



NEAFC

PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT

**9 & 10 April 2008
London**

Executive Summary of Report of the Meeting

PECCOE met on 9-10 April at NEAFC Headquarters under the Chair of Mr Martin Newman, the EU. All Contracting Parties were present. The Secretariat was rapporteur and the main issues on the agenda are listed below.

Scheme of Control and Enforcement - Implementation evaluation

At the request of the Committee, the Secretariat had analysed reporting by FMCs to the Scheme in 2007, i.e. position, catch, entry and exit messages. In addition, two Contracting Parties reported in written form and three orally on their own performance and problems encountered. Three Contracting Parties followed the Scheme to the letter, whereas two had problems fulfilling the requirement of the Scheme especially with respect to catch, entry and exit messages

It was agreed that this type of analysis of reporting on fishing activity should be made on a monthly basis to assist the planning of inspections. The Secretariat will prepare this for the October PECCOE Meeting.

With respect to correcting errors it was agreed that the FMC that has sent a message should stay in control with the authority to cancel and amend. A clear procedure for cancellation and sending a new message should be developed. To support this, the Secretariat was asked to be more active in reporting errors, for example by developing an automated mechanism warning when something was missing. This could be done by developing a system generating automatic e-mails with a warning from the database to the FMC. A proposal will be presented to the October meeting of PECCOE. A list of major problems in reporting was reviewed.

Clarifying amendments to Articles 17 and 28 were agreed.

Control measures for redfish

Particular tasks for PECCOE are the monitoring and verification of catches, uptake of quota by vessels, control of landings (including weighing procedures and inspection of landings), conversion factors for different products and methods of processing. It was suggested that the approach should be the same in the Irminger Sea and the Norwegian Sea (ICES SA I and II).

The requirement to report catch data correctly was stressed in the light of the recent agreement with respect to pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea that if a vessel did report correctly and the FMC did not do its part, the vessel could lose its authorisation. PECCOE agreed to define a closed box in the pelagic redfish fishery in the Irminger Sea in order to be able to monitor the time limited percentages of the total quota allowed in the box. Tentative decision rules were presented.

Tentative decision rules with respect to real time reports from vessels.

More than 30 % of 46,000, 13,800 tonnes in the box before 10 May - stop fishery in box until 11 May.

More than 65 % of 46,000, 29,900 tonnes in the box before 15 July - stop fishery in box until 16 July.

More than 99 % of 46,000, 45,540 tonnes in total at any time - close the fishery.

There was consensus that to monitor this fishery efficiently daily reporting is required.

Landing controls

Detailed labelling of product boxes is necessary. Landing controls should follow as closely as possible existing arrangements for port control. A separate landing declaration may be needed. It was agreed to prepare NEAFC measures on weighing for the October PECCOE meeting. National weighing measures were presented to the meeting.

The question was raised as to whether this calls for a specific recommendation on amendments to the Scheme or if they could be inferred from recommendations for management measures under Articles 5 and 6.

Following a Norwegian demonstration of a map facility, developed by a private company, which brings forward all data from the databases necessary for control and monitoring, Contracting Parties and the Secretariat were encouraged to look into these possibilities

Port State Control

A proposal to allow a shorter time interval in the Scheme to apply for entry into port for landing was agreed and a proposal for a recommendation will be presented to the EM2008.

It was also agreed to amend the PSC forms by taking out the reference to ICES in “area of catch” with the understanding that all catches are declared irrespective of area, but the flag state shall only verify catches from the NEAFC Convention Area.

Cooperative non-Contracting Party status

There are still outstanding issues with the applications from Panama and the Bahamas. PECCOE is not in a position to make any new proposal to EM2008.

IUU Lists A and B

PECCOE considered that the documentation presented by the flag state with respect to Polestar was insufficient to propose to EM2008 that its status on the B-list should be changed. The A and B-lists were reviewed and information on the different vessels noted.

Non-Contracting Party measures

PECCOE reviewed minor changes to Articles 34 to 46, tidying up language to cover all fishing activities including reefer activity and allowing the tidying up of the A and B-lists by removing scrapped vessels and vessels which have been reassigned for purposes other than fishing. The Committee agreed changes in Articles 34.1. a) and b); 38.1; 41; 44.1; 44.4; 44.4e.; 45, 45.1 a)9, b), c), d), e); 45.2 and 45.2. A proposal for a recommendation will be put forward as a recommendation to the EM2008.

New system for monthly catch reporting (Art. 10)

The item was discussed, and kept open for the next PECCOE meeting.

Monitoring Control and surveillance in deep-sea demersal fisheries

PECCOE discussed whether shorter reporting intervals would be necessary to protect vulnerable areas. Although there seemed to be general support for reducing the reporting time from 2 hours to 1 hour no decision was made.

