

COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY STATISTICS

Twentieth Session

Victoria, Seychelles, 21-24 January 2003

Report by IOTC

REPORT FROM THE IOTC TO CWP-20

ABSTRACT

The IOTC reported inter-sessional pro

MODIFICATIONS TO THE IOTC DATA SYSTEM SINCE CWP-19

Data Acquisition

The mandatory reporting standards for contracting and collaborating parties (Resolution 98/01) were updated to include the reporting of sample sizes and data related with purse seine fishing for tunas in association with fish aggregating devices, especially the activities of supply vessels. The text of the new Resolution (Resolution 01/05) can be found in Appendix I (all changes in relation to Resolution 98/01 are underlined).

The Secretariat addresses from one to three or more requests for IOTC data to contracting and non-contracting parties presumed to have been involved in tuna fishing within the IOTC Area. The requests usually refer to flag state statistics gathered for the year prior to that of the request. The number of countries to which data requests were sent has been increasing in recent years to include all Indian Ocean coastal countries and many Distant Water Fishing Nations (DWFN). The reporting of lists of foreign vessels operating within the IOTC Area by contracting and collaborating parties has helped the Secretariat to identify fleets from non-reporting countries. The Secretariat has been sending data requests to all countries for which activities of vessels were recorded in the vessel record database.

The Statistical data available to IOTC come mainly from flag State reporting. The statistics not reported by the responsible countries are obtained from other sources or estimated by the Secretariat. These include:

1. Catches of purse seiners belonging to European Community owners operating under several non-EC flags: complete statistics of these vessels are reported by European scientists.
2. Catches of non-reporting purse seiners and longliners: new estimates of catches of non-reporting fleets were conducted in 2001 and 2002 thanks to the improved vessel record and the inception of new IOTC Sampling Programs in Sri Lanka and Indonesia.
 - 2.1. Vessel Record: The Secretariat re-estimated the catches of non-reporting industrial purse seiners (1995-2000) and deep-freezing longliners (1985-2000) assigning the catches to the respective flags for the first time. These estimates are conducted according to the number of vessels recorded active in the vessel record and average catches per year, vessel and area available for fleets that are presumed to operate in the same way.
 - 2.2. IOTC Sampling Programs: The catches of fresh tuna longliners operating in the Indian Ocean were estimated on the basis of the data collected through different Sampling Schemes set up in cooperation with local institutions in Phuket (Thailand, AFDEC¹), Penang (Malaysia, FRI²) and Colombo (Sri Lanka, NARA³). New estimates of catches for the period 1986-2001 were conducted from the information collected.
3. Indonesia: The catches of artisanal and industrial (longline) vessels in Indonesia were re-estimated for the period 1970-2000. These estimates were possible thanks to background information gathered at IOTC and new information collected during several trips to the country. The catches estimated, far above the previous catches estimated for the last decade (over 150,000 tons), set Indonesia as the

¹ Andaman Sea Fisheries Development Centre

² Fisheries Research Institute

³ National Aquatic Resources and Development Agency

second fishing nation in the Indian Ocean. A Multilateral Catch Monitoring Project, involving local and foreign institutions, was set up in 2002 to improve data collection and processing systems in Indonesia. More information on this item is given under IOTC/OFCF Project below.

4. Catches of artisanal fleets not reported by the responsible countries: Most of these catches are usually reported to the FAO. The Secretariat has been using the FAO FishStat database and background information and as basis to estimate the catches of non-reporting coastal countries. The IOTC and the FAO have been exchanging capture databases since 2002 in order to give consistency to the data published for FAO (FishStat) and IOTC (IOTC Nominal Catches database, Data Summary, etc.).

IOTC/OFCF Project

The Japanese Overseas Fishery Cooperation Foundation (OFCF) informed the Secretariat early in 2001 that funds could be allocated to the Secretariat for the inception of projects in developing countries of the region to address their main needs regarding data collection and statistics. The joint IOTC-OFCF Project proposal was endorsed during the 6th Session of the Commission and a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) signed early in 2002 between the OFCF and the IOTC Secretariat. The Project is based on three main principles:

- The activities executed under the project follow the recommendations of the Commission and its relevant subsidiary bodies: the WPDCS⁴ and the Scientific Committee;
- There are no direct financial implications for IOTC Member countries.
- The activities of the project are directed towards reinforcing the statistical systems of developing countries from the region.

The IOTC Secretariat serves as base for the Project that will extend over the period of one year (April 2002-March 2003) at a level of funding of about US\$500,000. Renewal of the project is envisaged for up to five years at a similar annual funding level. A Resources Expert and a Project Coordinator were dispatched by the OFCF and are based at the IOTC Secretariat since the beginning of the Project.

The overall plan of action includes a series of fact-finding missions to Indian Ocean coastal States, followed by a workshop on data collection and processing systems with the participation of the countries concerned, as well as direct assistance as required in each participating country. The Secretariat has tentatively identified the main areas of concern that could be tackled by the project, based on their significance for stock assessment and future management measures. A priority is to improve data collection and reporting in Indonesia, in particular for the fresh-tuna longline fleet. Another priority is to improve the quality of the statistics of the gillnet fisheries (primarily in Iran, Oman, Pakistan and Sri Lanka), as they are an important and poorly documented component of the fisheries for tropical tuna. It is also necessary to assess and improve the quality and completeness of the current statistics in developing coastal countries with undocumented data collection systems. These countries include India, Oman, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Progress on this project has been so far satisfactory, in spite that the implementation in Indonesia, the main priority, has been more complicated than expected (it involved setting up several data-entry points, initiating size frequency sampling programs and establishing collaboration agreements with 2 different agencies). In addition, the IOTC-OFCF project has also taken over funding and technical assistance for the sampling programs in Thailand, Sri Lanka and the gillnet and handline yellowfin fisheries of Oman. A training workshop on WinTuna 2000, the software developed by the secretariat to collect and process fisheries information, was held in August this year with about 20 participants from 11 different countries. Also under the context of IOTC-OFCF project, Mauritius was provided with hardware, software and technical assistance to actualize their data entry and reporting system for tuna fisheries.

