

Report of the 18th Meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures (IMM)
(Hybrid / Brussels, Belgium, 17-20 June 2025)

1. Opening of the meeting and meeting arrangements

The Executive Secretary, Mr Camille Jean Pierre Manel welcomed everyone to the 18th Meeting of the Working Group on Integrated Monitoring Measures Working Group (IMM) and introduced the participants.

The Chair, Mr Neil Ansell, thanked the European Commission on behalf of the European Union (EU) for hosting the meeting, greeted the delegations and opened the meeting.

2. Nomination of Rapporteur

In the absence of any nominations, the Chair, with the support of the Secretariat, offered to rapporteur the meeting.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda items and intended working approach and asked delegations if they would like to include any points under any other matters. Japan noted its “Analysis of implementation of shark conservation measures and a proposed way forward” and while it did not necessarily belong in other agenda items, suggested addressing it under “Other matters”. Guatemala proposed initiating a discussion on the characterization of coastal fisheries fleets under “Other matters”. The Chair noted that a more in-depth debate on small-scale fisheries had also been proposed by the Catch Documentation Scheme Working Group (CDS WG). The agenda was subsequently adopted and is attached as **Appendix 1**.

The List of participants is attached as **Appendix 2**.

4. Review of Statistical Document Programmes and Catch Documentation Schemes (SDP/CDSs)

4.1 Consideration of outputs from the Standing Catch Document Working Group (CDS WG) meetings

The Chair summarized the work of the CDS WG noting that two meetings had taken place in 2025. The First Meeting of the Standing Catch Document Scheme Working Group was held online on 5 June 2025 with the participation of TRAGSA which reviewed the status of the eBCD system including pending and completed development items. Concerning a new section on processing, the CDS WG reviewed the proposal from TRAGSA and requested greater flexibility to respect current national processing practices. The other development items were considered operational with no major difficulties noted.

The need to upgrade the eBCD system due to its age was also underlined and TRAGSA and the Secretariat were asked to provide more detailed information and technical options considering the cost-benefit of system upgrades and potential new developments.

It was agreed to follow closely ongoing issues and communicate intersessionally as much as possible, especially on the system upgrade and development of the new processing section and inclusion of traded products from artificially hatched fries.

Finally, the CDS WG acknowledged the importance of the work ahead and the need for close cooperation and experience and lessons learned from the eBCD when discussing potential expansion of CDS in ICCAT. The [Chair’s Report on the First Meeting of the Standing Catch Document Scheme Working Group](#) was made available.

The Chair went on to inform of the Second Meeting of the Standing Catch Document Scheme Working Group which took place the day before the 18th Meeting of the IMM and focused on the broader aspects of potential CDS expansion in ICCAT. He thanked Japan for its “Key decision points on the technical elements of a new Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)” which served as the basis for discussions across 13 key points. The CDS WG discussed the inclusion of bigeye tuna and swordfish with some diverging views on whether to integrate both species together or consecutively. There was broad support for moving forward with these species although some members called for further technical discussions. An electronic catch-based system was prioritized ideally by adapting the existing eBCD system although the development of a new system should not be ruled out at this stage. It was agreed that an independent feasibility/cost study coordinated by the Secretariat would be needed to better inform on the most suitable platform and associated costs. Finally, the coverage of artisanal fisheries was noted acknowledging the related challenges and the need for a broader characterization of these fisheries in ICCAT.

On the point of whether to adapt the current eBCD platform or develop a new one, Morocco noted that, if it were decided to adapt technically the current platform, the experience acquired by TRAGSA with system management rules and functionalities could support further development and adoption of the eBCD system, while if it was decided to develop a new platform, a new tender would be necessary. Therefore, the contribution of IT experts is vital to see how a new IT platform could meet the agreed objectives and to decide whether to adapt the current platform or to launch a call for tenders.

Japan reiterated its concern of moving ahead with swordfish and bigeye simultaneously, particularly when testing a new/adapted eBCD system and underlined its preference to start with one species before moving to another. It suggested preparing a revised document for CPCs to further discuss the matter in the 2025 Annual Meeting. It also emphasized the need for concerned CPCs to submit documents and information on artisanal fisheries to support further discussions including the treatment these fisheries would require in the context of CDS in ICCAT.

The United States noted some concerns on the overall workload and in line with Japan suggested beginning with swordfish. In general, it expressed a willingness to move forward but underscored the need to balance implementation with domestic implications.

Egypt recalled the bluefin tuna farming recommendation adopted in 2024 related to a new eBCD system functionality for BFT products originating from aquaculture and expressed appreciation for the ongoing cooperation to address the issue in the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Responding to questions from the European Union (EU), the Secretariat clarified that it does not have the internal technical capacity to carry out a feasibility study related to the development of a new system or technological adaptation of the eBCD system. The CDS WG subsequently agreed to outsource the study and requested that the Secretariat draft the Terms of Reference and circulate them for CPC comments as soon as possible in order that they may be discussed and adopted by Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation Measures (PWG) and the Commission in November 2025 for publication thereafter.

5. Consideration of measures relating to monitoring and inspection and flag State responsibilities

5.1 Consideration of outputs of the Electronic Monitoring Systems Working Group (EMS WG)

The Chair summarized the work of the EMS WG which met immediately before the 18th Meeting of the IMM. He informed that CPCs (EU, Brazil) had updated the EMS WG on the progress of EMS trials and pilots. The United Kingdom also submitted the “Electronic Monitoring System (EMS) on a Small-Scale UK Longline Vessel - An updated information paper” to the EMS WG on recent trials. There followed a report by the implementing consortium on the pilot programme conducted under the *Resolution by ICCAT establishing a Pilot project to test the use of stereoscopic cameras during first transfer and the automation of video footage analysis* (Res. 22-15) regarding the use of artificial intelligence to automate weight calculations and fish counting where progress was considered extremely positive. Discussions also focused on the minimum standards under the *Recommendation by ICCAT to establish minimum standards and programme requirements for the use of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) in ICCAT fisheries* (Rec. 23-18) including the importance of clarifying the EMS WG mandate in the reviewing of CPC domestic programmes. CPCs were

encouraged to submit their programmes using the agreed templates to facilitate information exchange while distinguishing between mandatory and optional fields. In this regard, a revised version of “Comments from CPCs and revised templates for electronic monitoring systems (EMS), domestic programmes description, and implementation reports” (**Appendix 3**) was agreed by the EMS WG following the contributions received from Japan, the United States and the EU. Further discussion focused on the inclusion of small-scale fisheries and development of minimal standards for these fleet segments and the need for broader debate and categorization of small-scale fisheries within ICCAT.

While noting the importance of EMS, Senegal underlined the added value and complementarity of human observers for recording information on bycatch as well as biological sampling and differentiating similar species e.g. hammerhead sharks.

The IMM underlined the importance of the work of the EMS WG as the implementation of EMS evolves in ICCAT and noted that the frequency and timing of meetings may need to be adapted based on information submitted to ICCAT, in particular CPC domestic programmes.

5.2 Review of points referred from Panel 2

5.2.1 Possible amendments to the eastern bluefin tuna plan (Rec. 24-05)

The EU presented two documents (“Discussion paper on amendments to ICCAT Rec. 24-05 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean” (IMM_14/i2025) and “Proposal for amendments to Recommendation by ICCAT amending Recommendation 22-08 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean (Rec. 24-05) Intersessional Meeting of Panel 2 (Agenda point 7)” (IMM_19/i2025)) and recalled the discussions in Panel 2 in which from the five amendments submitted, two had been approved and three were referred to the IMM.

As regards the second document, Japan expressed concern regarding paragraphs 33 and 36 (minimum size), explaining that changing “or” to “and” may require compliance with two criteria (115 cm and 30 kg) which did not reflect its internal practice of using only weight and requested more time to assess the implications of this change. Following further discussions, new versions of the document were presented by the EU in which the word “either” was added to the first sentence to clarify that the minimum size for bluefin tuna would be “either 30 kg or 115 cm”; followed by a revised version. At the same time, a new version of the first document was presented in which the EU explained that the word “validation” had been replaced with a requirement for a signature except in cases of non-compliance. Japan thanked the EU for the revised version of this document and agreed with the change related to the observer’s signature.

The Chair concluded there was no agreement on the revised version of the second document, although there was consensus on the revised version of the first document which would be referred to Panel 2 for consideration at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

5.2.2 Possible amendments to the western bluefin tuna plan (Rec. 22-10)

The EU presented the “Discussion paper on amendments to Recommendation by ICCAT for a Conservation and Management Plan for Western Atlantic Bluefin Tuna (Rec. 22-10)”, which is a draft recommendation to amend the western Atlantic bluefin tuna conservation and management plan where the goal was to enhance control measures in the fishery drawing on familiar provisions from the eastern plan. It proposed moving forward with a phased implementation starting with the submission of fishing plans, provisions on bycatch, vessel registration, specific fishing activities and basic recording catch requirements such as logbooks.

The United States welcomed the opportunity to review the proposal reaffirming the IMM’s constructive approach while noting its surprise and concern that this matter had been raised again by the EU. The United States went on to question the rationale for increasing control measures given that no specific conservation or management need had been identified and suggested that CPCs operating in this fishery continue to discuss and, where necessary, collaborate on the development of measures. The United States concluded that eastern and western fisheries differ greatly in scale and complexity and hence control measures need not be of the same scale and nature.

Canada largely echoed the United States' concerns while acknowledging that many of the proposed measures were already rigorously controlled in Canada through different mechanisms and hence could be burdensome and counterproductive. Nonetheless, Canada appreciated the EU's effort to propose a broader timeline but felt that the changes would still create difficulties without clear management needs.

Japan agreed with previous delegations and went on to propose that any new measures should be based on agreed needs and not simply a harmonization between East and West control measures without clear justification. Japan suggested further discussions on identified shortcomings in the western fisheries before discussing potential control measures.

Morocco supported the proposal to enhance management and monitoring and control across all ICCAT fisheries although underlined the importance to better understand the shortcomings and specificities of the western fishery. Morocco suggested that CPCs operating in that fishery provide information and arguments to feed into the proposal and advance in a collaborative manner. It noted in general the lack of information and specificities of western BFT fisheries and gave the example of tuna traps referred to asking if western CPCs actually had them and if so, how they controlled them.

The United Kingdom informed that it was open to further harmonization between the stocks but emphasized the importance of considering the differing circumstances of each such as size and quotas. The United Kingdom noted the difficulty in justifying a highly detailed fishing plan for its quota of just 6 t and suggested introducing a threshold below which no fishing plan would be required.

The EU emphasized its intention was not to change how fisheries were managed or operate in the West but to address the lack of information and by applying ICCAT management lessons learned from the East. The EU clarified that it was not pursuing harmonization but rather seeking a clearer, stronger and more transparent Convention-wide ICCAT regulatory framework. It noted that basic elements such as a list of authorized vessels were already standard practices in ICCAT and other Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) and so failed to understand the resistance to such basic management measures. It concluded by regretting that even an initial debate had not taken place on the proposal which could have helped in moving forward collaboratively.