Traceability of fish and fish products

Mr Geir Myrvold, from the company *tracetracker* made a presentation.

Compilation of list of conversion factors

It has been agreed by Coastal and Fishing states to use a global factor of 1.7 for headed and gutted redfish. A global factor for fillets is still outstanding.

1. Opening

The Chair, Mr Martin Newman, EU, opened the meeting welcoming everybody. All Contracting Parties were present.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The agenda, document PE2007/01/01, was adopted.

4. Scheme of Control and Enforcement - Implementation evaluation

Notification/authorisation, catch reporting, VMS messages, surveillance

The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce Doc. PECCOE 2008-01-07, an analysis of the reporting of FMCs for selected fisheries and periods.

The scenarios analysed were

- Mackerel August IIb
- Herring August IIb
- Blue Whiting May/June IIb
- Blue Whiting January – February 2007 IIb
- Redfish May 2007 XIVb
- SEN/SEX and OBS messages by Contracting Parties

The EU representative thanked the Secretariat for the paper and asked if monthly data of this type could be produced, that is fishing activity by month as this would help the planning of inspections. The Secretariat confirmed this and it was agreed that this should be done for the October meeting.

The Icelandic representative reminded the meeting that it had been agreed in October 2007 that Contracting Parties should report to the Secretariat about the status of reporting. It was important to ascertain that Parties reported according to the Scheme now we are 8 years into the Scheme. The Norwegian representative supported this.

The Chair invited the Icelandic representative and the Norwegian representative to introduce their reports (Docs. PECCOE 2008-01-09&10.) No other Parties had reported in writing.

The Icelandic representative noted that Iceland reported monthly catches according to the Scheme and described the monitoring and weighing of landings of NEAFC stocks from Icelandic vessels in Iceland, the Faroe Islands and Norway. According to the analysis by the Secretariat, the Icelandic FMC reports according to the Scheme in all respects.

The Norwegian representative described their reporting and drew attention to some problems with RET messages and suggested a simpler system. All Norwegian catches are controlled and weighed on landing.

The EU representative reported orally about the status of catch reporting and other reports. Catch reports are according to the Scheme. With respect to FMCs, all do not report according to the Scheme, but he was not in a position to give details on FMC performance. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands) sends monthly catches. VMS data are sent automatically. Greenland has one vessel and VMS messages are sent automatically. Monthly catches are forwarded by e-mail. The representative of the Russian Federation did not have the necessary expertise in the delegation to report on the status of catch and other reporting. According to the analysis by the Secretariat, the Russian FMC reported according to the Scheme in all respects.

The Chair found the information in the Norwegian paper very interesting, especially problems in reporting routines and possible needs to be able to cancel and/or correct messages. The Norwegian representative thought that sending corrections of mistakes to the Secretariat for manual insertion was probably not a good idea, other ways should be found. The Secretariat agreed that the FMC that had sent a message should stay in control with the authority to cancel and amend. This also goes for messages such as SEN and SEX. A clear procedure for cancellation and sending a new message would be helpful.

The EU representative informed that they had problems with SEN/SEX messages and also saw a need for establishing procedures. Some simple way of cancelling erroneous messages should be in place. The Secretariat noted that a proposal for cancellation procedures had been discussed earlier, but had not been agreed. That proposal could be presented again. The Icelandic representative agreed with the findings of the Norwegian paper and suggested that the old cancellation proposal could be considered at the meeting in October. He reminded the meeting about former discussions on return messages. The EU representative supported the Icelandic position and stressed that the FMC should always be in control, but the Secretariat should be more proactive in informing about errors.

The Icelandic representative pointed out that there should always be a match of two messages in cases of transshipment, one from the donor and one from the receiver vessel. There should be an automated mechanism warning when something is missing. The Secretariat noted that what is important is that inspectors have the necessary data from the database before they board a vessel. Therefore corrections may be too late to be of use in that respect, but they are important to be able to describe the total activity of the vessel. It would be possible to have automated information about mismatches with respect to transshipments going to the relevant FMC. The Secretariat could have a proposal ready for the October meeting. The Icelandic representative noted that similar mechanisms could be established for other types of message.

The Chair noted Article 10, landed and transhipped catches, and Article 12 on reporting directly from the vessel. He asked if these two sources of reports on catch volume were matched or compared. The report under 10 is not under any confidentiality rules. The Norwegian representative noted that it is a common experience in control that different sources give results that differ for a number of reasons. In the redfish fishery it was important to use the catches reported under Article 12 in order to be able to close the fishery in time. Monthly catches give the possibility of evaluating the success of the closure. The Icelandic representative informed that they compare landings with other reports.