Data Gathering and Processing

Database Structure: The structure of the IOTC Nominal Catches (NC), Catch and Effort (CE) and Size Frequency (SF) databases was modified during 2001. Two new fields were added, the first to allow

⁴ Permanent Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics

recording the quality of each individual record in the databases and the second related with the reporting flag.

These additions have allowed to:

- Identify catch series of specific fleets which were previously recorded under broader aggregates: For example, catch information coming from different sources, with varying reliability, was all aggregated under NEI⁵. The new reporting field allows storage of these data separately, reducing the heterogeneity of the information recorded under each stratum.
- Flag data series or individual records in order to provide more information on their reliability.

Thorough reviews of each data series were conducted in 2001 in order to assign quality codes to all records in the IOTC databases. Although these reviews extended back to the first years for which data exist in the database, the assignment of quality codes is more uncertain in early years of the fishery, especially before 1970, due to the lack of documentation about the estimation process for catches at the species, gear and area levels.

The assignment of quality codes in each database followed the criteria below:

- Nominal Catch data: The quality was assigned to each individual record (stratum⁶) depending on whether the catches recorded were thought to represent the actual catches in the stratum.
- Catch and Effort data: The quality was assigned to each individual record (stratum⁷) depending on whether the catches (or effort⁸) recorded were thought to represent the catches (or effort) in the stratum.
- Size Frequency data: The quality was assigned to each individual record (stratum⁹) depending on whether the sample in that stratum was thought to represent the size frequency of the catch in the stratum.

More information about the quality codes and criteria used to assign quality codes to records in each database can be found in Appendix II.

Data source fields were also added to the catch and effort and size-frequency databases in 2001. Thorough reviews were conducted of all IOTC databases in order to provide more information on the origin of each dataset.

Data Revisions: The Secretariat continued developing processes to validate new and existent datasets in 2001 and 2002. This involved:

- The creation of standard validation and verification processes to check all new catch, effort, size frequency and vessel record data.
- The creation of standard validation and verification processes to check the data gathered in the IOTC databases.

All inconsistencies found in the databases were communicated to the respective flag countries for clarification. New quality codes were assigned to records in the IOTC databases according to the results of the validation carried out.

Development of WinTuna: The IOTC software WinTuna 2000 is now fully operational and is used as data entry software in all IOTC Sampling Programs. Specific sampling designs were created to input and process the data collected through the different sampling schemes. WinTuna is the subject of another presentation.

Data Dissemination

⁵ Not Elsewhere Included

⁶ Flag-Reporting -Year-Gear-Area-Species-Data Source

⁷ Flag-Reporting -Year-Month-Gear-Area-Species-Type of School-Data Source

⁸ The catch and effort database allows the assignment of distinct quality codes to catch/es and effort/s recorded in a same stratum.

⁹ Flag-Reporting -Year-Month-Gear-Area-Species-Type of Measurement-Data Source

The number of requests for IOTC data received at the Secretariat has been increasing during the past years. These requests refer especially to data from the Nominal Catches database and, less frequently, to Catch and Effort and/or Size Frequency statistics. These are usually generic requests, where only the type of data and period sought are specified.

The Secretariat, on the other hand, has been providing the scientists attending the different Working Parties with up-to-date datasets, either before or during the meetings.

To give consistency to the different data disseminated the Secretariat decided to create standard formats for data dissemination, at least for the data most routinely requested. The data are extracted through store procedures specific to each database and the final datasets saved as excel or text files depending on their size. The files due for dissemination are either self-explanatory, including details regarding the structure and codes used, or are sent along with specific files where this information is provided.

The Secretariat created in 2002 standard reports on the situation of the statistics of several IOTC species. These reports are presented to the different Working Parties for consideration.

Catalogues on the availability and quality of the data gathered at the IOTC have been created and are available through the IOTC WebSite, reports to Working Parties, Data Summary, etc.

The Secretariat also generated catch-at-size matrices for yellowfin and bigeye that were used during the 2002 meeting of the WPTT¹⁰.

ELASMOBRANCH STATISTICS

IOTC has no mandate to manage shark fisheries but it has to collect statistics. The quality of the statistics gathered at the IOTC is thought poor due to:

- Underreporting: Most of the shark species caught in tuna fisheries are discarded or only partially kept (mainly shark fins). The reporting of discards to the IOTC is very scarce. Furthermore, most of the statistics reported do not refer to total discards but to partial discards and no indication on the coverage rates is provided.
- Aggregation: Most of the incidental catches of sharks are reported nonspecifically, under Sharks (SKH code).

The collection of by-catch statistics (including sampling of shark fins) in Phuket can help to assess the amounts of sharks caught by fresh-tuna longliners in the future. This sampling is, however, becoming very difficult, due to the reluctance of vessel skippers to sampling of shark fins caught during the landing.

More information on the shark statistics held at the IOTC can be found in Appendix III.

The recent creation of a dedicated Working Party on Bycatch, -issuing from a Recommendation by the Scientific Committee on 2002- with priority given to shark statistics can help to assess this issue in the future.

NATIONAL DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGIES AND DATA QUALITY CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

These items are covered in Data Acquisition (IOTC/OFCF Project; Country Reports) and Data Gathering and Processing (Data quality criteria and indicators).

IOTC TRADE CERTIFICATION SCHEME: BIGEYE TUNA STATISTICAL DOCUMENT PROGRAM

¹⁰ Working Party on Tropical Tunas

The bigeye tuna is the only species managed by the IOTC for which a Trade Certification Scheme has been implemented (apart from the Scheme operated by the CCSBT on Southern Bluefin Tuna). The Resolution 01/06, concerning the IOTC bigeye tuna statistical document program, can be found in Appendix IV.

As to date the Secretariat is not receiving any trade certification data from participating countries. Only Japan has an operating trade documentation scheme for bigeye. Catch certification schemes are an important tool to identify IUU vessels and their level of activity. Nevertheless, the current requirement for twice-a-year summary information is not sufficient for the IOTC to identify IUU vessels for which the original trade documentation should be required. In addition, information about the trip date, and port and date of landing and/or transshipment would also be required to allow the estimation of the level of activity of involved vessels.

The use of these documents to estimate the catches of non-reporting fleets is not considered effective at this stage due to:

- Only the catches that are exported are recorded: alternative sampling would be needed to estimate the catches of bigeye that are not exported.
- The catches of bigeye exported fresh are not considered.