5.3.3 Other items related to flag State responsibility

EMS on processing vessels

The EU was asked to present their two proposals: "A proposal to introduce Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS) to improve control over bluefin tuna processing vessels" and "Draft Recommendation by ICCAT to amend Rec. 23-18 to establish minimum standards for the use of EMS".

The EU recalled that the previous year it had already proposed amending the eastern BFT measure to include EMS to improve control of processing vessels which it considered a critical point in the control chain. It reminded that the proposal offered operators or authorities the choice between deploying a regional observer(s) or using EMS. The cost would be borne by the operator of the processing vessel while the CPC flag would be responsible for data analysis.

Japan stated its view that assigning monitoring responsibility to processing vessels was inappropriate if the aim was to prevent illegal fishing at farms and that compliance responsibility should rest with CPC farm authorities. It also raised several specific concerns including the role of Regional Observer Programmes (ROPs), data analysis and costs and new EMS obligations which it considered went beyond the current measure.

Morocco supported implementing EMS to improve control on processing vessels however raised concerns about how the system would be implemented due to:

- a possible duplication of responsibilities between authorities of the flag CPC of the processing vessels, the ROP and the CPC farm authorities;
- possible new administrative tasks for CPC farm authorities.

The United Kingdom (UK) raised some questions including on the definition of “active fishing” in the context of BFT fishing and if that meant simply being authorised in the required BFT vessel list.

Following further discussions, the EU thanked those CPCs who had contributed and informed that it hoped to continue discussions with concerned CPCs intersessionally to address the points raised with a view of re-tabling the proposal at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Capacity

The EU introduced the “Discussion paper on farming capacity in ICCAT” and explained the context during 2023 when it noted discrepancies between farming capacity and other parameters in CPC Farming Plans. Unlike “input capacity” which is clearly defined in the eastern BFT measure, the use of other parameters raised questions on how ICCAT understands and defines farming capacity. It informed that under its own legislation, farming capacity is aligned with harvest weight although this is not always precise due to transfers between farms and varied across EU Member States. The EU asked how other farming CPCs define farming capacity in their national legislation and whether those definitions align with other parameters such as harvest weight or input capacity. It concluded by saying that its goal of raising this in the IMM was not to create a definition but simply to launch discussions to promote a pragmatic management of farming activities in ICCAT.

Japan supported the value of monitoring farming capacity to prevent overcapacity that could lead to illegal activities. It agreed that there is a lack of clarity and called for a clear and consistent definition across CPC Farming Management Plans.

Türkiye thanked the EU for raising this and for engaging in bilateral discussions in preparation for IMM. It stated that, in its view, input capacity should remain the primary metric for evaluating Farming Plans and it was not convinced of the need for a common definition of farming capacity suggesting it could remain as an alternative control measure. It explained that administrative definitions and procedures vary across CPCs and that lists of farming facilities introduced in 2009 were based on registered input capacities which is how it itself defined farming capacity. It concluded that reaching a common definition may be difficult and proposed that each CPC simply include in its Farming Plans how it interprets and calculates farming capacity.

The EU thanked Japan and Türkiye and reiterated that finding a common definition in ICCAT should remain the goal. It encouraged further discussion and for farming CPCs to contact them bilaterally to share experiences to continue working towards an agreement at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Traplines

The EU presented the “Discussion paper: The use of trap-lines in longline fisheries targeting swordfish in the ICCAT area” reporting on a new type of fishing gear used by longliners in the Mediterranean and Atlantic. It recalled that during both the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS) and 2024 Annual Meetings the use of traplines and their potential effects on target and non-target species was discussed and the SCRS requested CPCs to report the use of this gear in order to analyze CPUEs and other parameters. The EU informed that some Member States were planning projects and EU-Portugal had already initiated a research initiative on trapline bycatch which had been communicated to the Secretariat.

Guatemala acknowledged the importance of technological progress and the development of new fishing gear which in itself did not raise legal issues however given that this gear could affect CPUEs it considered it important that the matter be analyzed by the SCRS and followed by the relevant panels. It supported the EU approach but emphasized that pilot projects should be based on frameworks guided by the SCRS itself.

Japan informed that it had also submitted a document to the Subcommittee on Ecosystems and Bycatch (SC-ECO) and had conducted a survey to better assess the use of traplines by its fleets although noted that information at this time was limited, nonetheless it would continue investigating the use of this gear and consider possible management measures.

Canada supported the EU's initiative highlighting its potential impact on indices like CPUE and the need to codify this gear to ensure reliable stock assessments. Canada looked forward to a formal proposal at the Annual Meeting and expressed a willingness to collaborate.

Morocco reported having no information on the use of such gear and requested further information in order to further investigate its use.

The United States expressed interest in the document and understanding the effects of this new gear on target and non-target catches. Preliminary data suggested an increase in target catches and a decrease in bycatch but requested more detailed information particularly on impacts on shark and tuna bycatch. It also asked whether the SCRS uses gear codes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and whether new gear coding and/or data forms would be needed.

The SCRS Chair, Dr Brown, underlined the importance of increasing knowledge on this gear including its characteristics, usage rates and catch indices. He welcomed CPCs' proactive steps and reaffirmed the SCRS prioritization of this issue. Regarding coding, he confirmed that current codes are based on FAO standards and that the creation of a new code is possible although the Secretariat could assign a provisional code.

The Secretariat complemented that the ICCAT Secretariat would participate in the FAO's Coordinating Working Party (CWP) within a few weeks where a presentation on the subject was being prepared.

The Secretariat confirmed that creating a temporary gear code was not an issue and would be done if recommended by the IMM. It clarified that the process was simple but the code would only be valid once catch data using that gear was submitted hence the issue was the availability of data not the generation of the code itself.

The Chair concluded that beginning to record data was of utmost importance and that having a temporary code in place was agreeable to the IMM. He thanked Dr Brown for his comments and encouraged further discussion in the SCRS and the Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation Measures (PWG) and for CPCs to continue to share information, including on ongoing pilot projects.

Driftnets

The EU presented the "Discussion paper on establishing a ban on driftnets for the capture of certain ICCAT species". It explained that the proposal stems from recent findings of driftnets on vessels operating in the Mediterranean where the current ICCAT framework limited enforcement measures despite the well-known consequences of such gear on large pelagics and the marine environment. The goal of the proposal is to establish a legal framework banning driftnets in the Mediterranean and extend the prohibition to the entire Convention area in line with the 1991 United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215: Large-Scale Pelagic Drift-Net Fishing and Its Impact on the Living Marine Resources of the World's Oceans and Seas (UNGAR 46/215). Key elements of the proposal included a definition of driftnets targeting large pelagics and tunas with a special emphasis on mesh size which is controllable at sea. The proposal sought to prohibit a mesh size ≤ 90 mm with a derogation for small-scale artisanal vessels between 8 and 10 meters in length and a maximum length overall of 2,500 metres. A list of small tuna species would also be included along with a requirement to release or discard non-target species.

Japan expressed difficulty supporting the proposal while acknowledging the importance of controlling driftnets in accordance with the UN moratorium. In its view, the proposal exceeds the scope by suggesting broader bans on the high seas and across the ICCAT Convention area and questioned the scientific basis. It specifically opposed the paragraph prohibiting the possession and storage of such nets on land or onboard vessels by CPC nationals, noting that it exceeds the scope of the UN resolution and would be difficult to implement, a point also raised by Chinese Taipei. In general, it stated that it could not agree to the proposal at this time and would need to study it further and discuss with the EU during the intersessional period.

Morocco referred to UNGAR 46/215 and the [Recommendation by ICCAT relating to Mediterranean swordfish \(Rec. 03-04\)](#) which limits enforcement action due to a lack of clear regulatory provisions for inspectors. It emphasized the absence of a clear definition of driftnets, as well as what constitutes large pelagic species in the ICCAT framework.

The United States acknowledged concerns surrounding large-scale driftnets and appreciated the EU's efforts to define them and enhance management measures in ICCAT. It found it appropriate to define the gear by their physical characteristics rather than their targeted species and requested additional time for internal consultations.

The EU emphasized the existence of scientific literature supporting its proposal, particularly in relation to the Mediterranean. It acknowledged that the provision on the 3-nautical-mile limit exceeded UNGAR 46/215 however evidence showed that limiting driftnets to coastal areas reduced interactions with sensitive species. It committed to discussing more with concerned CPCs and taking up the issue in the 2025 Annual Meeting.

The Chair concluded that there was no consensus on the document at this time and encouraged further discussion.

Discarded gear

The "Draft Recommendation by ICCAT on abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear" was submitted by Canada and Norway. Norway, on behalf of its joint proposal with Canada, recalled the *Recommendation by ICCAT on abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear (Rec. 19-11)* which was ICCAT's first measure on marine pollution prohibiting and mandating the recovery of lost fishing gear. It emphasized growing concerns over marine plastics and ghost fishing noting that no CPC had reported lost or recovered gear using forms CP51 and CP52 since the entry into force of the Recommendation. It proposed strengthening and amending the Recommendation urging ratification of marine pollution instruments. Key changes of the proposal included a new definition of fishing gear, inclusion of longliners, mandatory reporting of lost gear material, a requirement to maintain a lost gear register and the obligation to report lost gear in the CPC annual reports.

The EU welcomed the proposal and considered it comprehensive. As a signatory to International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 as modified by the Protocol of 1978 (MARPOL 73/78), it informed that it had no issue with the fishing gear definition but expressed concern on the scope, noting the measure would not cover gear intentionally deployed for later retrieval such as fish aggregating devices (FADs) and suggested a modification to this paragraph. It also requested clarity on whether the proposed register was specific to abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear (ALDFG) and applicable to all vessels.

Japan stressed the importance of coherence with current international regulations especially MARPOL 73/78 and expressed caution regarding potential discrepancies. It recalled that longliners were excluded from *Recommendation 19-11* due to their low ghost fishing potential and should remain excluded from the current proposal. If FADs were to be included, it felt this should be optional. It also questioned whether the reporting requirement would effectively improve the situation given the practical difficulties associated with recovery and requested clarification on the type of inspections referred to.

Guatemala supported efforts in ICCAT to reduce marine pollution and fishing mortality of non-target species. It agreed with the EU that the proposal overlooks existing efforts like biodegradable FADs and hence could negatively affect the use of this legitimate fishing gear. It also raised concerns on the practicality and usefulness of the updated register and suggested a template.

Morocco thanked the EU and enquired about the format of the registry and what information should be included and to which vessel types it applies particularly artisanal and small-scale vessels.

The United States thanked the proponents and noted that redefining fishing gear to align with MARPOL could shift the focus away from the risk-based approach of *Recommendation 19-11*. It requested further information on the strategy behind this change and whether thresholds for reporting requirements had been considered. It referred to discussions of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) on thresholds and emphasized alignment with other instruments.