The Chair suggested that the responsibility of the FMCs should be specified and when the Secretariat, which has the full overview, should inform on problems. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) supported the idea that the Secretariat should be more proactive in informing FMCs. The EU representative suggested that AGDC may be asked to look into this problem. The Chair asked if the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) meant that the Secretariat should establish a central alarm system drawing attention to missing reports. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) found that this would be more effective than just relying on the return messages.

The Chair was mindful that this role by the Secretariat was not envisaged when the Scheme was established. The Icelandic representative informed that the understanding at that time was the small size of the Secretariat would not allow a more active role. Flag states were expected to react on any information and be in control. He accepted that AGDC could look into the problem. The Secretariat pointed to the possibility of generating automatic e-mails from the database; the system could thus be more informative without any manual intervention. However, this only made sense if these e-mails were really read. The Icelandic representative referred to a similar discussion in NAFO. His understanding was that this was technically quite simple and feasible.

The Chair asked if there was a need to define in which situations automatic messages should be generated to avoid drowning FMCs in information. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) asked if the Secretariat could indicate a top-10 list of major problems in reporting. The Secretariat listed five immediately. It was suggested that these be put on paper and this was agreed. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested that an alarm system was tested on the 2007 data to see the consequences and volumes of information generated. The EU representative asked if it was agreed that AGDC and the Secretariat should look into the problem. The Chair summed up that the Secretariat will list the major problems and suggest an alarm system; this will go to AGDC. This probably did not need any amendment of the Scheme. The NEAFC Commission has to adopt a resolution because of the financial implications. The Chair of AGDC saw a need to report before the next PECCOE meeting. He noted that if FMCs complied fully with the Scheme the need for this system would be very much reduced. The Chair hoped that such a system would introduce the necessary discipline into the system, and thereby reduce and mitigate the problem.

He then drew attention to Doc 05 in which the EU proposes an amendment to the Scheme under Article 28 adding references for infringements to Articles 17 and 28 and inserting surveillance in 28.3. The Icelandic representative thanked the EU for making this necessary proposal for improving control and supported it. The Chair asked how swiftly these amendments should be submitted to the NEAFC Commission. This will be decided after the discussion of item 5. He concluded that there was consensus on the EU proposal in 05.

The Norwegian representative suggested that these matters should be further discussed under items 5 and 10. The representatives of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and the EU agreed. The Icelandic representative could accept that, but was surprised that only two Contracting Parties had reported in written form on the status of reporting. There was a stark need to correct the situation to be able to monitor the redfish fisheries, where a lack of reporting would mean that vessels were without authorisation. The Norwegian representative supported this and reminded that vessels now have to report daily. To make this effective it is very important to sort out the problems in catch reporting.

The Chair agreed that the rest of the discussion could be taken under items 5 and 10. He noted that even if the vessel did report correctly and the FMC did not do its part, the vessel could lose its authorisation.

The EU representative asked about a comment in Doc. PE 2008-01-07 rev 1 that a Danish vessel was targeting other regulated resources. He wondered how this had come out of the analysis. He also noted that the Dutch vessel mentioned had actually submitted catch reports both automatically and in an e-mail.

The Secretariat observed that it was very difficult to establish what was going on if the requirements of the Scheme were not followed. In this case, there was a COX/COE or CAT message indicating another species. The Secretariat pointed out that the Scheme did not foresee messages being sent by e-mail and reporting by means other than automatic messages to the VMS database creates problems for the Secretariat. The Icelandic representative agreed with this statement and pointed out that, when the reporting requirements of the Scheme were set up, the small size of the Secretariat was important. The EU representative noted that messages sent by a Dutch vessel seemed to have disappeared. He suggested that the analysis by the Secretariat should have been circulated earlier to allow FMCs to look into the matter. The Secretariat accepted this.

The EU representative noted that the Scheme indicated electronic means and that included e-mails. The Chair drew attention to Article 12 and its reference to Annex 9, which lists the data protocols and formats, and e-mail is therefore not appropriate. Procedures have to be duly tested and the Scheme does not now mention a specific protocol, as technology develops all the time. He stressed the role of the Secretariat in these matters and mentioned the information in Doc. PE 2008-01-15 on warnings to be

sent to FMCs, but he agreed with the Icelandic representative that there was a limit to the capacity of the Secretariat to deal in detail with problems with communication.

5. Control measures for redfish

Protected area in the Irminger Sea, monitoring of catches, inspection of landings

The Chair introduced Doc. PE 2008-01-11 listing the points for discussion under this item. Particular tasks for PECCOE are the monitoring and verification of catches, uptake of quota by vessels, control of landings (including weighing procedures and inspection of landings), conversion factors for different products and methods of processing. He suggested that the approach should be the same in the Irminger Sea and the Norwegian Sea (ICES SA I and II).