CATCH TERMINOLOGY

The catches recorded in the IOTC Nominal Catches database refer to the landings of IOTC species per year, gear and IOTC Area converted to whole weight. The raising of the catches to round weight is conducted at the Secretariat in the case that the catches reported refer to processed weights.

VESSEL IDENTIFIERS

The IOTC Vessel Record database contains more than 6,000 vessel records. The following information is gathered (Appendix 5):

Vessel Identification: Vessel Name (Latin), Vessel Name (Actual; e.g. Chinese Name), Alias Name (all names under which a given vessel has been recorded, including miss-spelled names), Previous Ship Name, Country of Registration (Flag), National Registration Number, Radio Call Sign, Year Built, Ship Yard Built, Country Built, Homeport, Gear/s used, Hull Material, Vessel Picture/s.

Vessel Characteristics: Length overall, length between perpendiculars, Gross Registered Tonnage, Gross Tonnage, Net Registered Tonnage, fish Carrying Capacity, total Engine Power.

Vessel Owner/Charterer/Operator: Name and address of the owner/charterer/operator of the vessel.

Vessel Reporting: Reporting Country, Year of reporting, Location (port of landing, area of operation, etc.), Ocean of Activity, Licensed EEZ (the vessel is licensed to operate the Economic Exclusive Zone of the reporting country).

Vessel Activity: Reporting Country, last port of call, date trip started, date trip ended, location (port arrival) and date of departure.

The reporting of vessel records is uneven, more complete when the reporting refers to domestic than to foreign fleets. All new vessel records are validated before being input to the vessel record database to avoid miss-spelling and duplication. A dedicated database is used to validate and verify vessel records. This validation is more difficult for vessels for which the information available (especially as refer vessel identifiers) is scarce.

APPENDIX I

RESOLUTION 01/05 MANDATORY STATISTICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR IOTC MEMBERS

Catch and effort data

- a) **Surface fisheries:** catch and effort data of the surface fisheries, catch weight and fishing days at least (purse seine, baitboat, troll, drift nets) should be provided to the IOTC by 1° grid area and month strata. Purse seine fishery data should be stratified by type of school. Those data should preferably be extrapolated to the national monthly catches of each gear. The raising factors used, corresponding to the logbook coverage, should be given routinely to the IOTC.
- b) **Longline fisheries:** catch and effort data of the longline fisheries should be provided to the IOTC by 5° grid area and month strata, preferably in numbers and in weight. The fishing effort should be given in numbers of hooks. Those data should preferably be extrapolated to the national monthly catches. The raising factors used, corresponding to the logbook coverage, should be given routinely to the IOTC.
- c) The catches, efforts and sizes of the **artisanal, small scale and sport fisheries** should also be submitted on a monthly basis, but using the best geographical areas used to collect and process those data.

Size data

Considering that size data are of key importance for most tuna stock assessment, length data, including the total number of fish measured, should be routinely submitted to the IOTC on a 5° grid area and month basis, by gear and fishing mode (e.g. free/log schools for the purse seiners). Size data should be provided for all gears and for all species covered by the IOTC. Size data sampling should preferably be run under strict and well described random sampling schemes which are necessary to provide unbiased figures of the sizes taken. The exact recommended level of sampling could vary between species (as a function of various parameters), but the specific level of recommended sampling needs to be established by the working party on statistics. More detailed size data, for instance size by individual samples, should also be made available to the IOTC when requested by specific working groups, but under strict rules of confidentiality.

Fishing for tunas in association with floating objects including Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs)

It is essential for IOTC to better understand changing patterns in effective fishing effort in respect of fleets operating in the IOTC Area of Competence that more information is obtained. Considering that the activities of supply vessels and the use of Fish Aggregating Devices (FAD) are an integral part of the fishing effort exerted by the purse seine fleet the following information should be routinely submitted to the IOTC:

- a) **Number and characteristics of supply vessels :** (i) operating under their flag, (ii) assisting purse seine vessels operating under their flag, or (iii) licensed to operate in their exclusive economic zones, and that have been present in the IOTC Area of Competence.
- b) **Levels of activity of supply vessels :** including number of days at sea by 1° grid area and month basis. In addition, Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties shall make their best endeavours to provide data on the **total number and type of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs)** operated by the fleet by 5° grid area and month basis.

Timeliness of data submission to the IOTC

It is essential that all the fishery data be available in due time to allow the monitoring of stocks and analysis of the data. It is thus recommended that the following rules should be applied as standard obligation:

- a) **Surface fleets and other fleets operating in coastal zone** (including in respect of supply vessels) must provide their fishery data at the earliest possible date but **no later than the 30th of June each year** (previous year data).
- b) **Longline fleets operating in the high seas** must provide the **provisional** fishery data at the earliest date, but **no later than before June 30th** (for the previous year data). They must provide the **final estimate** of their fishery data **before December 30th each year** (for the previous year data).

The delays presently required to submit statistics could be reduced in the future because of the development of communication and data processing technologies, which should reduce the present data processing delays.

APPENDIX II

IOTC QUALITY CODE ASSIGNMENT CRITERIA

Nominal Catches Database: The quality code of each individual record (stratum) was assigned depending on whether the catches recorded (per Fleet, Year, Gear, IOTC Area, Species and Data Source) were thought to represent the actual catches occurred in the stratum concerned.

DB	STATISTICAL SYSTEM	IMPLEMENTATION	OTHER INDICATORS	DESCRIPTION	Q. CODE ASSIGNED
NC	UNKNOWN		NO	There is no information on how the catch data were generated.	0
			YES	There is no information on how the catch data were generated. The amounts reported have been repeated over several years. Catches reported fall fully under single species or species aggregates where they change drastically (sometimes falling under more species) in later periods (within the same strata). These shifts in the reporting are usually related with the implementation of new or improved data collection systems allowing better estimates of the catches and species and gear breakdowns. The catches reported in years prior to that implementation are thought inaccurate.	1
	POOR			The information available on how the catch data were generated tend to indicate that the statistical system in place does not allow to produce reliable catch estimates in the strata concerned	1
	GOOD	POOR		The information available on how the catch data were generated tend to indicate that accurate catch estimates would be obtained in the strata concerned. Nevertheless, there is information indicating the incomplete or inefficient implementation of the system in the field as much as to reduce the accuracy of the catch estimates produced	2
		GOOD		The information available on how the catch data were generated tend to indicate that accurate catch estimates would be obtained in the strata concerned.	3

Catch and Effort Database: The higher or lower quality of each individual record (stratum) was assigned depending on whether the catches recorded (per fleet, year, month, gear, area, species and data source) were thought to represent the total catches occurred in the stratum concerned.