Canada presented a revised version of the document, noting that the proposal had been slightly modified in response to some of the comments received. It clarified that there was no specific register in mind only a log that allows inspectors to verify the information. It stressed that the intention was not to penalize the use of

FADs but seek accountability for unretrieved ones and is happy to further work with CPCs to find acceptable language. It confirmed to Morocco that the register would apply to vessels referred to in paragraph 4. To the United States, it confirmed that the widening of the definition aims to address marine pollution and species entanglement which it considered consistent with MARPOL. Several CPCs gave thanks to the proponents but requested further time to review the proposal more thoroughly.

Norway concluded by noting that the previous week the United Nations Ocean Conference had adopted the Ocean Plan which officially encouraged the FAO and relevant international organizations to address the issue of discarded and lost fishing gear and its impacts on marine habitats. While not advocating major changes, it believed the small amendments in the draft proposal would reinforce ICCAT's commitment to the issue. Norway and Canada thanked all those CPCs who had made constructive comments and looked forward to further discussions on this matter at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

6. Observer Programmes

There were no points raised by the IMM on this agenda item.

7. At-sea and in-port transshipment requirements

There were no points raised by the IMM on this agenda item.

8. Rules for chartering and other fishing arrangements

Chartering

The United States presented the "Draft Recommendation by ICCAT on vessel chartering and access agreements" in which it proposed merging and combining two ICCAT recommendations with the objective to clarify elements and differentiate reporting obligations. Key changes included distinguishing catches under charter agreements up to the first landing, updating charter and landing practices in ports, the requirement for charter notifications before fishing begins and including IMO numbers and intended landing ports. For access agreements it was proposed to include new provisions on ICCAT vessel numbering, information reporting and historical data availability.

The EU expressed reservations about merging the two measures noting that the two instruments had different legal natures, scopes and procedures and hence feared combining them may cause more confusion than clarity.

Japan requested that the phrase "other than bareboat" be retained in the proposal. It explained that in bareboat chartering the flag is transferred to the chartering CPC which becomes the flag State thereby clarifying management responsibility and distinguishing it from regular chartering. It also raised concerns about the difficulty of distinguishing chartered catches from previous catches where reporting would create an excessive burden on fishers. On the registry of ports, it voiced concerns since Japanese vessels did not always land in ports in the ICCAT Convention area. Maintaining a list of vessels chartered for special agreements it considered a novel idea however it felt more time was needed to examine this to assess whether the administrative burden on the Secretariat was justified.

Guatemala, while appreciating the update and improvements, also questioned the benefit in merging the measures. It noted caution and reminded that ICCAT's mandate was to manage fisheries and not maritime law. It voiced support for a registry for chartering arrangements as currently maintained by the Secretariat but not for bareboat charters which would rest with the relevant CPC in accordance with current measures and international law.

The United Kingdom found the idea of combining both topics interesting and noted its access agreement with the EU on northern albacore. It asked whether the new vessel registry in the document would be incorporated into the ICCAT Integrated Online Management System (IOMS) to avoid duplication and questioned the deadline changes for the reporting of access activities (from 15 September to 31 July).

Panama thanked the United States and acknowledged the efforts to update the measures and harmonize the ICCAT regulatory framework. It stressed the importance of reviewing and updating these measures and ensuring efficient implementation. The Chair referenced the “Consultation from Panama as regards the different types of vessel charters described in ICCAT Recommendation 13-14, in particular ‘bareboat chartering’” as highly relevant to the discussion and asked Panama to present it immediately after this discussion.

Chinese Taipei thanked the United States and indicated it had clarification questions on paragraph 26 which it would review internally and follow-up bilaterally if needed.

The United States noted that it was open to reverting to the original wording of the *Recommendation by ICCAT on vessel chartering (Rec. 13-14)* by adding “other than bareboat”. On the merging of the two measures the United States explained that it was responding to previous requests for clarification on how to report and notify catches under both chartering and access agreements to give further clarity. It concluded by thanking CPCs and that it remained open to further debate on whether this was the best solution and expressed willingness to hold bilateral discussions with concerned CPCs to address its concerns intersessionally. A revised version was produced, but the Chair noted there was no consensus and encouraged further discussions.

Panama introduced the “Consultation from Panama as regards the different types of vessel charters described in ICCAT Recommendation 13-14, in particular “bareboat chartering” posing questions on the scope of bareboat chartering under *Recommendation 13-14*. Due to a difference in interpretation by the Secretariat, it had submitted the specific questions to the IMM to achieve legal certainty in full transparency seeking confirmation that this activity would fall under other international legal frameworks or whether the current measure could benefit from being clearer.

Japan confirmed that *Recommendation 13-14* did not cover bareboat chartering as it involves a temporary flag change to the chartering CPC which then assumes all responsibilities as flag State. As the chartering CPC is responsible for its vessels, it must follow all ICCAT Recommendations hence, in its view, there is no need for a specific measure or further clarification in the context of the current measure.

Guatemala agreed that there was a significant difference between bareboat chartering and chartering without a flag change under *Recommendation 13-14* and confirmed that ICCAT does not prohibit bareboat chartering.

Following further discussions, it was agreed that further discussions would continue upon further reflection of the United States proposal in the Annual Meeting following further bilateral discussions.

9. Vessel sightings and inspection programmes

The Chair asked Canada to introduce its proposal “Draft Resolution by ICCAT establishing an Ad Hoc Working Group on a High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme”. Canada recalled that since 2021 it had proposed establishing a High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme (HSBI) and that ICCAT was close to consensus in 2022. It emphasized that HSBI schemes were vital tools for addressing illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and that any future ICCAT HSBI scheme must be inclusive, participatory and cooperative. In this line, it proposed an ICCAT working group to continue to discuss and resolve any outstanding issues, enabling the Commission to adopt a scheme.

As a general rule in ICCAT, the EU informed that it did not support creating new working groups due to the time, energy and resource burden placed on CPCs and the Secretariat. Nonetheless, it agreed with the need to continue discussions and suggested that these take place in IMM and that these should be based on the already well-established “Draft Resolution by ICCAT establishing an Ad Hoc Working Group on a High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme”. It thanked Canada and expressed its willingness to further collaborate and contribute to the proposal in the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Guatemala informed that it saw HSBI as useful and important but expressed concern that it might not create an ICCAT system but rather allow certain nations authority to undertake activities without a Commission approved standard. It stressed the importance of defining key elements and standards and recalled previous

meetings such as the ICCAT Seminar on High Seas Boarding & Inspection Schemes held from 13 to 14 September 2023, in Vigo (Spain), where a lack of recognition of the need to address these standards had hindered progress. It voiced no strong preference for how the discussions proceeded either in a working group or the IMM but insisted on specific and focused work to develop a fully inclusive scheme to which it informed it was happy to contribute to.

Japan broadly supported Canada's proposal but shared concerns about the proliferation of working groups and the associated budgetary implications especially interpretation services. Regarding the text, it felt that some aspects were too technical and, to facilitate participation, requested that any meetings would be held back-to-back to the IMM meeting.

Morocco supported the creation of a working group but suggested integrating it with another working group such as the Port Inspection Expert Group (PIEG). Regarding the proposed text, Morocco suggested adding other important elements, in particular, the need for accreditation and inspector training, as well as contact points for official sharing of evidence and communication.

The United Kingdom supported Canada's proposal for a working group due to its importance to move forward on HSBI but shared the EU's concern on additional working groups and meetings and preferred having the discussions in IMM.

Brazil supported creating a dedicated working group but stressed the disparity in enforcement capacities between developing CPCs as a core challenge. It offered to contribute to the discussion in line with international and national frameworks including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

Uruguay supported creating this group despite the extra workload as the best way to tackle the topic and reach consensus on HSBI.

The United States supported efforts to establish a Convention wide HSBI noting it was essential to combat IUU fishing. It believed a working group would advance discussions and help reach consensus while acknowledging the concerns of establishing a new group.

Senegal welcomed Canada's proposal, stating it was essential in the fight against IUU and expressed support. Canada thanked the CPCs for their comments which reflected a shared willingness to advance the development of HSBI in ICCAT. It proposed dedicating a four-day IMM session in 2026 to HSBI ensuring interpretation and broad CPC participation. Canada committed to submitting a roadmap document at the Annual Meeting to guide further discussions.

The Chair concluded that while there was no consensus on the "Draft Resolution by ICCAT establishing an Ad Hoc Working Group on a High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme" at this time, he encouraged discussions to continue intersessionally and at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Pew Charitable Trusts (PEW) gave its broad support for the advancement of HSBI in ICCAT and shared an information note with examples of other RFMO HSBI programmes and how they could be applied within ICCAT.

Follow-up on Potential Non-Compliance (PNC)

The EU presented the "Follow up of possible infringements detected under the Joint International Inspection Scheme (JIS) for bluefin tuna and swordfish", which sought to present a follow-up of possible infringements detected in joint inspection scheme in the Mediterranean as submitted during the 2024 Compliance Committee meetings. It informed that inspections undertaken in the scheme took substantial human and financial resources and there was a need for a proper follow-up to ensure effectiveness and lack of follow-up sent a message of impunity to non-compliant operators. To ensure effective and transparent follow-up, the EU proposed that the Secretariat prepare and publish a table on the ICCAT website whenever a possible infringement was reported accompanied by an annex listing all cases until the infringement was confirmed or closed.

Japan acknowledged the need to clarify follow-up actions but considered it excessive to publish possible infringements on the ICCAT website before their validity was confirmed. It noted that inclusion in the ICCAT IUU list was already covered in Annex 7 of *Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 22-08 establishing a Multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean (Rec. 24-05)*. It also questioned who would determine what constituted a possible infringement since the proposal only stated that the ICCAT Secretariat would publish upon receipt of the report.

Morocco agreed that an infringement should be legally confirmed by CPC authorities before being officially recognized or published on the ICCAT website and supported limiting the published table only to proven non-compliance cases to avoid possible unfair actions on the operator concerned or any consequences likely to be caused by publication of an unsubstantiated infringement. It also indicated that the actions proposed in point iii must be incorporated into *Rec. 24-05 (BFT)* and *Recommendation by ICCAT replacing the Recommendation 13-04 and establishing a multi-annual recovery plan for Mediterranean swordfish (Rec. 16-05) (SWO)*, because the current provisions on JIS programmes in these Recommendations do not require the flag CPC to respond to the inspection CPC, or to submit a report to the Secretariat.