He noted the definition of the area, in which catches were limited in volume and time, and felt that it had to be clearer. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) would have preferred the box agreed the two previous years. He suggested a clear definition of the box and had prepared maps, shown in Annex I. The box from last year was shown. This has been increased to go from 36 W north of 59 N. Vessels have to send a message when they enter the area, but the area has not been defined to the east and north. The Icelandic representative said in those cases the entry will be into the Regulatory Area from EEZs. Iceland has used this approach for several years and given the area a name. The Chair pointed out that there may be a problem coming from the east in a straight line - there would not be any box line to cross and start reporting procedures. The Icelandic representative explained their experience and did not see there was any need to change the measure. He then explained the map used by Iceland in detail and the ensuing reports to be made shown in Annex II.

The Chair pointed out that it was possible to enter the area from east. The EU representative agreed. The Norwegian representative asked if it was not enough to close the corridor from the east. In other places the Greenland and Iceland EEZs would be borderlines. The Chair thought it was more straightforward to define a box which triggers reporting. The Icelandic representative pointed out that the Scheme only triggers reporting when entering the Regulatory Area. Inside the Regulatory Area positions, together with catch reports, will allocate catches geographically. The EU representative was not convinced. The Norwegian representative maintained that a third line closing the corridor would make it more obvious which area should be closely monitored and trigger the "1 hour in advance" report agreed. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) pointed out that they needed to define the box to the north following the 36 E to the North and then a line to the east following the 26 E. The Icelandic representative admitted it was simpler to define an area and give it a name. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested that the box should simply be ICES Sub-division XIVb1. The Chair felt that this was not necessarily in line with the agreement.

It was pointed out that a NAFO solution would be the most effective, a defined area that triggers reporting. The EU representative called for a solution to be as simple as possible.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed. The Icelandic representative saw the problem that there was no named area to refer to and would support giving the area a name. It was agreed to create a box. The EU representative indicated that he had to coordinate before committing his position.

It was agreed that the Icelandic representative would inform about the discussions in NAFO on how reporting takes place when entering and leaving 3M.

With respect to uptake of quota of vessels, it was a complicating factor that there is an overall quota with two additional time limited percentages in the box. All these things have to be monitored.

Tentative decision rules with respect to real time reports from vessels

More than 30 % of 46,000, 13,800 tonnes in the box before 10 May - stop fishery in box until 11 May.

More than 65 % of 46,000, 29,900 tonnes in the box before 15 July - stop fishery in box until 16 July.

More than 99 % of 46,000, 45,540 tonnes in total at any time - close the fishery.

There was consensus that to monitor this fishery daily reporting is required. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested that the pattern of fishery in 2007 should be studied to assist monitoring. It was also felt that to make simplify matters daily catch reporting should apply to all fisheries for pelagic *S. mentella*.

Landing controls

It was agreed that to make this work detailed labelling of boxes is necessary. Fish is only landed frozen. Some of the landings are already covered by the Port State Control System.

That means there are forms to cover all landings of pelagic *S. mentella* in the port control system and the general notification procedures of the PSC could used. Time limits may be different - shorter than three days if the port state and the flag state is the same.

Part B of the PSC1 is not very relevant if the flag and port state are the same. This may call for a PSC 4 form, which basically would be a landing declaration. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had given this some thought. Catches inside and outside the box and two time periods have to be recorded, but initially it seemed to be possible to use the PSC1. He needed more time to consider the implications. The EU representative pointed out that PECCOE had a mandate to look into problems of weighing, but he also needed time to consider all implications. The Chair wanted to avoid creating systems that were not compatible. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thought it made sense to use the same procedures towards a CP's own vessels as towards foreign vessels. That would increase transparency; even if the CP's own vessels would, to some extent, be treated differently from foreign vessels. This would also solve the potential problem of

discrimination. The EU representative pointed out that using the term “Port State Control” was wrong. This was a flag state control system and could be quite as transparent. The Norwegian representative observed agreement that a declaration of redfish landings was necessary. He suggested calling the form a Port Control Form. The Chair drew attention to the need for consistency and compatibility between the two systems, as some landings were already covered by the PSC system.

The Chair summed up that some progress had been made. There were two main elements. Reporting according to Article 12, with definitions of area and time and daily catch reporting and proper respect for Article 12 requirements. Performance had not been as it should in its first real test in September last year, monitoring the quota of *S. mentella* SA I and II. It is necessary to have transparent information on what everybody is doing. Landing controls should follow as close as possible the existing arrangements for port control. A separate landing declaration may be needed.

