
001EU0495	EU-Spain	04/07/2019	18/07/2019	After the caging operation carried out on 4 July 2019, there was more than a 10% difference between the estimate of bluefin transferred made by the observer and the number in the BCD.	Article 98 of Rec. 18-02.	Once the video was reviewed by the inspectors, more than a 10% difference was observed for this caging. Once all the cagings from this JFO were considered and applying the compensation criteria between cages, more than a 10% difference was observed. A release of excess catch from this JFO was carried out.
001MA0477	Morocco	04/04/2019	05/04/2019	It was not possible for the observer to make an independent estimate of the fish transferred. There was a six-second pause in the video and approximately half of the door was not visible for several seconds during the transfer.	Rec. 17-07 (Annex 8 vii)	<p>The farm operator reported that the video recording was of insufficient quality, which did not allow the required estimates to be made.</p> <p>Therefore, a new caging operation was carried out in accordance with the provisions of Recommendation 18-02, which enabled recording of a better quality video.</p> <p>Following this, the ICCAT regional observer signed the fattening section of the eBCD corresponding to this operation.</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001MA0478	Morocco	13/05/2019	14/05/2019	On 10 May it was not possible for the observer to make an independent estimate of the fish being transferred from the trap to the transport cage. The quality of the video was not good enough to let the observer have an estimation of the quantity of the tuna transferred	Rec. 17-07 (Annex 8 vii)	<p>The trap operator reported that the quality of the video was insufficient and that there was a lack of visibility, which did not allow the required estimates to be made.</p> <p>Therefore, a new caging operation was carried out in accordance with the provisions of Recommendation 18-02, which enabled recording of a better quality video.</p> <p>Following that, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that a similar case should not be reported as a PNC. Indeed, it should be recalled that at the meeting held in Madrid in the margin of the meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM), in the presence of the ROP-BFT consortium, the Secretariat and three CPCs (EU, Morocco and Tunisia), it was agreed, as indicated in item 3 "Evaluation of ROP work procedures" of the meeting report transmitted by the Secretariat on 09/04/2019:</p> <p>"...2) That no PNC would be issued if no count could be made from the video recording of the first transfer from net to cage providing that a second voluntary transfer was carried out and a count was possible. Only if no count was possible after this second transfer should a PNC be issued."</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001MA0477	Morocco	21/05/2019	22/05/2019	The quality of the video produced after the transfer operation from the trap to the towing cage was not sufficient to allow the observer to make an independent estimate of the fish transferred. The observer understood that a transfer operation for control purposes was requested.	Rec. 17-07 (Annex 8 vii)	<p>The trap operator reported that the quality of the video was insufficient and that there was a lack of visibility, which did not allow the required estimates to be made.</p> <p>Therefore, a new caging operation was carried out in accordance with the provisions of Recommendation 18-02, which enabled recording of a better quality video.</p> <p>Following that, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that a similar case should not be reported as a PNC. Indeed, it should be recalled that at the meeting held in Madrid in the margin of the meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM), in the presence of the ROP-BFT consortium, the Secretariat and three CPCs (EU, Morocco and Tunisia), it was agreed, as indicated in item 3 "Evaluation of ROP work procedures" of the meeting report transmitted by the Secretariat on 09/04/2019:</p> <p>"...2) That no PNC would be issued if no count could be made from the video recording of the first transfer from net to cage providing that a second voluntary transfer was carried out and a count was possible. Only if no count was possible after this second transfer should a PNC be issued."</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
001MA0477	Morocco	23/05/2019	24/05/2019	The quality of video produced after the transfer operation from the trap to the towing cage was not sufficient to allow the observer to make an independent estimate of the fish transferred. The observer understood that a transfer operation for control purposes was requested.	Rec. 17-07 (Annex 8 vii)	<p>The trap operator reported that the quality of the video was insufficient and that there was a lack of visibility, which did not allow the required estimates to be made.</p> <p>Therefore, a new caging operation was carried out in accordance with the provisions of Recommendation 18-02, which enabled recording of a better quality video.</p> <p>Following that, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that a similar case should not be reported as a PNC.</p> <p>Indeed, it should be recalled that at the meeting held in Madrid in the margin of the meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM), in the presence of the ROP-BFT consortium, the Secretariat and three CPCs (EU, Morocco and Tunisia), it was agreed, as indicated in item 3 "Evaluation of ROP work procedures" of the meeting report transmitted by the Secretariat on 09/04/2019:</p> <p>"...2) That no PNC would be issued if no count could be made from the video recording of the first transfer from net to cage providing that a second voluntary transfer was carried out and a count was possible. Only if no count was possible</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						after this second transfer should a PNC be issued.”
001MA0478	Morocco	21/05/2019	22/05/2019	It was impossible to estimate the number of bluefin tuna transferred due to the insufficient quality of the video (low quality + the video does not show the whole door throughout).	Recommendation 17_07 (annex 8 vii).	<p>The trap operator reported that the quality of the video was insufficient and that there was a lack of visibility, which did not allow the required estimates to be made.</p> <p>Therefore, a new caging operation was carried out in accordance with the provisions of Recommendation 18-02, which enabled recording of a better quality video.</p> <p>Following that, the ICCAT regional observer signed the ITD. However, it should be noted that a similar case should not be reported as a PNC. Indeed, it should be recalled that at the meeting held in Madrid in the margin of the meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM), in the presence of the ROP-BFT consortium, the Secretariat and three CPCs (EU, Morocco and Tunisia), it was agreed, as indicated in item 3 “Evaluation of ROP work procedures” of the meeting report transmitted by the Secretariat on 09/04/2019:</p> <p>“...2) That no PNC would be issued if no count could be made from the video recording of the first transfer from net to cage providing that a second voluntary transfer was carried out and a count was</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						possible. Only if no count was possible after this second transfer should a PNC be issued."
001TN0484	Tunisia	26/06/2019	28/06/2019	During the caging on 26/06 of the cage towed by the tow, the quality of the video did not allow the observer to estimate the number of tuna caged.	Rec. 18-02 para 97 Annex 8	Due to very poor visibility in the water, the quality of the video did not allow a clear count and a control transfer was authorised under No. TUN-2019/AUT047 and was carried out on 29/06/2019.
001TN0484	Tunisia	09/08/2019	10/08/2019	During the caging on 09/08, the quality of the video did not allow the observer to estimate the number of tuna caged.	Rec. 18-02 para 97 Annex 8	A control transfer was authorised under No. TUN-2019/AUT063 and was carried out on 17/08/2019.
001TN0484	Tunisia	17/08/2019	19/08/2019	During the control caging carried out on 17/08, the estimates of the amount of fish caged between the observer and the farm operator differed by more than 10%: Observer's estimate: 2023 individuals; Farm estimate: 1498 individuals; Difference: 35%	Rec. 18-02 para 97 Annex 8	Indeed, a difference of more than 10% in the number of individuals was observed. For this reason, a release request, as indicated in Annex 8, was sent to the catching CPC, which provided confirmation and a release authorisation under No. TUN-2019/AUT067, which was carried out on 28/09/2019. A stereoscopic camera release report was sent to the catching CPC after the release so the necessary modification could be made.
001TN0506	Tunisia	24/08/2019	25/08/2019	The caging took place after 22 August. Other cagings are scheduled.	Rec. 18-02, para 95	Operation notified to the Secretariat and the CPC concerned (EU) on 22/08/2019. This delay is mainly due to the following circumstances: - a change in destination of the fish following late agreements between the Tunisian operators and their European counterparts, - essential logistical preparations for Tunisian fattening farms that have not