DB	STATISTICAL SYSTEM	IMPLEMENTATION	OTHER INDICATORS	DESCRIPTION	CODE
CE	UNKNOWN		NO	There is no information on how the catch and effort statistics were generated. Whether the catches and efforts reported in the strata are representative of the total catches and efforts occurred in those strata is unknown	0
			YES	There is no information on how the catch and effort statistics were generated. Nevertheless, inconsistencies were found during the verification process run with the data (e.g. reporting inconsistent over the years or catches reported inconsistent if compared with those reported as nominal catches, etc.)	1
	POOR		The information available on how the catch and effort statistics were generated tend to indicate that the statistical system in place does not allow to produce reliable estimates in the strata concerned	1	
	GOOD	POOR		The information available on how the catches and effort statistics were generated tend to indicate that reliable catch and effort estimates would be obtained in the strata concerned. Nevertheless, there is information indicating the incomplete or inefficient implementation of the system in the field as much as to reduce the accuracy of the catch and/or effort estimates produced	2
		GOOD		The information available on how the catch and effort statistics were generated tend to indicate that reliable catch and effort estimates would be obtained in the strata concerned.	3

Size frequency Data: The higher or lower quality of each sample was assigned depending on whether the size frequencies recorded (per Fleet, Year, month, Gear, Grid, Species, Type of Measurement and Data Source) were thought to represent the size frequencies of all specimens within the stratum concerned.

DB	STATISTICAL SYSTEM	IMPLEMENTATION	OTHER INDICATORS	DESCRIPTION	CODE
SF	UNKNOWN		NO	There is no information on how the size frequency statistics were generated. Whether the size frequencies of the specimens recorded in each stratum are representative of those of all specimens within the stratum is unknown	0
			YES	There is no information on how size frequency statistics were generated. Nevertheless, inconsistencies were found during the verification process run with the data (e.g. reporting inconsistent over the years, inconsistent sizes for the species, etc.)	1
	POOR		The information available on how the size frequency statistics were generated tend to indicate that the statistical system in place does not allow to produce reliable estimates in the stratum concerned	1	
	GOOD	POOR		The information available on how the size frequency statistics were generated tend to indicate that reliable size frequency estimates would be obtained in the stratum concerned. Nevertheless, there is information indicating the incomplete or inefficient implementation of the system in the field as much as to reduce the accuracy of the size frequency estimates produced	2
		GOOD		The information available on how the size frequency statistics were generated tend to indicate that reliable size frequency estimates would be obtained in the stratum concerned.	3

APPENDIX III

AVAILABILITY OF CATCHES OF SPECIES OTHER THAN IOTC TUNA AND TUNA-LIKE SPECIES AND DISCARDS FROM INDUSTRIAL FLEETS OPERATING IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

Gear	Fleet	Av96/00	NTAD	SKH	TUX	DISCARDS
Longline	Taiwan,China	101,041	542	696	99,803	NO
	Indonesia	70,904	N/A	1,574	69,330	NO
	NEI-Deep-freezing	48,159	253	322	47,584	NO
	Japan	41,646	N/A	N/A	41,646	NO
	NEI-Fresh Tuna	27,838	126	299	27,413	NO
	Korea, Republic of	10,610	N/A	11	10,599	NO
	China	4,042	N/A	57	3,985	NO
	NEI-Indonesia Fresh Tuna	3,216	N/A	71	3,144	NO
	Spain	3,070	0	1,968	1,103	NO
	France-Reunion	2,689	67	60	2,562	NO
	Philippines	1,734	18	11	1,705	NO
	Australia	1,415	1	39	1,375	NO
	Other	4,068	88	554	3,426	NO
		TOTAL LL	320,432	1,096	5,661	313,674
Purse seine	Spain	134412	N/A	N/A	134412	NO
	France	76,031	N/A	N/A	76,031	NO
	NEI-European	58,058	N/A	N/A	58,058	NO
	Thailand	39,603	N/A	N/A	39,603	NO
	NEI-Ex-Soviet Union	29,221	N/A	N/A	29,221	NO
	Seychelles	16,753	N/A	N/A	16,753	NO
	Other	29,343	1	N/A	29,342	NO
		TOTAL PS	383,421	1	N/A	383,420
	TOTAL	703,852	1,097	5,661	697,094	

Table 1: Average catches of tuna and tuna-like species (TUX) for the period 1996-2000 and amounts of sharks (SKH) and other non-tuna or tuna-like species (NTAD) from the IOTC NC database

The reporting of catches of sharks and species other than those covered in the IOTC Agreement has been scarce and uneven over time. It is currently impossible to know to what extent the catches of these species are underestimated due to the lack of reliable data.

The reporting of discards has also been very low. Furthermore, when reported, the discards never represented the total amount and no indication on what proportion of the total catches was covered, being impossible to estimate their totals. These discards might involve considerable amounts of undersized tuna species, especially in purse seine fisheries exploiting schools associated to fish aggregating devices (FADs).

Gear	SppGroup	Total	Aggregated	Disaggregated
Longline	NTAD	5,480	5,110	370
	SKH	28,307	16,760	11,547
Purse seine	NTAD	5	0	5
	SKH			
TOTAL		33,792	21,870	11,922

Table 2: Average catches of sharks (SKH) and other non-tuna or tuna-like species (NTAD) recorded under species aggregates (Aggregated) or at the species level (Disaggregated) in the IOTC NC database for the period 1996-2000

This underreporting concerns more industrial fisheries, mainly longline and purse seine, than artisanal fisheries, where the amount of discards is thought negligible.

Species aggregation is, besides underreporting, an important problem concerning the reporting of these data, with some 60% of the catches available reported under species aggregates.

The implementation of observer programs in industrial fleets might help to reduce the uncertainties regarding the catches of these species.