The Icelandic representative assumed that everybody has reported to NEAFC about national arrangements and shares of the total quota. The Secretariat suggested that information from Contracting Parties be circulated. It informed that it does not see its role as monitoring adherence to national arrangements, but attempted to give a very transparent picture of what was going on and alerting Parties to developments in the fisheries.

The Chair invited the EU representative to introduce Doc. PE 2008-01-14 on the weighing of fish. He noted that the industry had participated in developing the procedures. These are based on weighing samples to estimate total weight and prescribe sample size in relation to volume of landings. Most landings of this type are in the Netherlands. Surveys have shown that the system works well. Conversion factors for whole products and gutted and headed presentations are given, but for fillets no factor has been agreed.

The Chair asked in what direction NEAFC should go, more or less detail. Should the NEAFC measure prescribe detail or leave detail to the discretion of Contracting Parties, as long as they described the systems used in a transparent way. If there was agreement a proposal could be prepared for the PECCOE October meeting.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) needed to compare the procedures suggested with domestic arrangements. He would not be in a position to make a decision here. He saw the advantage of including procedures in the Scheme. The Norwegian representative, having been involved in the process, did not have any problems with the procedures and also saw an advantage in having this procedure in the Scheme.

The Chair closed the item, noting that there was a basis supported by Contracting Parties for moving forward and a proposal could be ready in October.

The Chair pointed out that there was a need to tidy up the present version of the Scheme: amendments to Article 7 (abandoned and lost gear), in Article 44 CCAMLR and SEAFO should be included, Annex I should be amended as a consequence of including redfish in SA I and II. The question was raised whether this calls for a specific recommendation on amendments to the Scheme or if they could be inferred from recommendations for management measures under Articles 5 and 6. The EU representative pointed out that the Scheme was always amended by specific recommendations under Article 8. The Chair mentioned that the PSC forms had been amended to take out the reference to ICES in the area of catch column. He suggested that corrections be made in specific recommendations. It was particularly important to update the list of regulated resources.

The Chair invited the Norwegian representative to present a demonstration of a map facility that brings forward all data from the databases necessary for control and monitoring shown in Annex III. VMS and ERS-data as well as electronic logbook data are presented in the map facility. The Norwegian representative thought that such a facility could make life easier for inspectors and inspection vessels in their activity at sea and onshore by presenting different types of information relevant to control and monitoring in an easy and pedagogic way. By using such a facility, inspectors and inspection vessels can easily identify vessels from which NEAFC has not received ERS reports according to the Scheme.

The Norwegian representative informed that Norway is running a pilot project on ERS with the Faroe Islands and Iceland in 2008. In addition, the plan was to install the necessary software on board a couple of Norwegian vessels when fishing in Greenland waters to allow those vessels to send reports to the Greenland fisheries authorities electronically as well. Mention was also made of an ongoing pilot project on ERS between Denmark and Norway in which three Danish vessels are reporting electronically when fishing in Norwegian waters. The ongoing Norwegian pilot project on electronic logbooks in which at the moment 20 trawlers are reporting logbooks data electronically to the Norwegian FMC was also described.

Access to the map facility will be given to inspectors in the Directorate of Fisheries, Norway as well as to the Norwegian Coast Guard. These bodies will be given access to the map on line using secure Internet connections.

To make the map facility even more usable for relevant users, work will start in the spring of 2008 to present manual reports (received from vessels by telefax) in the same map facility. By doing so, it was hoped that the map facility would be even more interesting for inspectors in their work both at sea and on shore.

The plan was also to include information on landings and from other internal sources such as licences and quotas in the future. The amount of data in the future would be huge and works to establish tools that could give “warnings” on vessels that behave “strangely” have started but will not be implemented in the near future.

The “beauty” of the map facility is that the input data to the system is the same as the reports forwarded from flag states to NEAFC (VMS and ERS reports). The Norwegian representative offered to assist the Secretariat in analysing the data from the redfish fishery in SA I and II last year by setting up a dedicated map facility in the Directorate of Fisheries in Norway. The Secretariat as well as other Contracting Parties could be given access to the facility. The facility is a commercial product.

The Chair thanked the Norwegian representative for the presentation and offer and suggested that interested parties should contact the Norwegian delegation in the margin of the meeting. He asked if there was a problem with data protection for the redfish fishery in SA I and II in 2007. The Norwegian representative responded that, if data from last year were not accessible, data from this year might be used to analyse fisheries patterns in different fisheries.

6. Port State Control

Implementation evaluation and possible amendments to the Scheme

The Chair invited the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce Doc. PE 2008-01-16. Norway and the representative of the Russian Federation informed that they needed more time. The representative of the Russian Federation noted that 89 % of landings under the PSC involved Russian vessels. In the light of experience gained, the representative of the Russian Federation would like to propose amendments.