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						<p>been operational for at least 2 seasons,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the time elapsed in obtaining the agreement of the flag States for caging of some catches, - additional inquiries and control transfers at the request of flag States.
001TR0463 and 001TR0475	Turkey	Continuous	03/04/2019	The Turkish flagged vessel XXX was involved in farm operations. This vessel does not appear to be on the current ICCAT active vessel list. However, this vessel does have an historical record.	Rec. 17-07 / Rec. 18-02, Para 51	<p>Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator following the receipt of this PNC. It was confirmed by the operator that the vessel xxx was being used in the farm YYY for operational purposes and since the vessel have been used in the harvesting operation in previous years the vessel has a historical record in ICCAT active vessel list, however inadvertently the application for inclusion of the vessel to authorized list of ICCAT vessels has not been made. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of the failure. MoAF sent an official letter to all BFT farming operators on 24.04.2019 instructing not to engage in any activity with the auxiliary vessels whose authorization period has not been updated and to update the authorization periods of the auxiliary vessels to be operated in the farms and to ensure VMS (BAGİS) of the vessels shall send signals. It is confirmed that the vessel XXX has not been used in subsequent operations and the operator has applied for inclusion of the vessel in ICCAT authorized vessels list</p>

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						and to update the authorization period on 24.04.2019. MoAF checked all documents and did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities for this farming operation.
001TR0469	Turkey	11/04/2019	14/04/2019	The Turkish flagged vessel XX was involved in farm operations on the 11 April. This vessel does not appear to be on the current ICCAT active vessel list.	Rec. 17-07 / Rec. 18-02, Para 51	Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) initiated an investigation in respect to the PNC reported with an official notification to the concerned operator following the receipt of this PNC. It is confirmed that the questioned vessel XXX was not an operating (auxiliary) vessel but used for the night security purposes within the farm. The operator stated that a harvesting operation was being conducted on 11.04.2019 and the harvested BFTs were being carried to the processing vessel using another vessel. Due to a technical machine failure of that the operator had to use the vessel XXX immediately for a short time. The operator confirmed that following the completion of the technical failure, the operation was carried out by that vessel. The operator has received an official warning to avoid repetition of the failure. MoAF sent an official letter to all BFT farming operators on 24.04.2019 instructing not to engage in any activity with the auxiliary vessels whose authorization period has not been updated and to update the authorization periods of the auxiliary vessels to be operated in the farms and to ensure VMS

<i>Request No.</i>	<i>CPC</i>	<i>Date of event</i>	<i>Date reported</i>	<i>PNC</i>	<i>In potential contravention of</i>	<i>Response</i>
						<p>(BAGIS) of the vessels shall send signals. It is confirmed that the questioned vessel XXX has not been used in any subsequent farming operations. Since the vessel is not an auxiliary vessels there exists no application by the operator for inclusion of the vessel to ICCAT authorized vessels list and to update the authorization period.</p> <p>MoAF checked all documents and did not conclude any serious infringements, suspicious or illegal activities for this farming operation.</p>