Species	ScientName	AvCatch	Longline	Purse seine	Baitboat	Gillnet	Line	Other
Sharks various nei	<i>Selachimorpha (Pleurotremata)</i>	44,072	3,320			20,720	186	19,845
Other non tuna-like fishes nei	<i>Fishes non Scombroidei</i>	14,594	206		9,590		4,389	409
Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	3,655	6			3,650		
Non targeted, associated and dependent species		3,365	816			2,549		
Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	3,176	1,933			1,242	0	
Striped bonito	<i>Sarda orientalis</i>	1,476		1	0	456	23	995
Rays, stingrays, mantas nei	<i>Rajiformes</i>	1,256	0			1,255		
Indian mackerel	<i>Rastrelliger kanagurta</i>	1,076				46		1,030
Requiem sharks nei	<i>Carcharhinidae</i>	898	17			881		
Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	682	16			666		
Dogtooth tuna	<i>Gymnosarda unicolor</i>	577	0		214	7	354	2
Thresher sharks nei	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	407	11			396	0	
Hammerhead sharks nei	<i>Sphyrna spp.</i>	389	2			386	0	
Shortfin mako	<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	363	314			49	0	
Common dolphinfish	<i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>	207	73				134	
Sharks mackerel, porbeagles nei	<i>Lamnidae</i>	111				108	3	
Mackerels Indian, nei	<i>Rastrelliger spp.</i>	37	0		11	0	24	2
Smooth-hound	<i>Mustelus mustelus</i>	20	20				0	
Dolphins nei	<i>Delphinidae</i>	14				14		
Tope shark	<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i>	13	3				10	
Blue mackerel	<i>Scomber australasicus</i>	8			7			1
Longfin mako	<i>Isurus paucus</i>	7	7					
Smooth hammerhead	<i>Sphyrna zygaena</i>	7	7					
Copper shark	<i>Carcharhinus brachyurus</i>	5	3					2
Blacktip reef shark	<i>Carcharhinus melanopterus</i>	2						2
Dusky shark	<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>	2						2
Sharks nei other than oceanic whitetip shark and blue shark		1	1					
Porbeagle	<i>Lamna nasus</i>	1	1					
Butterfly kingfish	<i>Gasterochisma melampus</i>	0	0					
Broadnose sevengill shark	<i>Notorhynchus cepedianus</i>	0	0					0
Dogfishes nei	<i>Squalus spp.</i>	0	0					
Tiger shark	<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>	0	0					

Table 3: Species other than tuna and tuna-like for which catches are available in the IOTC NC database and average catches reported for 1996-2000

APPENDIX IV

RESOLUTION 01/06 RECOMMENDATION BY IOTC CONCERNING THE IOTC BIGEYE TUNA STATISTICAL DOCUMENT PROGRAMME

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC).

Recognizing the authority and responsibility of IOTC to manage bigeye tuna in the IOTC area of competence (“Convention Area”), at the international level,

Recognizing also the nature of the international market for bigeye tuna in the Convention Area,

Recognizing also that there is uncertainty on the catch of bigeye tuna in the Convention Area and that the availability of trade data would greatly assist in reducing such uncertainty,

Recognizing also that bigeye tuna is the main target species of “flag of convenience” fishing operations and that most of the bigeye harvested by such fishing vessels are exported to Contracting Parties, especially to Japan,

Recalling that the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) has established its Bluefin Tuna, Bigeye Tuna and Swordfish Statistical Document Programs, and that the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) has also established its Southern Bluefin Tuna Statistical Document Programme,

Recognizing that the Statistical Document Programme is an effective tool to assist the Commission’s effort for the elimination of IUU fishing operations,

Recommends, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article IX of the Agreement, that,

- 1 Contracting Parties, by July 1, 2002 or as soon as possible thereafter, require that all bigeye tuna, when imported into the territory of a Contracting Party, be accompanied by an IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document which meets the requirements described in **Annex 1** or an IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate which meets the requirements described in **Annex 2**. Bigeye tuna caught by purse seiners and pole and line (bait) vessels and destined principally for the canneries in the Convention Area are not subject to this statistical document requirement. The Commission and the Contracting Parties importing bigeye tuna shall contact all the exporting countries to inform them of this Programme in advance of the implementation of the Programme.
- 2 (1) The IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document must be validated by a government official or other authorized individual or institution of the flag State of the vessel that harvested the tuna, or, if the vessel is operating under a charter arrangement, by a government official or other authorized individual of the exporting state, and;
(2) The IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate must be validated by a government official or other authorized individual or institution of the state that re-exported the tuna.
- 3 Each Contracting Party shall provide to the Secretary sample forms of its statistical document and re-export certificate required with bigeye tuna imports and information on validation in the format specified in **Annex 4**, and inform him/her of any change in a timely fashion.
- 4 The Contracting Parties which export or import bigeye tuna shall compile data from the Programme.
- 5 The Contracting Parties which import bigeye tuna shall report the data collected by the Programme to the Secretary each year by April 1 for the period of July 1 - December 31 of the preceding year and October 1 for the period of January 1 - June 30 of the current year, which shall be circulated to all the Contracting Parties by the Secretary. The formats of the report are attached as **Annex 3**.
- 6 The Contracting Parties which export bigeye tuna shall examine export data upon receiving the import data mentioned in paragraph 5 above from the Secretary, and report the results to the Commission annually.

- 7 The Contracting Parties should exchange copies of statistical documents and re-export certificates to facilitate the examination mentioned in paragraph 6, consistent with domestic laws and regulations.
- 8 The Commission shall request Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties to take the measures described in the above paragraphs.
- 9 The Secretary shall request information on validation from all the non-Contracting Parties/Entities/Fishing Entities fishing and exporting bigeye tuna to Contracting Parties, and request them to inform him/her in a timely fashion of any changes to the information provided.
- 10 The Secretary shall maintain and update information specified in paragraphs 3 and 9 and provide it to all the Contracting Parties, and promptly circulate any changes.
- 11 The Commission shall request the non-Contracting Parties which import bigeye tuna to cooperate with implementation of the Programme and to provide to the Commission data obtained from such implementation.
- 12 Implementation of this Programme shall be in conformity with relevant international obligations.
- 13 At the initial stage of the programme, the statistical documents and the re-export certificates will be required for frozen bigeye products. Prior to implementing this Programme for fresh products, several practical problems need to be solved, such as guidelines to ensure procedures to handle fresh products at customs.
- 14 The statistical documents for bigeye tuna caught by fishing vessels flying the flag of a Member State of the European Community may be validated by the competent authorities of the Member State whose flag the vessel flies or by those of a different Member State where the products are landed, provided the corresponding quantities of bigeye tuna are exported outside the Community from the territory of the Member State of landing.
- 15 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article IX, paragraph 4, of the Agreement, the Contracting Parties shall implement this recommendation by July 1, 2002 or as soon as possible thereafter in accordance with the regulatory procedures of each Contracting Party.