Following further discussions and questions from some CPCs, the EU informed that it would follow-up with concerned CPCs intersessionally and hoped to present a new version of the document to the Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation Measures (PWG) at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

10. Port Inspection Schemes and port State measures

10.1 Review of Recommendation by ICCAT amending Recommendation 18-09 on port State measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (Rec. 23-17)

The United Kingdom presented the “Draft Recommendation by ICCAT replacing Recommendation 23-17 amending Recommendation 18-09 on port State measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing”, for better alignment with the 2009 FAO Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA). It underlined that these measures represented a key defense against IUU fishing in the ICCAT Convention area. It expressed appreciation for the positive responses received and introduced the changes which included coordination between control authorities, a strengthening of cooperation and information exchange including by electronic means, appropriate training for inspectors and measures to enhance transparency and provide a recourse mechanism for masters denied port entry.

Guatemala underlined the importance of the FAO PSMA, noting that some countries are still in the process of ratification. It considered it balanced that the preamble only mentions the agreement without implying adoption of its content which facilitates the situation for Guatemala, however it expressed concern about the practicality for the vessel’s representative to present the entry authorization to the same State that granted it. It also requested a reference or access to ICCAT’s inspector training manuals and clarification regarding potential conflicts with Annex B of the FAO agreement and some other editorial suggestions for clarity.

Japan requested clarification on several paragraphs such as the electronic communication mechanism being referred to in para 7. It, as a PSMA member, also expressed its willingness to support the additions if they were aligned with FAO PSMA provisions.

Canada supported the United Kingdom’s proposal to align ICCAT measures, noting it had submitted written comments on the United Kingdom’s first revision.

Morocco appreciated the proposal and the need to align it with PSMA and suggested standardizing the use of “prior request” instead of “prior notification” throughout the text. On electronic exchanges, it pointed out that the PSMA requires inspection reports to be sent to the flag State and the FAO Secretariat even if no infringement had occurred. This was different to the current ICCAT practice and hence proposed harmonization and for this to be considered in the new proposal. It also recommended discussing how ICCAT could be linked electronically with the FAO’s Global Information Exchange System (GIES) to facilitate work and avoid duplication in reporting by CPCs that are Parties to the PSMA and burden to these CPCs.

The United States supported adjusting the Recommendation to align with the PSMA and had already shared drafting suggestions with the United Kingdom. It echoed Japan's concerns about the text's structure and proposed consistency in the terminology used.

The EU welcomed the focus on coordination, training, and information exchange, and supported alignment with the PSMA.

Following some further discussions a new version was made available: "Draft Recommendation by ICCAT amending Recommendation 23-17 on port State measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing", which sought to address many of the points made by CPCs. The United Kingdom acknowledged that due to the time constraints for submitting the revised version not all comments could be addressed particularly on the harmonization of terminology but remained open to continued dialogue.

The Secretariat noted that interoperability between GIES and the IOMS system could be explored and that while this would facilitate work for the Secretariat and CPCs, it was not currently considered a priority in the workplan of the Online Reporting Technology Working Group (WG-ORT).

Following further discussions, the IMM acknowledged that it was not only an issue of system interoperability but that on the broader issue of data reporting, there was the need to avoid duplication in reporting to ICCAT and to FAO through GIES. It was agreed that the Secretariat would reach out to the FAO about the state of play of GIES and possible application in the ICCAT context and report back to the PWG at the Annual Meeting.

The United Kingdom thanked everyone for their contributions and interest and would continue liaising with CPCs intersessionally. Given the work was considered ongoing, the Chair clarified that there was no consensus at this time on the revised version of the draft Recommendation but nonetheless encouraged further discussions between CPCs with a view to further discussion in the PWG in the 2025 Annual Meeting.

10.2 Discussion relating to Port Inspection Expert Group (PIEG)

The ICCAT Secretariat presented the "Report on the mission of ICCAT Port inspection needs assessment and training missions in Walvis Bay, Namibia" concerning an update of the recent port inspection training mission in Namibia and related activities. It was noted that no meeting of the Port Inspection Expert Group (PIEG) had been held to date in 2025.

The ICCAT Secretariat informed that an initial visit to Namibia to identify gaps took place in December 2024 followed by a training session in March 2025 for about 30 national inspectors. The course was well received and considered beneficial by the participants.

It was noted that both Côte d'Ivoire and Nigeria (Category A), Namibia (Category B) had so far received this type of support and Senegal would be the next Category B country to benefit. It was also reported that other countries had requested assistance, these included Guinea (Rep.), São Tomé e Príncipe, Mauritania and St Vincent and the Grenadines. The Secretariat reminded CPCs of the availability of self-assessment questionnaires and encouraged their submission to the ICCAT Secretariat to help update capacity-building priorities. The ICCAT Secretariat urged all CPCs to review the available resources including the inspector training manuals which had now been completed and were available on the ICCAT website.

The EU thanked the Secretariat and recalled that the PIEG had been established in 2017 to support the implementation of the *Recommendation by ICCAT on port State measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (Rec. 18-09)*, which has been replaced by the *Recommendation by ICCAT amending Recommendation 18-09 on port State measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (Rec. 23-17)*. It noted that the PIEG had not met that year and had no upcoming meetings planned possibly due to a lack of pressing issues. It explained that it aimed to reduce the number of ICCAT working groups due to the costs and time demands placed on experts and suggested that this expert group be gradually phased out. Any update of further training activities and issues could be reported and considered by the IMM and the Compliance Committee.

The United States acknowledged that ICCAT working groups required time, effort and funding but stressed that this particular group had met occasionally and had contributed to capacity building activities which assisted in the implementation of [Rec. 18-09](#), which has been replaced by [Rec. 23-17](#). It emphasized the value of the experts sharing their knowledge which had helped plan needs assessment and training missions and considered it premature to consider phasing out the group. It suggested that the group could simply refrain from meeting in a given year if no urgent topics arose thus avoiding meeting costs.

Canada acknowledged the EU and the burden of many working groups, however agreed with the points made by the United States. It provided its feedback from the recent mission in Namibia which it considered valuable. It stressed the importance of such activities and that there is work to be done, including review of newly submitted self-assessment forms.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat and suggested that the recent and potential future training activities would be reported to the PWG and issues relevant and useful to the PIEG be referred to the PWG at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

11. Vessel listing requirements

There were no points raised by the IMM on this agenda item.

12. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) requirements

There were no points raised by CPCs under this agenda item.

Global Fishing Watch (GFW) presented an “Observer paper on considerations for introducing Automatic Identification System in a Recommendation” which detailed the potential use of AIS as a complement to the VMS monitoring in ICCAT. It highlighted the value of open-source automatic identification system (AIS) data for maritime safety, fisheries management, transparency and in the fight against IUU fishing. It proposed that discussions on a Recommendation regarding AIS be taken up by the PWG at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

The EU thanked Global Fishing Watch for the document and noted aspects of its proposal as very interesting. It recalled that the EU already mandates AIS on vessels for control purposes and appreciated that the document highlighted its added value and best practices from other RFMOs. The EU expressed its support for including such provisions in ICCAT and looked forward to discussing such a proposal at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

Guatemala reserved the right to examine the proposal, expressing concern on the difference in precision between AIS and VMS systems. It anticipated difficulties in using both systems simultaneously to prove violations beyond reasonable doubt as discrepancies between the two systems could undermine legal cases. It requested that if such a measure is presented to the PWG that it be accompanied by a technical comparative analysis of the systems precision and relative advantages. While acknowledging the value of AIS, it remained skeptical about its suitability as a substitute or complement to VMS until more certainty about its reliability is available.

Japan acknowledged the importance of monitoring fishing activities however it informed that it had difficulty supporting the mandatory public disclosure of vessel position information which it regarded as highly sensitive and commercially confidential. It urged caution with such an approach and noted that AIS was originally designed for safety purposes and mandating its use for compliance could discourage application by operators.

Brazil highlighted its commitment to transparency and noted that both AIS and VMS data are already publicly available in Brazil. It considered the points raised in the document to be important and supported further evaluation of the use of AIS for compliance purposes in ICCAT.

Senegal supported the approach and shared a practical example of AIS usefulness recalling an inspection case where the absence of AIS data prevented the identification of a vessel, delaying decision-making.

Panama appreciated the push for technological tools to improve traceability and transparency, acknowledging that CPC capacities vary. It reported that AIS is already included in national regulations for Panama's international fleet and that it is useful as a complementary tool for both compliance and safety. It supported the idea of gradually exploring such technologies and adapting ICCAT's framework.

The United States welcomed efforts to enhance the VMS using new technology recognizing the increasing demand for AIS in maritime safety and as a tool for analyzing fishing activity however it highlighted technical limitations. In general, it acknowledged the utility of AIS in investigations and as a supplementary enforcement tool but emphasized its limitations and potential challenges as a control tool in the way suggested.

The Chair concluded the discussion and thanked GFW for their paper.

13. Other matters

The Chair asked Japan to present its "Analysis of implementation of shark conservation measures and a proposed way forward". Japan pointed out that, as expressed during the last year's Commission, prohibition of "storing, selling, or offering for sale of shark" should be excluded from the shark Recommendations since such prohibition for all nationals was deemed unfeasible. According to its review of how CPCs implement these bans on their nationals, some CPCs apply them only to fishers not to all nationals, and it concluded that not only Japan but also other CPCs face challenges in implementing a blanket prohibition. Based on the review, it also proposed a paragraph which will be included in the integrated shark Recommendation, such as "[Draft Recommendation by ICCAT on the conservation and management of sharks caught in association with ICCAT fisheries](#)" (PA4_805B/2024) so that CPCs do not have to prohibit all the nationals from storing, selling or offering for sale the sharks while ensuring prohibition of retention and other activities of these species by their fishing vessels. It concluded that prohibiting such actions aboard vessels would suffice and announced its intention to submit a formal proposal of consolidated shark Recommendation at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

The EU explained that the goal of its 2024 consolidation proposal ([PA4_805B/2024](#)) was to clarify ICCAT's explanations and requirements and not to expand them. It noted that while ICCAT provisions are not directly transposed into EU national law they are automatically binding through foundational treaties. Moreover, these obligations are covered under other EU regulations such as those on wildlife protection and fisheries resource conservation which establish enforcement and sanction mechanisms. EU Member States also apply national bans on shark sales and trade and inspections are carried out onboard, during landings and by customs authorities. At least from its perspective, it disagreed with Japan's conclusion that few CPCs implement the ban. The EU gave its appreciation to Japan's proposed wording and would consider it when drafting a proposal for the 2025 Annual Meeting and reserved its position until then.

Morocco thanked Japan and first requested a correction to the reference to Morocco in the document which indicated that sales are prohibited "under the condition of fishing permits that only apply to fishers." It clarified that when a species is banned, the prohibition applies across all supply chains under strict national legislation which regulates and sanctions retaining onboard, transshipment, landing, storage, sale and offering for sale.

Norway thanked the EU and the Secretariat for the meeting and Japan for its comprehensive analysis. Norway supported the EU's previous year's consolidation efforts and noted that Norway implements all obligations of international instruments such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). It would further study Japan's proposal before adopting a formal position at the 2025 Annual Meeting.