Meeting resumed at 11:45. The Chair went through Doc. PE 2008-01-16 containing the Russian proposal and asked for comments. The EU representative had some concerns about the new paragraph 3. The time given could make planning of inspection difficult. The original Russian proposal indicated a notification period of 24 hours, which would work. Norway noted that the Russian proposal addressed problems experienced with Russian landings in Norway. He suggested that after the first sentence in the new paragraph 3 a new sentence be added, taken from Article 22, allowing for other deadlines. The EU representative could accept that solution if carefully drafted.

The Icelandic representative understood that this did not change the sequence of events. He felt it was important that there was a concrete cancellation if something changed so to be able to follow events. The Norwegian representative had tried to keep things as simple as possible. He thought that if the correction was indicated on the proper stamped form, that should suffice. It would be evident that a form sent earlier was not valid. The Chair noted that in the system the forms get a number, so the correction and cancellation could be related to that number. The Chair felt that we will only discover if this works by trying it out in practice. The EU representative asked how the Secretariat numbers the forms; the information was given. The Chair wondered if there really was a problem. It should be possible to manage this. The Norwegian representative commented that their experience was that these situations can be handled in practical terms. The procedure should be evaluated and if there were problems it could be amended.

The Icelandic representative noted that the only thing that could change was the product weight. The Norwegian representative confirmed this in principle, but in the real world another species could be added, but it would not be possible to start a new fishery. The Icelandic representative asked if the text was too limiting. The EU representative agreed that there may be a case for being more general, but that should be spelt out. The Chair asked if it was more straightforward to do a real cancellation, when more than the product weight changed. The EU representative thought so. This, however, may cause problems with the timing. The Norwegian representative described the situation with Russian vessels fishing in the Norwegian Economic Zone close to the coast. For this situation the present proposal was adequate. The EU representative accepted that Russia and Norway were the two parties close to the problem, so he would go along with the Norwegian representative. The Chair asked if we should refer to catch information in general. The Icelandic representative thought that the cancellation procedure may run into the same problems.

With respect to the PSC forms, the Chair suggested that the area of catch should be amended by taking out reference to ICES, but this may not be straightforward because the catches may be both from the NEAFC and NAFO Area. He referred to the case where a vessel had been refused landing because there were landings from NAFO onboard. The EU representative pointed out that the PSC applied to the NEAFC Convention Area. Therefore NAFO catches should not be included on the form. The Chair noted that the reference to the Convention Area refers to the vessels not the fish. The Norwegian representative thought that the format allowed the reporting of NAFO catches although the Scheme did not apply to them and the flag state should only verify catches from the NEAFC Convention Area.

The Chair felt we should stay with what we have and think about it. A common solution for NAFO and NEAFC should not be undermined by trying to solve the present problem. The Norwegian representative accepted that there may be legal complications, but the important part is that the flow of information on where the catch has been taken allowed the Port State to make its decision. There could be a footnote that only catch from the NEAFC Area had to be verified. The Chair agreed that this was the case for part B of the form. This could be spelt out in the heading of part B and then the reference to ICES could be deleted. If a similar system is introduced for NAFO, this can be changed again. The Norwegian representative asked for time to consider the implications.

Document PE 2008-01-16 rev. 1 was introduced by the Chair. It showed the Russian proposal in the context of the Scheme. It involved forms to cover all situations. It was noted that something was missing in the text, reference to the 24 hours. This will be included in rev 2. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) commented on the readability of certain forms. The EU representative noted that there may be fish from other parts of the world outside NEAFC and NAFO. The Icelandic representative proposed not having NEAFC and NAFO in the heading, but explaining things in a footnote e.g. ICES area or NAFO division. The Norwegian representative suggested that we should learn from experience before we try to cover any conceivable situation. Only NEAFC and NAFO should be mentioned.

The Chair asked it was necessary to indicate ICES area and NAFO division. The Icelandic representative felt that we should make it clear to users. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) would not like this to develop into a complete manual. The Chair felt that the forms in their present form had been well completed. It was agreed to use the heading: Area of catch. The Norwegian representative accepted this with the qualification that total catch onboard was declared. The representative of the Russian Federation agreed. The Icelandic representative asked if it would be clearer to add “all areas”. The EU representative noted the Russian experience and he would like to be informed from the Dutch authorities and the Secretariat. The new reference for flag states to only verify catches from the NEAFC Convention Area was agreed.

The proposal as amended (Doc. PE 2008-01- 16 rev 2) was then agreed and a proposal for a recommendation submitted for the Extraordinary Meeting of the Commission in June.