Requirements Concerning the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document

- 1 The sample form of the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document shall be as in the Appendix.
- 2 Customs or other appropriate government officials will request and inspect all import documentation including the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document for all bigeye tuna in the shipment. Those officials may also inspect the content of each shipment to verify the information on the document.
- 3 Only complete and valid documents will guarantee that shipments of bigeye tuna will be allowed to enter the territory of Contracting Parties.
- 4 Shipments of bigeye tuna that are accompanied by improperly documented Bigeye Tuna Statistical Documents (i.e., improperly documented means that the Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document is either missing from the shipment, incomplete, invalid or falsified) will be considered illegitimate shipments of bigeye tuna, that are contrary to IOTC conservation efforts, and their entry will be suspended (PENDING RECEIPT OF A PROPERLY COMPLETED DOCUMENT) into the territory of a Contracting Party or subject to administrative or other sanction.
- 5 The import of fish parts other than the meat, i.e., head, eyes, roe, guts, tails may be allowed without the document.

DOCUMENT NUMBER	IOTC BIGEYE TUNA STATISTICAL DOCUMENT		
EXPORT SECTION			
1.FLAG OF COUNTRY/ENTITY/FISHING ENTITY			
2.NAME OF VESSEL AND REGISTRATION NUMBER (when available)			
3.TRAPS (if applicable)			
4.POINT OF EXPORT (City, State / Province, Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)			
5.AREA OF CATCH (check one of the following) (a) Indian (b) Pacific (c) Atlantic * In case of (b) or (c) checked, the item 6 and 7 below do not need to be filled out.			
6.DESCRPTION OF FISH			
Product Type (*1) F/FR D/GG/DR/FL/OT		Gear Code(*2)	Net Weight (Kg)
*1= F=Fresh, FR=Frozen, RD=Round, GG=Gilled and Guttet, DR=Dressed, FL=Fillet OT=Other, describe the type of product			
*2= When the Gear Code is OT, describe the type of gear,_____.			
7.EXPORTER CERTIFICATION <u>I certify that the above information is complete, true, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</u>			
Name	Company name	Address	Signature Date License Number (if applicable)
8.GOVERNMENT VALIDATION <u>I validate that information listed above is complete, true, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</u>			
Total weight of the shipment _____ Kg			
Name & Title	Signature	Date	Government Seal

IMPORT SECTION:

IMPORTER CERTIFICATION I certify that the above information is complete, true, and correct
to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Importer Certification (Intermediate Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)

Name Address Signature Date License # (if applicable)

Importer Certification (Intermediate Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)

Name Address Signature Date License # (if applicable)

Final Point of Import

City _____ State/Province _____ Country / Entity / Fishing Entity

NOTE: If a language other than English is used in completing this form. Please add the English translation on this document.

INSTRUCTIONS

DOCUMENT NUMBER: Block for the issuing Country to designate a country coded Document Number.

(1) FLAG COUNTRY/ENTITIES/FISHING ENTITIES: Fill in the name of the country of the vessel that harvested the bigeye tuna in the shipment and issued this Document. According to the Recommendation, only the flag state of the vessel that harvested the bigeye tuna in the shipment or, if the vessel is operating under a charter arrangement, the exporting state can issue this Document.

(2) NAME OF VESSEL AND REGISTRATION NUMBER (when available): Fill in the name and registration number of the vessel that harvested the bigeye tuna in the shipment.

(3) TRAPS (if applicable): Fill in the name of the trap that harvested the bigeye tuna in the shipment.

(4) POINT OF EXPORT: Identify the City, State or Province, and Country from which the bigeye tuna was exported.

(5) AREA OF CATCH: Check the area of catch. (If (c) or (d) checked, items 6 and 7 below do not need to be filled out.)

(6) DESCRIPTION OF FISH: The exporter must provide, to the highest degree of accuracy, the following information.

NOTE: One row should describe one product type

(1) Product Type: Identify the type of product being shipped as either FRESH or FROZEN, and in ROUND, GILLED AND GUTTED, DRESSED, FILLET or OTHER form. For OTHER, describe the type of products in the shipment.

(2) Gear Code: Identify the gear type which was used to harvest the bigeye tuna using the list below. For OTHER TYPE, describe the type of gear, including farming.

(3) Net product weight in kilograms.

(7) EXPORTER CERTIFICATION: The person or company exporting the bigeye tuna shipment must provide his/her name, company name, address, signature, date the shipment was exported, and dealer license number (if applicable).

(8) GOVERNMENT VALIDATION: Fill in the name and full title of the official signing the Document. The official must be employed by a competent authority of the flag state government of the vessel that harvested the bigeye tuna appearing on the Document or other individual or institution authorized by the flag state. When appropriate, this requirement is waived according validation of the document by a government official, or if the vessel is operating under a charter arrangement, by a government official or other authorized individual or institution of the exporting state. The total weight of the shipment shall also be specified in this block.

(9) IMPORTER CERTIFICATION: The person or company that imports bigeye tuna must provide his/her name, address, signature, date the bigeye was imported, license number (if applicable), and final point of import. This includes imports into intermediate countries. For fresh and chilled products, the signature of the importer may be substituted by a person of a customs clearance company when the authority for signature is properly accredited to it by the importer.