The United States agreed with Japan on the importance of focusing on CPC vessels up to the point of first landing when implementing shark measures, however it expressed concern over how broader provisions might impact shark markets, citing legal cases in the United States involving vessels receiving catches from vessels subject to such bans. It called for further studies to assess how focusing only on the vessel may avoid market loopholes. It concluded by noting that current ICCAT measures already provide important conservation and management tools and that the underlying issue may be poor implementation rather than poor regulation. Finally, it took note of Japan's intention to present a proposal at the 2025 Annual Meeting and welcomed further discussions.

Guatemala expressed openness to considering the text and suggested potential refinements. Regarding the appendix, it clarified that under Guatemalan legislation through its participation in RFMOs, ICCAT provisions are automatically enforceable on their nationals and fisheries despite the indication in the note of “no information” for them on legislation prohibiting shark storage and sale.

Panama in reference to its listing in the appendix also aligned with previous interventions and emphasized that its national regulations enforce all RFMO management measures including shark-related measures.

The United Kingdom supported the view that ICCAT measures should not be watered down or diminished in terms of compliance. It noted ongoing internal consultations on Japan’s suggestions, citing the complexity of its own legislation which includes shark protection frameworks and fisheries regulations complemented by trade laws and border controls. It concluded by endorsing the precautionary approach and the pursuit of practical solutions for implementation and monitoring of ICCAT measures and welcomed further discussions.

Japan appreciated all comments and emphasized that the aim of this reflection was not to point out non-compliance but to highlight shared implementation difficulties. Acknowledging the complexity of CPC legal frameworks, Japan requested all CPCs to clarify their implementation status using the shark check sheet. It reiterated its intention of preparing a draft recommendation and looked forward to continuing the discussion at the 2025 Commission meeting.

14. Adoption of Report and closure

The Chair informed that the Report would be drafted and circulated for adoption by correspondence. He thanked everyone for their contributions, the work of the interpreters, the support of the Secretariat and adjourned the meeting.

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting and meeting arrangements
2. Nomination of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of agenda
4. Review of Statistical Document Programmes and Catch Documentation Schemes (SDP/CDSs):
 - 4.1 Consideration of outputs from the Standing Catch Document Scheme Working Group (CDS WG) meetings
5. Consideration of measures relating to monitoring and inspection and flag State responsibilities:
 - 5.1 Consideration of outputs of the Electronic Monitoring Systems Working Group (EMS WG)
 - 5.2 Review of points referred from Panel 2:
 - 5.2.1 Possible amendments to the eastern bluefin tuna plan ([Rec. 24-05](#))
 - 5.2.2 Possible amendments to the western bluefin tuna plan ([Rec. 22-10](#))
6. Observer programmes
7. At-sea and in-port transshipment requirements
8. Rules for chartering and other fishing arrangements
9. Vessel sighting and inspection programmes
10. Port inspection schemes and port State measures
 - 10.1 Review of [Rec. 23-17](#)
 - 10.2 Discussions relating to Port Inspection Expert Group (PIEG)
11. Vessel listing requirements
12. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) requirements
13. Other matters
14. Adoption of report and closure

List of participants^{*1}

CONTRACTING PARTIES

ALGERIA

Melikechi, Hamza

16000

Tel: +213 661 898 447, E-Mail: melikechiamza2@gmail.com

Tamourt, Amira ¹

Ministère de la Pêche et des Ressources Halieutiques, 16100 Alger

BRAZIL

da Costa Doria, Carollina Rodrigues *

Setor de Indústrias Gráficas (SIG), Quadra 02, Ed. Soheste, Lotes 530 a 560, 70610-420 Distrito Federal, Brasília

Tel: +55 61 3276 4439, E-Mail: carolina.doria@mpa.gov.br; sermop@mpa.gov.br

Souza Lira, Alex

Registering, Monitoring and Research Secretariat, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Setor de Autarquias Sul Q. 2, 70043-900 Brasília, DF

Tel: +55 819 855 15243, E-Mail: alex.lira@mpa.gov.br

Azeredo, Alexandre

Marinha do Brasil - Estado-Maior da Armada, Esplanada dos Ministérios - Bloco "N" - 5º andar, 70055-900 Brasília

Tel: +55 21 98330 5365, E-Mail: fonseca.azeredo@marinha.mil.br

Bispo Oliveira, André Luiz ¹

International Negotiations Coordinator, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture, International Advisory, 70297-400 Brasília DF

CANADA

Browne, Dion

Senior Compliance Officer, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 80 East White Hills Road, St. John's, NL A1C5X1

Tel: +1 709 685 1531, E-Mail: dion.browne@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Cossette, Frédéric

Policy Advisor, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Tel: +1 343 541 6921, E-Mail: frederic.cossette@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Couture, John ¹

Oceans North, Sydney NS B1P 6P3

COSTA RICA

Pacheco Chaves, Bernald *

Instituto Costarricense de Pesca y Acuicultura, INCOPECA, Departamento de Investigación, Cantón de Montes de Oro, Puntarenas, 333-5400

Tel: +506 899 22693, E-Mail: bpacheco@incopesca.go.cr; bernald.pacheco@gmail.com

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Djou, Kouadio Julien

Statisticien de la Direction de Pêches, Chef de Service Etudes, Statistiques et Documentation, Direction des Pêches (DP), ministère des Ressources Animales et halieutiques (MIRAH), 27 Rue des pêcheurs, BP V19, Abidjan 01

Tel: +225 79 15 96 22, Fax: +225 21 25 67 27, E-Mail: djoujulien225@gmail.com; ko.djou@ressourcesanimales.gouv.ci

EGYPT

Abdou Mahmoud Tawfeek Hammam, Doaa

Lakes and Fish Resources Protection and Development Agency, 210, area B - City, 5th District Road 90, 11311 New Cairo

Tel: +201 117 507 513, Fax: +202 281 17007, E-Mail: gafrd_EG@hotmail.com

* Head Delegate.

¹ Some delegate contact details have not been included following their request for data protection.

EUROPEAN UNION

Howard, Séamus

European Commission, DG MARE, Rue Joseph II 99, 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 229 50083; +32 488 258 038, E-Mail: seamus.howard@ec.europa.eu

Marot, Laura

European Commission, DG MARE B2, 99 Rue Joseph II, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 229 82243, E-Mail: laura.marot@ec.europa.eu

Miranda, Fernando

Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries - DG MARE, Fisheries Control and Inspections, Rue Joseph II St, 99 01/090, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +322 299 3922, E-Mail: fernando.miranda@ec.europa.eu

Galetti, Fabio

DG-MARE_European Commission, Belgium
Tel: +32 229 52259, E-Mail: fabio.galetti@ec.europa.eu

Ciubotaru, Doina

European Commission, Belgium
E-Mail: Doina.CIUBOTARU@ec.europa.eu

Khalil, Samira

European Commission, DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Unit B-1 "International Affairs, Law of the Sea and RFOs", Joseph II - 99 3/74, 1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 298 03 39; +32 229 11111, E-Mail: samira.khalil@ec.europa.eu

Magnolo, Lorenzo Giovanni

Permanent Representation of Italy to the EU, MASAF - DG PESCA, 00187 Rome
Tel: +32 222 00597, E-Mail: l.magnolo@esteri.it; l.magnolo@masaf.gov.it; l.magnolo@esteri.it

Pintilie, Denisa

European Commission, Belgium
Tel: +32 497 397 525, E-Mail: denisa.pintilie@ec.europa.eu

Ansell, Neil ¹

European Fisheries Control Agency, 36201 Vigo, Spain

Avignon, Frédérique

Direction générale des affaires maritimes, de la pêche et de l'aquaculture, 1 place Carpeaux, 92800 Île de France, France
Tel: +33 660 883 604, E-Mail: frederique.avignon@mer.gouv.fr

Bošnjak, Marija

Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries, Service for aquaculture, Office Split, Trg hrvatske bratske zajednice 8, 21000, Croatia
Tel: +385 21 444 062, Fax: +385 21 444 027, E-Mail: marija.bosnjak@mps.hr

Bouts, Leon

EFCA, Avenida García Barbón 4, 36201 Vigo, Spain
Tel: +34 664 656 563, E-Mail: leon.bouts@efca.europa.eu

Camilleri, Aldo

Aquaculture Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Triq il-Qajjenza, BBG 1287 Marsaxlokk, Malta
Tel: +356 229 26918, E-Mail: aldo.a.camilleri@gov.mt

Conte, Fabio

Dipartimento delle Politiche Europee e Internazionali, Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste - Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione Generale della Pesca Marittima e dell'Acquacoltura - PEMAC III, Via XX Settembre, 20, 00187 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 4665 2838, Fax: +39 06 4665 2899, E-Mail: f.conte@masaf.gov.it

Cormio, Carlo

Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione generale della pesca marittima e dell'acquacoltura, Via XX Settembre n. 20, 00187 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 348 886 6702, E-Mail: c.cormio@masaf.gov.it

Crespin, Rosalie

ORTHONGEL, 134 avenue Malakoff, 75116 Paris, France
Tel: +33 172 711 814, E-Mail: rcrespin@orthongel.fr

Di Natale, Antonio

Director, Aquastudio Research Institute, Via Trapani 6, 98121 Messina, Italy
Tel: +39 336 333 366, E-Mail: adinatale@costaeditainment.com; adinatale@acquariodigenova.it

Gatt, Mark¹

Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Food and Animal Rights Fort San Lucjan, Triq il-Qajjenza, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Malta Aquaculture Research Centre, QRM 3303 Qormi, Malta

Herrador Benito, Ruth

Jefa de Servicio BFT y Mediterráneo, Secretaría General de Pesca, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación de España, Subdirección General de Control e Inspección y Lucha contra la Pesca Ilegal, C/ Velázquez 147, 28002 Madrid, Spain

Tel: +34 913 476 150; +34 648 768 905, E-Mail: rherrador@mapa.es; ruth.herrador@correo.gob.es

Lanza, Alfredo

Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste - Dipartimento delle politiche competitive, della qualità agroalimentare, della pesca e dell'ippica, Direzione Generali della Pesca Maritima e dell'acquacoltura - PEMAC VI, Via XX Settembre, 20, 00187 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 331 464 1576; +39 646 652 843, E-Mail: a.lanza@masaf.gov.it

Lopes, Vera

DGRM, Av. Brasilia, 1449-030 Lisbon, Portugal

Tel: +351 962 103 780, E-Mail: vlopes@dgrm.pt

Monteiro, Inês

Higher Technician, DGRM, Portugal

Tel: +351 916 664 949, E-Mail: imonteiro@dgrm.pt

Orozco, Lucie¹

Chargée de mission affaires thonières, Direction générale de affaires maritimes, de la pêche et de l'aquaculture (DGAMPA), Bureau des Affaires Européennes et Internationales (BAEI), 92055 La Défense, Île de France, France