7. Cooperative non-Contracting Party status

Diversified categories of NCP status, applications for NCP status from Bahamas and Panama

The Secretariat reported that there are still outstanding issues with Panama and the Bahamas. PECCOE considered the documentation presented by the flag state with respect to Polestar was insufficient to propose to the NEAFC Commission (for the Extraordinary Meeting of the Commission 1-3 July) that the status of the Polestar on the B-list should be dropped. The NEAFC Commission will hear the report from PECCOE in July. It will also review the A- and B-lists.

8. IUU Lists A and B

Status of vessels (Polestar, Pavlovsk...)

The Chair referred to Doc. PE 2008-01-08 which described the situation with respect to the A- and B-lists. He also referred to a letter from the Seychelles which informed that the vessel had been delisted from their registry. The Seychelles flag should thus be deleted on the A-list. He noted that there had not been any responses on the three vessels on the A-list and the Committee should propose that the four vessels be transferred to the B-list.

With respect to the B-list, he mentioned that the “Cephey” had been delisted from the Russian registry. This has to be amended in the list. The vessel is on its way to be scrapped in India. The Norwegian representative noted that that he had had the same information.

The Chair referred to Doc. PE 2008-01-06 and the changes proposed to Articles 34.1. a) and b); 38.1; 41; 44.1; 44.4; 44.4e.; 45, 45.1 a9, b), c), d), e); 45.2 and 45.2.

He noted that vessels on the list could not be deleted, but there was a proposal to amend the Scheme to allow this. The list should be tidied up when this change in the Scheme had taken place. He drew attention to two other vessels under the Russian flag, one withheld in Murmansk and one in Kristiansund. The representative of the Russian Federation informed that the Dolphin would probably be scrapped. The representative of the Russian Federation is going to present all documents from the new owners of the Chudovorets. These two vessels have never received fishing licences. The Chair noted that nothing more could be done now. Call signs should be removed for vessels with no flag. The EU representative informed that, according to Lloyds, the Alpha had sunk off West Africa and there were reports that the Iannis has also sunk in harbour.

The Norwegian representative asked if the postal vote via e-mail in the case of the "Pavlovsk" was appropriate. The Chair accepted that there could be problems, but it had worked. He thought a pragmatic approach was valuable. The reality of the situation had called for this solution and this showed flexibility on the part of NEAFC. The Secretariat confirmed that no formal rules had been broken.

It was agreed that these proposed changes will be reconsidered in October aiming at a proposal for a recommendation for the 27th Annual Meeting.

9. Non-Contracting Party measures

Criteria for removal of vessels from the lists, possible amendments to the Scheme

The Chair introduced Doc. PE 2008-01-06 proposing minor changes to Articles 34 to 46, tidying up language to cover all fishing activities including reefer activity and allowing the tidying up of the A and B-lists by removing scrapped vessels and vessels which have been reassigned for purposes other than fishing. He asked if sunken vessels should be included. The Icelandic representative supported this and also thought that the requirement that the flag state has to produce evidence should be changed to allow other evidence as a basis for decision. The Norwegian representative asked if the last known flag state could not produce the evidence. The Chair wondered if they would bother. The EU representative pointed out that the sentence after g) deals with this problem, (Contracting Parties can provide evidence). The Icelandic representative asked if this applied to reefers. The Chair thought that a change in cargo was not permanent reassignment. The EU representative suggested that activities were added at the end of g).

The changes in Article 45 offer clarification of text in 1 and 2 rather than changes in the system and in 3 legalise the steps necessary to have a vessel scrapped or reassigned by derogations.

The Chair asked for further comments and read out the agreed changes to the proposal. The proposal as amended was then agreed and will be put forward as a recommendation to the EM2008.

10. New system for monthly catch reporting (Art. 10)

The Secretariat introduced Doc. PE 2008-01-03. The main conclusion in the paper is that the REP / JUR reporting according to Article 10 of the Scheme does not work because the requirement was to report on species and ICES statistical divisions, not on the stocks and fisheries NEAFC regulates. The result is that the information reported cannot be used to control quota uptake. It is suggested that the reporting requirements in Article 10 are taken out of the Scheme as they are not of relevance to inspectors and inspection platforms. It was also suggested that additional expertise would be gained by organising an advisory group on fisheries statistics.

The Chair asked for comments. The Icelandic representative asked whether delegations could bring statistical experts to the meetings. The Secretariat responded that a system analogous to AGDC was envisaged. The Secretariat is obliged to make the reports available to all parties with specific deadlines, but the information is not really helpful. The Norwegian representative thanked the Secretariat, He was aware of the problems in REP and JUR reporting. One problem is that numbers are provisional so they change all the time until final figures are available. The EU representative asked if we had the right people here. What do we want to use the information for? The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) referred to the NAFO monthly reports. It shows that a similar system can function. The Secretariat referred to the REP-JUR reports for redfish in SA I and IIa. Nobody has submitted final figures after the Annual Meeting.