GEAR CODE:

<i>GEAR CODE</i>	<i>GEAR TYPE,</i>
BB	BAITBOAT
GILL	GILLNET
HAND	HANDLINE
HARP	HARPOON
LL	LOGLINE
MWT	MID-WATER TRAWL
PS	PURSE SEINE
RR	ROD AND REEL
SPHL	SPORT HANDLINE
SPOR	SPORT FISHERIES UNCLASSIFIED
SURF	SURFACE FISHERIES UNCLASSIFIED
TL	TENDED LINE
TRAP	TRAP
TROL	TROLL
UNCL	UNSPECIFIED METHODS
OT	OTHER TYPE

RETURN A COPY OF COMPLETED DOCUMENT TO: (the name of the office of the competent authority of the flag state).

**Requirements Concerning
the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate**

- 1 The sample form of the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate shall be as in the Appendix.
- 2 Customs or other appropriate government officials will request and inspect all import documentation including the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate for all bigeye tuna in the shipment. Those officials may also inspect the content of each shipment to verify the information on the document.
- 3 Only complete and valid documents will guarantee that shipments of bigeye tuna will be allowed to enter the territory of Contracting Parties.
- 4 A Contracting Party shall be free to validate IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificates for bigeye tuna imported by that Contracting Party, to which IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Documents or IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificates are attached. IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificates shall be validated by government organizations or by recognized institutions which are accredited by a Contracting Party's government to validate the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document. A copy of the original Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document accompanying the imported bigeye tuna must be attached to an IOTC Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate. The copy of the original Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document so attached must be verified by that government organization or by that recognized institution accredited by a government which validated the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document. When re-exported bigeye tuna is again re-exported, all copies of documents, including a verified copy of a Statistical Document and Re-export Certificate which accompanied that bigeye tuna upon importation, must be attached to a new Re-export Certificate to be validated by a re-exporting Contracting Party. All copies of the Documents to be attached to that new Re-export Certificate must be also be verified by a government organization or a recognized institution accredited by a government which validated the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document.
- 5 Shipments of bigeye tuna that are accompanied by improperly documented Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate (i.e., improperly documented means that the Bigeye Tuna Re-export Certificate is either missing from the shipment, incomplete, invalid or falsified) will be considered illegitimate shipments of bigeye tuna, that are contrary to IOTC conservation efforts, and their entry will be suspended (PENDING RECEIPT OF A PROPERLY COMPLETED DOCUMENT) into the territory of a Contracting Party or subject to administrative or other sanction.
- 6 IOTC Contracting Parties that validate Re-export Certificates in accordance with the procedure set forth in paragraph 4 shall require from the re-exporting bigeye dealer necessary documents (e.g. written sales contracts) which are to certify that the bigeye tuna to be re-exported corresponds to the imported bigeye tuna. Contracting Parties which validate Re-export Certificates shall provide flag states and importing states with evidence of this correspondence upon their request.
- 7 The import of fish parts other than the meat, i.e., head, eyes, roe, guts, tails may be allowed without the document.

DOCUMENT NUMBER	IOTC BIGEYE TUNA RE-EXPORT CERTIFICATE			
RE-EXPORT SECTION:				
1.RE-EXPORTING COUNTRY / ENTITY / FISHING ENTITY				
2.POINT OF RE -EXPORT				
3.DESRIPTION OF IMPORTED FISH				
Product Type(*) F/FR RD/GG/DR/FL/OT		Net Weight (Kg)	Flag country/ Entity/Fishing Entity	Date of Import
4.DESRIPTION OF FISH FOR RE-EXPORT				
Product Type(*) F/FR RD/GG/DR/FL/OT		Net Weight (Kg)		
* F=FRESH, FR=Frozen, RD=Round, GG=Gilled and Guttred, DR=Dressed, FL=Fillet OT=Other(Describe the type of product)				
5.RE-EXPORTER CERTIFICATION: <u>I certify that the above information is complete, true and correct</u> <u>to the best of my knowledge and belief.</u>				
Name/Company Name Address Signature Date License Number (if applicable)				
6.GOVERNMENT VALIDATION: <u>I validate that the above information is complete, true and correct</u> <u>to the best of my knowledge and belief.</u>				
Name & Title Signature Date Government Seal				

IMPORT SECTION:

7. IMPORTER CERTIFICATION: I certify that the above information is complete, true and correct
to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Importer Certification (Intermediate Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)

Name Address Signature Date License # (if applicable)

Importer Certification (Intermediate Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)

Name Address Signature Date License # (if applicable)

Importer Certification (Intermediate Country / Entity / Fishing Entity)

Name Address Signature Date License # (if applicable)

Final Point of Import

City _____ State/Province _____ Country / Entity / Fishing Entity

NOTE: If a language other than English is used in completing this form. Please add the English translation on this document.

INSTRUCTIONS

DOCUMENT NUMBER: Block for the issuing Country/Entity/Fishing Entity to designate a Country/Entity/Fishing Entity coded document number.

(1) RE-EXPORTING COUNTRY/ENTITY/FISHING ENTITY

Fill in the name of the Country/Entity/Fishing Entity which re-exports the bigeye tuna in the shipment and issued this Certificate. According to the IRecommendation, only the re-exporting Country/Entity/Fishing Entity can issue this Certificate.

(2) POINT OF RE-EXPORT

Identify the City/State Province and Country/Entity/Fishing Entity from which the bigeye tuna was re-exported.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF IMPORTED FISH

The exporter must provide, to the highest degree of accuracy, the following information: NOTE: One row should describe one product type. (1) Product type: Identify the type of product being shipped as either FRESH or FROZEN, and in ROUND, GILLED AND GUTTED, DRESSED, FILLET or OTHER form. For OTHER, describe the type of products in the shipment. (2) Net weight: Net product weight in kilograms. (3) Flag Country/Entity/Fishing Entity: the name of the Country/Entity/Fishing Entity of the vessel that harvested the bigeye tuna in the shipment. (4) Date of import: Imported date.

(4) DESCRIPTION OF FISH FOR RE-EXPORT

The exporter must provide, to the highest degree of accuracy, the following information: NOTE: One row should describe one product type. (1) Product type: Identify the type of product being shipped as either FRESH or FROZEN, and in ROUND, GILLED AND GUTTED, DRESSED FILLET or OTHER form. For OTHER, describe the type of products in the shipment. (2) Net weight: Net product weight in kilograms.