Seguna, Marvin

Chief Fisheries Protection Officer, Ministry for Agriculture, Food and Animal Rights, Fort San Lucjan, Triq il-Qajjenza, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Ghammieri Ingiered Road, MRS 3303 Marsa, Malta

Tel: +356 229 26918; +356 797 09426, E-Mail: marvin.seguna@gov.mt

Thasitis, Ioannis

Fisheries and Marine Research Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment, Department of Fisheries and Marine Research, 101 Vithleem Street, 1416 Nicosia, Cyprus

Tel: +35722807840, Fax: +35722 775 955, E-Mail: ithasitis@dfmr.moa.gov.cy; ithasitis@dfmr.moa.gov.cy

GHANA

Dovlo, Emmanuel Kwame

Director, Fisheries Scientific Survey Division, Fisheries Commission, P.O. Box GP 630, Accra, Tema

Tel: +233 243 368 091, E-Mail: emmanuel.dovlo@fishcom.gov.gh

GUATEMALA

Chavarría Valverde, Bernal Alberto

Asesor en Gestión y Política pesquera Internacional, DIPESCA, Bárcena

Tel: +506 882 24709, Fax: +506 2232 4651, E-Mail: bchavarria@lsg-cr.com

JAPAN

Fukugama, Chika

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907

Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: chika_fukugama740@maff.go.jp

Iioka, Mako

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8204, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: mako_iioka540@maff.go.jp

Kawano, Masataka

Technical Official, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: masataka_kawano320@maff.go.jp

Kawashima, Tetsuya

Counsellor, Resources Management Department, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8460, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: tetsuya_kawashima610@maff.go.jp

Miyahira, Masayoshi

Official, Agricultural and Marine Products Office, Trade Control Department, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8901
Tel: +81 3 3501 0532, E-Mail: miyahira-masayoshi@meti.go.jp

Miyazaki, Satoshi

Assistant Director, Agricultural and Marine Products Office, Trade Control Department, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8901
Tel: +81 335 010 532, Fax: +81 335 016 006, E-Mail: miyazaki-satoshi@meti.go.jp

Tominaga, Haruo

Director, International Fisheries Coordination, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3591 1086, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: haruo_tominaga170@maff.go.jp

Yamaguchi, Akane

Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency of Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907
Tel: +81 3 3502 8204, Fax: +81 3 3504 2649, E-Mail: akane_yamaguchi660@maff.go.jp

KOREA (REP.)

Jung, Yoonsuk

Deputy Director, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, 94, Dasom 2-ro, Sejong-si, Republic of Korea
Tel: +82 44 200 5368, E-Mail: henato@korea.kr

Kim, Taerin

Advisor, Fisheries Monitoring Center, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, 638, Gijanghaean-ro, Gijang-gun, 46079 Busan
Tel: +82 51 410 1405, Fax: +82 51 410 1409, E-Mail: shararak@korea.kr

Kim, Soomin

Policy Analyst, Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center, 6th FL, S Building, 253, Hannuri-daero, 30127 Sejong
Tel: +82 44 868 7363, Fax: +82 44 868 7840, E-Mail: soominkim@kofci.org

Lee, Jooyoun

Policy Analyst, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, Government Complex Bldg.5, Dasom 2-ro Sejong, 30110
Tel: +82 44 200 5379; +82 103 787 0249, Fax: +82 44 200 5379, E-Mail: sporyoun@korea.kr

MAURITANIA

Taleb Moussa, Ahmed

Directeur Adjoint de l'Aménagement, des Ressources et des Études, Ministère de la Pêche, des Infrastructures Maritimes et Portuaires, Direction de l'Aménagement des Ressources, rue Ahmed Ould Bouceif. BP 137, Nouakchott
Tel: +222 452 952 141; +222 464 79842, E-Mail: talebmoussaa@yahoo.fr

MEXICO

Soler Benítez, Bertha Alicia ¹

Comisión Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca (CONAPESCA), 82100 Mazatlán, Sinaloa

MOROCCO

Aouraghe, Abdelhakim

Directeur de contrôle des activités de la pêche maritime, Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal Rabat
E-Mail: aouraghe@mpm.gov.ma

Ben Bari, Mohamed

Expert MCS Auprès du Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal Rabat
Tel: +212 537 688 196, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: benbari@mpm.gov.ma

Hmidane, Abdellatif

Chef du Service de la Coordination de la Lutte contre la Pêche INN / DCAPM, Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal Rabat
Tel: +212 537 688 356, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: hmidane@mpm.gov.ma

Sabbane, Kamal

Chef du Service du Suivi et du Contrôle par Outil informatique / DCAPM, Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de la Pêche Maritime, Département de la Pêche Maritime, Nouveau Quartier Administratif; BP 476, 10090 Haut Agdal, Rabat
Tel: +212 537 688 528, Fax: +212 537 688 382, E-Mail: sabbane@mpm.gov.ma

NORWAY

Sørdahl, Elisabeth * 1

Senior Adviser, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries, Department for Fisheries, 0032 Oslo

Lysnes, Guro Kristoffersen

Adviser, Directorate of Fisheries, Resource Management Department, Strandgaten 229, 5004 Bergen (P.O. Box 185 Sentrum), 5804 Bergen
Tel: +47 46 89 66 44, E-Mail: gulys@fiskeridir.no

Mjorlund, Rune 1

Senior Adviser, Directorate of Fisheries, Department of Coastal Management, Environment and Statistics, 5804 Bergen

PANAMA

Vergara, Yarkelia *

Directora encargada de Cooperación y Asuntos Pesqueros, Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario, Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá, Cooperación Técnica y Asuntos Pesqueros Internacional, Edificio Riviera, Ave. Justo Arosemena, Calle 45 Bella Vista, 0819-02398
Tel: +507 511 6008 (ext. 359), E-Mail: yvergara@arap.gob.pa; hsfs@arap.gob.pa

Sierra, María Esther

Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá (ARAP), Calle 80 1/2 este, hatu pintado
Tel: +507 6095 9083, E-Mail: msierra@arap.gob.pa

Díaz de Santamaría, María Patricia

Delegada representante de la Industria, FIPESCA - Fundación Internacional de Pesca, Zona de Libre Proceso de Corozal, Edificio 297, Corozal
Tel: +507 378 6640; +507 657 32047, E-Mail: mpdiaz@fipesca.com

PHILIPPINES

Demo-os, Marlo

PFDA Fishport Complex, North Bay Boulevard North BFAR MCS Station and Fishing Tech Lab., 1411 Navotas NCR, ISL
Tel: +63 918 964 0454, E-Mail: mbdemoos@gmail.com

Viron, Jennifer

Chief, Aquatic Wildlife Regulatory Section-Fisheries Regulatory and Licensing Division, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Department of Agriculture, 1128 Quezon City Metro Manila

SENEGAL

Niang, Magatte

Chef du Bureau des observateurs de la Direction de la Protection et de la Surveillance des Pêches (DPSP), Fenêtre Mermoz, Corniche Ouest, BP: 3656 Dakar
Tel: +221 775 854 440, E-Mail: niangmagatte966@gmail.com

Sèye, Mamadou

Ingénieur des Pêches, Chef de la Division Gestion et Aménagement des Pêcheries, Direction des Pêches maritimes, Sphère ministérielle Ousmane Tanor Dieng, Bâtiment D, 2^e étage, Diamniadio, BP 289 Dakar
Tel: +221 77 841 83 94, Fax: +221 821 47 58, E-Mail: mdseye@gmail.com; mdseye1@gmail.com; mdouseye@yahoo.fr

TUNISIA

Hayouni ep Habbassi, Dhekra

Ingénieur en chef, Direction de la préservation des ressources halieutiques, Direction Générale de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, 32 rue Alain Savary, 1002 Tunis
Tel: +216 718 90784; +216 201 08565, Fax: +216 717 99401, E-Mail: hayouni.dhekra@gmail.com

TÜRKİYE

Elekon, Hasan Alper

Senior Fisheries Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-3, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara
Tel: +90 312 258 30 76, Fax: +90 312 258 30 75, E-Mail: hasanalper.elekon@tarimorman.gov.tr; hasanalper@gmail.com

Gökçinar, Niyazi Can

Senior Fisheries Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-0, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara
Tel: +90 312 258 3077, Fax: +90 312 258 3039, E-Mail: niyazican.gokcinar@tarimorman.gov.tr; niyazicangokcinar@hotmail.com

Topçu, Burcu Bilgin

Senior Fisheries Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Üniversiteler Mah. Dumlupınar Bulvarı, No: 161 / 1-6, 06800 Lodumlu, Ankara
Tel: +90 532 207 0632; +90 312 258 3077, Fax: +90 312 258 30 39, E-Mail: burcu.bilgin@tarimorman.gov.tr; bilginburcu@gmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Sampson, Harry

Senior International Fisheries Policy Officer, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), Marine & Fisheries Directorate, Nobel House 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 3JR
Tel: +44 208 026 4403; +44 755 742 8543, E-Mail: harry.sampson@defra.gov.uk; trfmo@defra.gov.uk

Aldred, Corrine

Lutra House Dodd Way, Preston, Lancashire PR5 8BX
Tel: +44 782 454 2692, E-Mail: corrine.aldred@marinemangement.org.uk

Allison, Sarah

Integrated Marine Manager, Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Miranda House, The Quay, Harwich, Essex, CO12 3HH
Tel: +44 739 287 9893, E-Mail: sarah.allison@marinemangement.org.uk

Deary, Andrew

Head of Blue Belt Compliance, MMO, Marine Management Organisation, Lutra House. Dodd Way. Walton House. Bamber Bridge. Preston Office, PR5 8BX
Tel: +44 772 222 1352, E-Mail: andrew.deary@marinemangement.org.uk

Defriez, Emma

Seacole Building 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF
Tel: +44 750 318 6847, E-Mail: emma.defriez@marinemangement.org.uk

Harrison-Stirling, Montgomery

Defra, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF
Tel: +44 203 025 9470, E-Mail: montgomery.harrison-stirling@defra.gov.uk

Jennings, Sebastian

Senior Data Officer, Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham B31AQ
Tel: +44 740 782 6798, E-Mail: sebastian.jennings@marinemangement.org.uk

Kowalska O'Neil, Eleanor

Marine Management Organisation, Lancaster House, Hampshire Court, NE4 7YH
Tel: +44 788 212 5296, E-Mail: eleanor.kowalskao'neil@marinemangement.org.uk

May, Stefan

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2nd Floor, Foss House, Kings Pool, 1-2 Peasholme Green, York, YO1 7PX
Tel: +44 208 026 7627, E-Mail: stefan.may@defra.gov.uk

Murphy, Paul

Principal Fisheries Manager, Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Chi Gallos Hayle Marine Renewables Business Park, Lancaster House, Hampshire Court, London NE4 7YH
Tel: +44 782 575 4838, E-Mail: paul.murphy@marinemanagement.org.uk