The Chair noted that there may be a need to amend Article 10. Delegations seemed not to be in a position to commit themselves at this stage. We should concentrate on what we need the figure for and how to make the system efficient. If the data are not used, should PECCOE step back from this obligation? The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested that the Secretariat made a small manual to make reporting easier. He felt it was disgraceful that we cannot produce reliable figures. The Secretariat could be more aggressive.

The Chair kept the issue open for the next PECCOE meeting, allowing Parties to consider the implications.

11. Monitoring Control and Surveillance in deep sea demersal fisheries

The Secretariat introduced the issue of whether shorter reporting intervals would be necessary to protect vulnerable areas. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) would prefer a general reduction in intervals, so there would not be two systems running. He would be able to support a general reduction in the reporting interval from 2 hours to 1 hour. The Norwegian representative supported this as did the Icelandic representative. The Chair asked if 1 hour reports would be enough. He suggested looking closer at this. The Icelandic representative wondered about the practicalities of protecting small areas, for example a system of warnings from the

database. This would mean that entering a closed area would trigger a warning. The Chair thought that we have to reflect more and look at the concrete closures. The EU representative could accept 1 hour intervals, but would not accept shorter intervals. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thought 1 hour may be enough considering the fisheries, but this should be discussed on the basis of the closures agreed. The EU representative drew attention to the requirements from the UN General Assembly Resolution 61/105 and the need to respond by November 2008 at the latest.

12. Traceability of fish and fish products

The meeting resumed at 2 pm. The Chair invited Mr Geir Myrvold of *tracetracker* to make a presentation on this issue. He outlined the technology available and used around the world, in Asia and pilot projects in Norway. Systems aim at making information available to consumers that food products are safe and sustainable, following all elements in the supply chain in real time. He stressed that only electronic trace systems made sense considering the real time concerns and volume of information. Mr. Myrvold's presentation is available for those interested on the PECCOE page of the NEAFC website.

The Chair thanked Mr. Myrvold for his stimulating presentation which could form the basis for further discussions on this issue in PECCOE.

13. Compilation of list of conversion factors

The Chair indicated that no changes to the list in place had been reported, but he urged Contracting Parties to submit factors to update the list. It had been agreed by Coastal and Fishing states to use a global factor of 1.7. for headed and gutted redfish. Distinguishing between different cuts would be too difficult. The other main product was fillets. It should be kept in mind that these factors are for control purposes. He noted the uniform factor of 1.7 for headed and gutted as a massive step forward. There is information about factors for fillets which can be looked at tomorrow. Also in this case a single figure should be established.

The EU representative referred to the need for rules for weighing, which is under a PECCOE mandate originally coming out of the performance review and discussions in WGFN. There is an agreement between Norway, the Faroe Islands and the EU on procedures with respect to weighing fresh pelagic species. The EU has its own regulation for weighing frozen pelagic species. The NEAFC Scheme probably does not need to be so detailed. The EU representative noted that Norway and the Faroe Islands were aware of the EU rules. He was willing to produce a paper tonight that described the system and present it tomorrow. This was agreed.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) commented on the need for global conversion factors for the Regulatory Area. It could create problems that factors in national waters and in the Regulatory Area were not the

same. The Chair admitted this was a problem, but pointed out that this problem was also inherent in the PSC system when controlling landings, where the form only dealt with product weight. The representative of the Russian Federation accepted the convenience of a global factor, but asked about the fillets; should PECMAS not be asked? This was agreed.

14. Any other business

There was none

15. Report to the 2008 Extraordinary and Annual Meetings

The Chair listed the recommendation for the EM2008 mentioned above. Based on the Summary Records, the Secretariat will prepare the report for the EM2008. He reminded Contracting Parties to submit the required annual reports by 1 October at the latest.

The Icelandic representative noted the agreement on creating a redfish box in the Irminger Sea. She asked about daily catch reporting and wondered whether there was agreement. The Chair responded that PECCOE had been asked to look into this under the agreement on measures for pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea for 2008, but daily reporting and the box had to be entered into the Scheme in due course to have effect.

16. Closure of the meeting

The Chair closed the meeting at 4:40 thanking all participants for a useful meeting and wishing everyone a safe journey home. The EU representative thanked the Chair and added thanks to Lars Gråberg, the EU, who is leaving this congregation. Lars Gråberg thanked everybody, he had enjoyed being in this group and especially the development of the PSC forms.