(5) RE-EXPORTER CERTIFICATION

The person or company re-exporting the bigeye tuna shipment must provide his/her name, address, signature, date the shipment was re-exported, and re-exporter's license number (if applicable).

(6) GOVERNMENT VALIDATION

Fill in the name and full title of the official signing the Certificate. The official must be employed by a competent government authority of the re-exporting Country/Entity/Fishing Entity appearing on the Certificate, or other individual or institution authorized to validate such certificates by the competent government authority.

(7) IMPORTER CERTIFICATION

The person or company that imports bigeye tuna must provide his/her name, address, signature, date the bigeye tuna was imported, license number (if applicable) and re-exported final point of import. This includes imports into intermediate Countries/Entities/Fishing Entities. For fresh and chilled products, the signature of the importer may be substituted by a person of a customs clearance company when the authority for signature is properly accredited to it by the importer.

RETURN A COPY OF THE COMPLETED CERTIFICATE TO: (the name of the office of the competent authority of the re-exporting Country/Entity/Fishing Entity).

REPORT OF THE IOTC BIGEYE TUNA STATISTICAL DOCUMENT

Period _____ to _____, _____ IMPORT COUNTRY/ENTITY/FISHING ENTITY
 Month Month Year

Flag Country/Entity /Fishing Entity	Area Code	Gear Code	Point of Export	Product Type		Product Wt.(Kg)
				F/FR	RD/GG/DR/FL/OT	

<u>Gear Code</u>	<u>Gear Type</u>
BB	Baitboat
GILL	Gillnet
HAND	Handline
HARP	Harpoon
LL	Longline
MWT	Mid-water trawl
PS	Purse seine
RR	Rod & reel
SPHL	Sport Handline
SPOR	Sport fisheries unclassified
SURF	Surface fisheries unclassified
TL	Tended line
TRAP	Trap
TROL	Troll
UNCL	Unclassified methods
OTH	Other type (Indicate the type of gear):

<u>Product type</u>	<u>Area Code</u>
F	Fresh ID Indian Ocean
FR	Frozen PA Pacific
RD	Round AT Atlantic
GG	Gilled & gutted
DR	Dressed
FL	Fillet
OT	Other form, describe the type of products in the shipment

REPORT OF THE IOTC BIGEYE TUNA RE-EXPORT CERTIFICATE

Period _____ to _____, _____ IMPORT COUNTRY/ENTITY/FISHING ENTITY
 Month Month Year

Flag Country/Entity/ Fishing Entity	Re-export Country/Entity/ Fishing Entity	Point of Re-export	Product Type		Product Wt.(Kg)
			F/FR	RD/GG/DR/FL/OT	

Product type

- F Fresh
- FR Frozen
- RD Round
- GG Gilled & gutted
- DR Dressed
- FL Fillet
- OT Other form, describe the type of products in the shipment

INFORMATION ON VALIDATION OF IOTC STATISTICAL DOCUMENTS

1 Flag

2 Government/Authority Organization(s) accredited to validate Statistical Documents

Organization Name	Organization Address	Sample Seal

NOTE: For each organization, attach a list with the names, titles and addresses of the individuals authorized to validate Documents.

3 Other institutions accredited by the government/authority to validate Statistical Documents

Organization Name	Organization Address	Sample Seal

NOTE: For each organization, attach a list with the names, titles and addresses of the individuals authorized to validate Documents.

Instructions

Contracting Parties, non-Contracting Parties, Entities, Fishing Entities having vessels that harvest species whose international trade must be accompanied by Statistical Documents are requested to submit the information on this sheet to the Secretary of IOTC*, and to ensure that any changes to the above are also transmitted to the Secretary on a timely fashion.

*IOTC; P.O.BOX 1011, Fishing Port, Victoria, Seychelles

APPENDIX V

VR_EditRecords : Form

Vessel Identification

ID: 3546 Ship Picture

Ship Name (Latin): ALBACORA 4 Ship Name (Originaly):

First Year Activity: 1984 Last Year Activity: 2002 Alias Record: 1

Year Built: 1974 ShipYard: UNCL Country Built: UNCL

Lloyds' number: 7325904 Hull material: STL Comments:

Previous Ship Name:

Type	Description	Year First Reported	Year Last Reported	Comments
▶ FLAG	ESP	1984	2002	
NRN	VI-5 9478	1984	2001	
RCS	EALH	1984	2001	
HOME	VIGO	1984	2002	
GEAR	PS	1984	2002	

OwnerShip

Type: OWN

Name of the Company: EUROPEA DE TUNIDOS Country: UNCL

Year First Reported: 1984 Year Last Reported: 2002

Phone: Fax: E-mail:

Record: 1 of 2

Vessel Characteristics

Type	Units	Size	Year First Reported	Year Last Reported	ShipYardC hanged	Country Changed
▶ LOA	m	76.21	1984	2001	UNCL	UNCL
LWL	m	65.99	1984	2001	UNCL	UNCL
GT	t	1970	1984	2001	UNCL	UNCL
GRT	t	1582	1984	2001	UNCL	UNCL
EPOW	kw	2984	1984	2001	UNCL	UNCL

Reporting

Year	Flag	Reporting Country	Gear	Location	Ocean Reported	Activity Ind. Oc.	Licensed EEZ	Com
▶ 1984	ESP	EUR	PS	UNCL	ID	YES	UNCL	
1985	ESP	EUR	PS	UNCL	ID	YES	UNCL	
1988	ESP	EUR	PS	UNCL	ID	YES	UNCL	
1989	ESP	EUR	PS	UNCL	ID	YES	UNCL	
1990	ESP	EUR	PS	UNCL	ID	YES	UNCL	

Activity

Flag	Reporting Country	Last Port of Call	Date Trip Started	Date Trip Ended	Location	Date Departure	Com
▶ ESP	SYC	UNCL		30-Jan-00	VICTORIA	05-Feb-00	h
ESP	SYC	UNCL		02-Mar-00	VICTORIA	06-Mar-00	h
ESP	SYC	UNCL		27-Mar-00	VICTORIA	30-Mar-00	h
ESP	SYC	UNCL		06-Apr-00	VICTORIA	06-Apr-00	h
ESP	SYC	UNCL		01-May-00	VICTORIA	05-May-00	h

Record: 45 of 6193