Peel, Michael

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs - DEFRA, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF
Tel: +44 798 418 9608, E-Mail: michael.peel@defra.gov.uk

Schaeffter, Gerlinde

Senior Policy Advisor, Illegal, Unregulated & Unreported Fishing Policy, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, DEFRA, 1st floor, Seacole Block, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF
Tel: +44 208 026 1572, E-Mail: gerlinde.schaeffter@defra.gov.uk

Smith-Devey, Imogen

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, DEFRA, 2 Marsham St, London SW1P 4DF
Tel: +44 782 409 1262, E-Mail: imogen.smith-devey@defra.gov.uk

UNITED STATES

King, Melanie Diamond

Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs Trade, and Commerce (F/IATC), NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring Maryland 20910
Tel: +1 301 427 3087, E-Mail: melanie.king@noaa.gov

Harris, Madison

Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs, Trade, and Commerce (F/IATC), NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Tel: +1 202 480 4592, E-Mail: madison.harris@noaa.gov

Anderson, Amy

NOAA, 1318 East West Highway SSMC-3, Suite 3301, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Tel: +1 240 856 7200, E-Mail: amy.anderson@noaa.gov

Baker, Colleen

Foreign Affairs Officer, Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC), Department of State, Washington DC 20520
Tel: +1 609 206 9830; +1 202 538 1070, E-Mail: bakerca2@fan.gov

Campbell, Derek

Attorney-Advisor International Section, Office of General Counsel - International Law, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W. HCHB Room 48026, Washington, D.C. 20230
Tel: +1 202 482 0031, Fax: +1 202 371 0926, E-Mail: derek.campbell@noaa.gov

Htun, Emma ¹

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection, MD 20910

Javor, Pallavi

NOAA, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Tel: +1 202 936 5875, E-Mail: pallavi.javor@noaa.gov

Lemoine, Hayley

NOAA, 1315 East-West Hwy, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Tel: +1 310 773 1335, E-Mail: hayley.lemoine@noaa.gov

Moore, Kathleen

Living Marine Resources Program Manager, United States Coast Guard, Atlantic Area-Response, Office of Maritime Security and Law Enforcement, 431 Crawford St., Portsmouth, Virginia 23704
Tel: +1 571 607 2157, E-Mail: katie.s.moore@uscg.mil

URUGUAY

Forselledo, Rodrigo *

Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos - DINARA, Laboratorio de Recursos Pelágicos, Constituyente 1497, CP 11200 Montevideo

Tel: +598 2400 46 89; +598 99 487 401, E-Mail: rforselledo@gmail.com; rforselledo@mgap.gub.uy

VENEZUELA

Galicía Tremont, Jeiris Nathaly *

Directora General de Pesca Industrial, Viceministerio de Producción primaria Pesquera y Acuicola, Av. Lecuna, Torre Este, Parque central, piso 17

Tel: +58 0414 970 3064, E-Mail: ing.jeiriscalicia@gmail.com; dgpi.minpesca@gmail.com; jgalicia.minpesca@gmail.com

Miranda Córdova, Jesús

Gerente de Ordenación Pesquera, Ministerio de Pesca y Acuicultura - INSOPESCA, Torre Este, Parque central, Piso 12, 1015 Caracas

Tel: +58 412 369 5325, E-Mail: mirandaj1201@gmail.com; marinefishbp@gmail.com

Vivas Jiménez, Maria Daniela

Ministerio del Poder Popular de Pesca y Acuicultura, Parque Central. Piso 17, 1040 Caracas

Tel: 04242808103, E-Mail: minpescaven@gmail.com

OBSERVERS FROM COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES, ENTITIES, FISHING ENTITIES

CHINESE TAIPEI

Chou, Shih-Chin

Section Chief, Distant Water Fisheries Division, Fisheries Agency, 8F, No. 100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., 10060

Tel: +886 2 2383 5915, Fax: +886 2 2332 7395, E-Mail: chou1967sc@gmail.com; shihcin@ms1.fg.gov.tw

Chou, Ling-Fei

Deputy Director, Representative Office in the EU and Belgium, Square de Meeûs 26-27, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 02 287 2800, Fax: +32 02 513 9590, E-Mail: lingfei@ms1.fg.gov.tw

Fu, Tzu-Yu Richard

Director, Representative Office in the EU and Belgium, Square de Meeûs 26-27, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 0 2 287 2800, Fax: +32 0 2 513 9590, E-Mail: tzuyufu@moa.gov.tw

Hsiao, Kai-Han

Master Student, Graduate Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, 70 Lien-Hai Road, Kaohsiung, 80424

Tel: +886 7 525 2000, E-Mail: h86095764@gmail.com

Kao, Shih-Ming

Professor, Graduate Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, 70 Lien-Hai Road, 80424 Kaohsiung City

Tel: +886 7 525 2000 Ext. 5305, Fax: +886 7 525 6205, E-Mail: kaosm@mail.nsysu.edu.tw

Shang, Yu

First Secretary on Home Assignment, Agriculture, Fisheries and Economic Organizations Section, Department of International Organizations, No.2 Ketagalan Blvd., 100

Tel: +886 2 2348 2527, Fax: +886 2 2361 7694, E-Mail: yshang@mofa.gov.tw

Yang, Shan-Wen

Secretary, Overseas Fisheries Development Council, 3F, No. 14, Wenzhou Street, Da'an Dist., 10648

Tel: +886 2 2368 0889 #151, Fax: +886 2 2368 6418, E-Mail: shenwen@ofdc.org.tw

OBSERVERS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ECOLOGY ACTION CENTRE - EAC

Isnor, Holly

Ecology Action Centre - EAC, 2705 Fern Lane, Halifax Nova Scotia B3K 4L3, Canada

Tel: +1 902 580 0600, E-Mail: hollyisnor@ecologyaction.ca

GLOBAL FISHING WATCH

Arruda Sêga, Luana

Global Fishing Watch, CCSW 4, 70680-450 Brasilia DF, Brazil

Tel: +554 799 966 3536, E-Mail: luana.sega@globalfishingwatch.org

Bartra, Ariadna

Global Fishing Watch, 2051BB North Holland, Netherlands

Tel: +31 643 281 665, E-Mail: ariadna.bartra-baron@globalfishingwatch.org

Buckley, Joanna

Global Fishing Watch, Bristol BS6 5BX, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 758 274 5364, E-Mail: joanna.buckley@globalfishingwatch.org

Elliott, Brianna

Global Fishing Watch, 1025 Connecticut Ave NW # 200, Washington, DC 20036, United States

Tel: +1 443 226 3379, E-Mail: brianna.elliott@globalfishingwatch.org

INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION - ISSF

Recio Vázquez, Lorena

Data Analyst and Research Assistant, ISSF, 28003 Madrid, Spain

Tel: +34 622 86 03 85, E-Mail: lrecio@iss-foundation.org

OCEANA

Vulperhorst, Vanya

OCEANA, Rue Montoyer 39, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 2 513 2242; +32 479 927 029, E-Mail: vvulperhorst@oceana.org

PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS - PEW

Evangelides, Nikolas

Pew Charitable Trusts, 20 Eastbourne Terrace, London W2 6LA, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7535 4232, E-Mail: nevangelides@pewtrusts.org

SCIAENA

Carvalho, Gonçalo

SCIAENA, Incubadora de Empresas da Universidade do Algarve, Campus de Gambelas, Pavilhão B1, 8005-226 Faro, Portugal

Tel: +351 936 257 281, E-Mail: gcarvalho@sciaena.org; sciaena@sciaena.org

THE BILLFISH FOUNDATION - TBF

Petersen, Andrew

Fisheries Data and Technology Company, 3014 Dauphine St Ste A PMB 29021, New Orleans, LA 70117, United States

Tel: +1 225 407 9192, E-Mail: andrew@bluefindata.com

THE SHARK TRUST

Hood, Ali

The Shark Trust, 4 Creykes Court, The Millfields, Plymouth PL1 3JB, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 7855 386083, Fax: +44 1752 672008, E-Mail: ali@sharktrust.org

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

SCRS CHAIRPERSON

Brown, Craig A.

SCRS Chairman, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149, United States

Tel: +1 305 586 6589, E-Mail: drcabrown@comcast.net; craig.brown@noaa.gov

TRAGSA

Lara Romero, Ana

TRAGSA, C/ Julián Camarillo 6B, 28037 Madrid, Spain

Tel: +34 915 358 996, E-Mail: alaro@tragsa.es

Pelayo, Víctor

TRAGSA, C/ Julián Camarillo 6B, Spain

E-Mail: vpelayo@tragsa.es

ICCAT Secretariat

C/ Corazón de María 8 – 6th floor, 28002 Madrid – Spain
Tel: +34 91 416 56 00; Fax: +34 91 415 26 12; E-mail: info@iccat.int

Manel, Camille Jean Pierre
Neves dos Santos, Miguel
Parrilla Moruno, Alberto Thais
Mayor, Carlos
Campoy, Rebecca
Motos, Beatriz
Peyre, Christine
Baity, Dawn
Idrissi, M'Hamed
Martínez Herranz, Javier
Mergarejo Dremov, Félix
Peña, Esther
Samedy, Valérie
Vieito, Aldana

Appendix 3

Comments from CPCs and revised templates for electronic monitoring systems (EMS), domestic programmes description, and implementation reports

(Submitted by ICCAT Secretariat)

In accordance with paragraphs 14, 15, and 16b) of the *Recommendation by ICCAT to establish minimum standards and programme requirements for the use of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) in ICCAT fisheries* (Rec. 23-18), the Secretariat prepared two templates as suggestions for use to transmit the report on implementation of EMS domestic programmes and the EMS domestic programme description. Both templates are currently available on the ICCAT website.

During the Meeting of the Electronic Monitoring Systems Working Group (EMS WG), held in hybrid format on 10 June 2024 in Porto (Portugal), the European Union suggested circulating these templates, presented respectively as documents EMS_05/i2024 (**Addendum 1 to Appendix 3**) and EMS_06/i2024 (**Addendum 2 to Appendix 3**), to CPCs for comments. For this purpose, the Secretariat distributed ICCAT Circular # 05960/2024. After compiling the comments, revised templates are submitted for review by the Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation Measures (PWG) at the 24th Special Meeting of the Commission.

Comments on the report on implementation of EMS domestic programmes template were received from the European Union and Japan (**Addendums 3 and 4 to Appendix 3**, respectively) and comments on the EMS domestic programme description template were received from the European Union (**Addendum 5 to Appendix 3**).

Following the Electronic Monitoring Systems Working Group Meeting (EMS WG), held in hybrid format on 17 June 2025 in Brussels (Belgium), Japan, the United States, and the European Union jointly submitted a proposal concerning the EMS Domestic Programmes Template (**Addendum 6 to Appendix 3**) and the EMS Domestic Programme Description Template (**Addendum 7 to Appendix 3**).

Addendum 1 to Appendix 3

Report on the results of the implementation of its EMS domestic programme during (YYYY)
(Rec. 23-18, para 16 b)

1. Number of vessels monitored
2. Fishing effort monitored (specify unit)
3. Coverage levels achieved by fishery and gear type
4. Details on how those coverage levels were calculated
5. Information on compliance monitoring, where appropriate

Addendum 2 to Appendix 3

EMS domestic programme description

(Rec. 23-18, para 14)

1. Example of the Vessel Monitoring Plan (VMP) used in the programme
2. Responsibilities of fisheries authorities and vessel owner/crew with respect to:
 - Installing and maintaining equipment (including routine cleaning of cameras)
 - Responses to mechanical or technical failure of the EMS
3. Protocols for data storage and retrieval
4. List of any ICCAT measures where the use of EMS is necessary for the CPC to meet the requirements of ICCAT recommendation(s):
 - For monitoring compliance
 - Protocols for reporting and following up on potential infringements mentioned in [Rec. 23-18](#) Annex 5

Addendum 3 to Appendix 3

**Comments from the EU on the Report on the results of the implementation
of its EMS domestic programme during (YYYY)**

(Rec. 23-18, para 16 b)

(submitted by the EU)

1. Number of vessels subject to observer requirements under ICCAT rules, broken down by fishery and gear type
2. Number of vessels monitored and coverage levels achieved, broken down into human observer and EMS monitoring, and by fishery and gear type
3. Fishing effort monitored (specify unit) achieved by fishery and gear type (both human and EMS)
[...]
4. Details on how those coverage levels were calculated
[...]
5. Possible technical failures in the operation of the system and their impact (number of hours/days and percentage of the total trip, when no information was received)
6. When the EMS is used for science purposes:
 - Details on the data analysis performed (percentage of days/operations analysed, method: random, etc.)
 - Details on the completeness of data extracted and submitted to ICCAT as part of the observer data used for science (ST-09 forms or others adopted in the future)
7. When the EMS is used for monitoring compliance:
 - List of the ICCAT measures that were monitored with the use of EMS (i.e. para 37 Rec. 22-01 - Use of FADs, para 50 Rec. 22-01 - Accurate recording of catches, etc.)
 - Details on the data analysis performed (percentage of days/operations analysed, method: risk-based or random)
 - List and details of the non-compliances detected

Addendum 4 to Appendix 3

**Comments from Japan on the Report on the results of the implementation of
its EMS domestic programme during (YYYY)**

(Rec. 23-18, para 16 b)

(submitted by Japan)

1. Number of vessels or fishing efforts (specify unit) monitored.

[...]

2. Coverage levels achieved by fishery and gear type.
3. Details on how those coverage levels were calculated.
4. Information on compliance monitoring, where appropriate.

Note: CPCs can provide this information in the body text of their Annual Report.

Addendum 5 to Appendix 3

Comments from the EU on the EMS domestic programme description

(Rec. 23-18, para 14)

(submitted by the EU)

1. Number of vessels to be covered by the EMS, broken down by fishery and gear type
2. Example of the Vessel Monitoring Plan (VMP) used in the programme (for each type of vessel and/or fishery)
3. Responsibilities of fisheries authorities and vessel owner/crew with respect to:
 - Installing and maintaining equipment (including routine cleaning of cameras)
 - Responses to mechanical or technical failure of the EMS
4. Protocols for data storage and retention, and data transmission or retrieval
5. CPC-authorized independent companies, CPC institutions or CPC authorities in charge of EMS data analysis
6. When the EMS is used for science purposes:
 - Method of data analysis to be employed (risk-based or random, percentage of video analysed, use of sensors for data analysis)
 - Details on protocol for data extraction and submission to ICCAT as part of the observer data used for science (ST-09 forms or others adapted for EMS data in the future)
7. When the EMS is used for monitoring compliance:
 - List of ICCAT measures to be monitored with the use of EMS (i.e. para 37 [Rec. 22-01](#) - Use of FADs, para 50 [Rec. 22-01](#) - Accurate recording of catches, etc.)
[...]
 - Method of data analysis to be employed (risk-based or random, percentage of video analysed, use of sensors for data analysis)
 - Protocols for reporting and following up on potential infringements mentioned in [Rec. 23-18](#) Annex 5

Addendum 6 to Appendix 3

**Comments from Japan, the US and the EU on the Report on the results of
the implementation of its EMS domestic programme during (YYYY)**
(Rec. 23-18, para 16 b)

(submitted by Japan, the US and the EU)

CPCs choosing to implement EMS to meet ICCAT requirements for scientific data collection and/or compliance monitoring shall report in its Annual Report the following relevant information on the results of the implementation of its EMS domestic programme during the previous year:

If choosing to implement EMS for scientific data collection requirements:

1. Number of vessels or fishing efforts (specify unit) monitored by EMS.
2. EMS Coverage levels achieved by fishery and gear type for scientific reporting.
3. Details on how those EMS coverage levels were calculated:

Optional Information:

- Details on the data analysis performed (percentage of days/operations analysed, method: random, etc.):
- Details on the completeness of data extracted and submitted to ICCAT as part of the observer data used for science (ST-09 forms or others adopted in the future).

If choosing to implement EMS for compliance monitoring purposes:

1. Number of vessels or fishing efforts (specify unit) monitored by EMS.
2. EMS coverage levels achieved by fishery and gear type.
3. Details on how those EMS coverage levels were calculated.

Optional Information:

- Details on the data analysis performed (percentage of days/operations analysed, method: risk-based or random).
- List and details of the non-compliances detected.

Addendum 7 to Appendix 3

**Comments from Japan, the US and the EU on
EMS domestic programme description**
(Rec. 23-18, para 14)

(submitted by Japan, the US and the EU)

A CPC that chooses to implement an EMS programme in its longline and/or purse seine fisheries to meet ICCAT requirements for scientific data collection and/or compliance monitoring purposes shall develop an EMS domestic programme containing the following information.

1. Example of the Vessel Monitoring Plan (VMP) used in the programme
2. Responsibilities of fisheries authorities and vessel owner/crew with respect to:
 - Installing and maintaining equipment (including routine cleaning of cameras)
 - Responses to mechanical or technical failure of the EMS
3. Protocols for data storage and retrieval
4. List of any ICCAT measures where the use of EMS is necessary for the CPC to meet the requirements of ICCAT recommendation(s):
 - For monitoring compliance
 - Protocols for reporting and following up on potential infringements mentioned in Rec. 23-18 Annex 5

Optional information:

1. Number of vessels to be covered by the EMS, broken down by fishery and gear type
2. CPC-authorized independent companies, CPC institutions or CPC authorities in charge of EMS data analysis
3. When the EMS is used for science purposes:
 - Method of data analysis to be employed (percentage of video analysed, use of sensors for data analysis)
 - Details on protocol for data extraction and submission to ICCAT as part of the observer data used for science (ST-09 forms or others adapted for EMS data in the future)
4. When the EMS is used for monitoring compliance:
 - List of ICCAT measures to be monitored with the use of EMS (i.e. para 40 Rec. 24-01 - Use of FADs, para 61 Rec. 24-01 - Accurate recording of catches, etc.)
 - Method of data analysis to be employed (risk-based or random, percentage of video analysed, use of sensors for data analysis)

Appendix 4

**Discussion paper on amendments to ICCAT Rec. 24-05
establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna
in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean
(submitted by the European Union)**

Explanatory note

With regard to the amendment to *Recommendation by ICCAT amending the Recommendation 22-08 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean* (Rec. 24-05) proposed during the last Intersessional Meeting of Panel 2 held in March 2025 ("Proposal for amendments to *Recommendation by ICCAT amending Recommendation 22-08 establishing a multi-annual management plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean* (Rec. 24-05) Intersessional Meeting of Panel 2 (Agenda point 7)" [PA2_25/2025]) concerning the validation by the Regional Observer, the European Union undertook to identify the provisions of the recommendation in which this reference appeared.

**Modification Rec. 24-05
Validation by the ICCAT Regional Observer**

<i>Current text</i>	<i>Proposed text</i>
<i>Para 194</i> When the destination of the bluefin tuna is a processing vessel, the master or representative of the processing vessel shall complete a processing declaration. When the harvested bluefin tuna is to be landed directly into port, the farm or trap operator shall complete a harvesting declaration. The processing and harvesting declarations shall be validated by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer present at the harvesting operation.	<i>Para 194</i> When the destination of the bluefin tuna is a processing vessel, the master or representative of the processing vessel shall complete a processing declaration. When the harvested bluefin tuna is to be landed directly into port, the farm or trap operator shall complete a harvesting declaration. The processing and harvesting declarations shall be verified and then signed, by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer present at the harvesting operation, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature.
<i>Para 195</i> The processing declaration and harvesting declaration shall contain at least the following information using Annex 15: [...] - validation by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer, as appropriate.	<i>Para 195</i> The processing declaration and harvesting declaration shall contain at least the following information using Annex 15: [...] - verification and signature, by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature.
<i>Annex 6. CPC Observer Programme</i> 4. b) validate the information in the processing and/or harvesting declarations made by the master or representative of the processing vessel or the trap operator.	<i>Annex 6. CPC Observer Programme</i> 4. b) verify and then sign, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature, the information in the processing and/or harvesting declarations made by the master or representative of the processing vessel or the trap operator.
<i>Annex 6. ICCAT Regional Observer Programme</i> xxiii. in both cases, verify the release order issued by the competent authority and validate the information in the release declaration made by the donor or farm operator;	<i>Annex 6. ICCAT Regional Observer Programme</i> xxiii. in both cases, verify the release order issued by the competent authority and then sign, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature, the information in the release declaration made by the donor or farm operator;
<i>Annex 6. ICCAT Regional Observer Programme</i> xxv. validate the information in the processing and harvesting declarations made by master or representative of the processing vessel or by the farm operator;	<i>Annex 6. ICCAT Regional Observer Programme</i> xxv. verify and then sign, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature, the information in the processing and harvesting declarations made by master or representative of the processing vessel or by the farm operator;

<i>Annex 10. Release protocol</i> 7. The ICCAT Regional Observer shall validate the information in the release declaration. The donor or farm operator shall submit the release declaration to its authorities within 48 hours of the release operation taking place for transmission to the ICCAT Secretariat.	<i>Annex 10. Release protocol</i> 7. The ICCAT Regional Observer shall verify and then sign, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature, the information in the release declaration. The donor or farm operator shall submit the release declaration to its authorities within 48 hours of the release operation taking place for transmission to the ICCAT Secretariat.
<i>Annex 15. Template for a processing declaration and harvesting declaration</i> Validation by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer, as appropriate:	<i>Annex 15. Template for a processing declaration and harvesting declaration</i> Verification and then signature, unless there is a possible non-compliance preventing signature, by the ICCAT Regional Observer or CPC Observer, as appropriate: