

Report of the Third PECCOE meeting London– 28 – 29 May 2002

1. Opening by the Chairman, H. Koster (EU)

The meeting was opened at 10 am by the Chairman who welcomed representatives from all Contracting Parties. A list of participants is given in Annex A. Those documents available are given in Annex B. No delegation wished to make any comments at the outset of the meeting.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

There were no comments to the agenda, which is attached as Annex C, and no delegation indicated any wish to raise issues under any other business. The Norwegian representative wanted clarification about Agenda item 6 on the deletion of Article 8 of the Scheme. The Secretariat explained the background to this.

4. Running in the Schemes

The Chairman reminded the meeting that this has been a standard agenda item. At this meeting it is only possible to report on a small portion of the year. An annual report would be more appropriate later in the year.

- **Implementation by the Secretariat**

The Secretariat introduced document PE 03/06 describing the status of implementation of the Scheme. There were distinct improvements as both FMCs and the Secretariat gained experience. There was still much to desire regarding transmitting messages automatically. During peak periods the manual entry of observations is still a major task for the Secretariat. The different issues covered in the paper were listed. Details of inspection coverage were given. Coverage is substantial, both in the Irminger and the Norwegian Sea. The bilateral link between national inspection services was very important.

It was noted that the interpretation of some communication parties of the requirements of the Scheme was not consistent with generally accepted interpretation. This caused additional work, more often than not stemming from differences in procedures.

There were no comments to this report from the Contracting Parties

- **Implementation by Contracting Parties**

The Chairman did not want an “annual report” but wished to give Contracting Parties a chance to comment.

The Norwegian representative reported in October 2001 on the exchange of messages between the Norwegian FMC and the Secretariat for the first 9 months of 2001. The Norwegian representative handles most message types automatically according to the Scheme. The automatic transmission of messages from inspection platforms is still outstanding, but would probably be solved soon.

The representative of the Russian Federation noted that the Russian system was fully automated and was not experiencing any problems.

The EU representative noted the different levels of automation between Member States, which would be addressed internally. Some matters would be discussed directly with the Secretariat. The EU representative had suggestions for changes to the Scheme and would revert to that.

The Icelandic representative reported that the system was fully automated and preparations were being made to run trials on alternative communication protocols.

The Polish representative indicated that they were still in the middle of discussions on setting up a Polish VMS, but was not able to comment further on the implementation of the Scheme.

Greenland has progressed slowly since the last meeting, but there were improvements in some respects. This should be seen in the context of the very low number of Greenlandic vessels fishing in the NEAFC area. The Faroe Islands’ system is fully automated and has not experienced any serious problems in implementing the requirements of the Scheme.

- **Implementation by non-Contracting Parties**

The Secretariat reported that Contracting Parties seemed to observe the non-Contracting Party Scheme and gave examples.

At present, Estonia complies fully with NEAFC rules. New Zealand is striving to implement all rules. Estonia also accepts inspection. Belize vessels have allowed inspection and showed some cooperation, but do not report on their activity. Lithuania has sent some information. It is the Secretariat’s impression that Estonia and, to a lesser extent, New Zealand comply with NEAFC’s rules whilst the others do not. There has not been any Japanese activity this year.

The EU has been in contact with Lithuania and would follow possible improvements with interest.

The Icelandic representative reported that Lithuanian vessels had informed Iceland that they were instructed by their owner not to allow inspection. A Latvian vessel had accepted inspection. They also noted that Lithuanian authorities had approached Icelandic authorities to acquire information about logbooks.

The Chairman suggested that facts on each non-Contracting Party and how they have reacted to requests for cooperation were listed. This list could accompany the PECCOE report.

The Secretariat informed the meeting that the President intends to seek clarification on what Contracting Parties expect in the way of cooperation from non-Contracting Parties.

The Chairman concluded that there is reason for satisfaction on what has been achieved with a rather complex Scheme working in real time. The Scheme is working. However, it is unsatisfactory that automatic reporting has not been fully achieved by all communications partners and Contracting Parties.

Before proceeding to the next item, the Chairman noted that PECCOE had not observed its own rule of procedure that papers should be circulated 30 days in advance of the meeting, but he would allow papers to be presented in order to proceed with the work.

Annual reports will be submitted in the agreed format at the latest by 1 October 2002. The Chairman suggested that the annual report should also reflect the improved level of coverage and of cooperation between inspection services, including exchange of inspectors. This should be encouraged

5. 20th Annual Meeting mandate to PECCOE

Port State Control PECCOE Mandate 1

The NEAFC non-Contracting Party Scheme provides for port state control of non-Contracting Party vessels sighted in the R.A by Contracting Party. This requirement should be extended to contracting Party vessels operating in the RA.

The NEAFC Secretariat should be informed of the inspection carried out by Contracting Parties in accordance with a procedure to be adopted by the NEAFC Commission.

PECCOE shall:

1. Elaborate the procedures by which the NEAFC secretariat will be informed of inspections of non-Contracting Party vessels and Contracting Party vessels in their ports.
2. Elaborate the corresponding amendments of the Scheme

The mandate is rather restrictive and the Committee touched upon other elements including coverage, designated ports, equal treatment of Contracting and non-Contracting Parties.

The Committee examined the rules applicable for landings from the NAFO area. NAFO rules stipulate 100 % coverage of landings in Port States. They give detailed rules for inspectors to follow, forms to complete and rules for reporting to NAFO. All NEAFC's Contracting Parties are Contracting Parties of NAFO and the procedures should be familiar to everybody.

The Committee had an extensive discussion on the different elements, but did not make any conclusions.

The Committee decided to adhere to the terms of the mandate closely. There was general agreement that NAF format and automated procedures could be used to inform the NEAFC Secretariat, whatever level of coverage was agreed upon. It was also thought there should be consistency between procedures in NAFO and NEAFC.

Contracting Parties were urged to consider this issue further. The item will be on the agenda of the next PECCOE meeting.

Evaluation of return (RET) messages and record number (RN) data element PECCOE Mandate 2

Difference of opinion between Contracting Parties exists concerning the usefulness of return messages and record numbers. The NEAFC Commission has referred the question concerning record numbers to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Computerisation.

PECCOE shall:

1. Examine the usefulness of return messages for:
 - VMS position messages
 - Other reports
2. Consider reports from the Ad Hoc Working Group Computerisation on record numbers or any other relevant reports from this Group.
3. Where appropriate, elaborate appropriate amendments to the Scheme concerning the above topics

It has been proposed that return messages should be made voluntary for VMS purposes, but some parties consider they are important elements in automated systems. The Secretariat reported that a number of communication partners did not use return messages and, therefore in some cases, had not become aware of serious communication problems.

The Committee was alerted to the fact that changes in communication protocols may offer solutions other than return messages to locate errors. Iceland is initiating trials and would be in the position to report in more detail at a later stage.

The Committee agreed to wait for results from the trials and not make any recommendation to the Commission on this issue for the time being. Results may be available at the next PECCOE meeting.

Control of Transshipment Operations in the NEAFC Regulatory Area PECCOE Mandate 3

During the last PECCOE meeting, Contracting Parties expressed difference of opinion as regards the provisions of the Scheme to apply to transport vessels. Divergence concerned in particular the interpretation of the nature of information to be reported under "catch on board" when sending the Exit report as provided for in Article 10.

Furthermore a review of the results of the 2001 NEAFC campaign revealed inconsistency in the implementation of the rules on transshipment activities

Considering the above, PECCOE shall:

- Examine the current obligations of the Scheme which are applicable to transport vessels,
- Where appropriate, elaborate a clarification of the current provisions of the Scheme, which could imply amendments to the Scheme.

The Chairman explained that this item arose from the need to clarify the status of transport vessels with respect to the Scheme. He referred to Article 7. 1.c and 10. 1.d.

The Norwegian representative did not agree that transport vessels participate in fishing operations. It was noted that there is a distinct difference between a transport operation and a fishing operation. It was pointed out that fishing vessels, processing vessels and transport vessels have to be notified (Article 1). The Norwegian representative argued that a vessel used for transport could not participate in a joint fisheries operation. The Chairman agreed that the definition in Article 1 was not complete.

The Chairman suggested that PECCOE should formulate recommendations on the amendment of Articles 7 and 10, and this should also cover the problem in mandate 4. The Norwegian representative wished to deal with the two items separately because they were so complicated. The Icelandic representative suggested including two new data elements, describing the type of vessel and the form of the transfer, over the side or from the net. The Chairman would like to clarify the present text before adding elements. He suggested starting with Article 1, then going on to 7 and 10 to see if an additional report on joint fisheries operations was necessary. A drafting group was asked to produce text to cover this.

The drafting group produced PE 03/09 1. rev. (Annex D). The Committee went through it paragraph by paragraph. The representatives of Norway and Iceland indicated that they would prefer to take out the square bracket in 3.2.

The Chairman concluded that the proposed changes had not been agreed. There was agreement in principle, but the document was still open to scrutiny and amendment of language and it would be possible to revisit it at the next PECCOE meeting. The square bracket had to remain until then. Norway considered there was danger in opening discussions on all items again. Consensus should be reached on the proposal before the next meeting of PECCOE. The Chairman suggested that Contracting Parties should write to the Secretariat if they discover serious problems. If no written comments are received by the Secretariat, this will be construed as consensus. The Norwegian representative accepted this. Items in bracket are still open to discussion.

On Joint Fishing Operations in the NEAFC Regulatory Area PECCOE Mandate 4

A - DESCRIPTION OF A JOINT FISHING OPERATION

As observed by inspectors in the RA, joint fishing operations could be described as such :

- One fishing vessel has caught an amount of fish in its net (usually around 200 T),
- Fish is kept in the net and swim in the water until a second fishing vessel arrive and,
- Pump part, or usually all, the fish from the net of the first vessel to its one hold.
- This activity has been observed mostly in the Herring Fishery where it was carried out by purse seiner.
- Some of those vessels have been inspected and inspectors observed that :
 - no catch was recorded in the logbook of the fishing vessel having catch the fish in her net (= "catching" vessel),
 - fish received from those "catching" vessels are sometimes recorded in the logbook of the "pumping" vessel, similarly catch reports are sometimes sent but crosschecks of data reveal important inconsistencies : missing reports, discrepancies in quantities reported and recorded, no mention of the origin of the fish...
- when asked, the masters of both vessels were not clear as to who should record the quantities concerned in the logbook (and how) neither did they know who should provide the catch reports provided for by Art. 10 of the Scheme (and how to label it).

B – TASKS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY PECCOE

- Examine the scope of the above activities and the rules currently applied by Contracting Parties to such activities,

- Examine the duties of EACH of the two masters under the terms of the NEAFC Scheme both with regard to recording of information in the logbook, according to Art. 7, and to catch reports, to be provided according to Art. 10,
- Consider whether the current rules do adequately apply to joint fishing operations, or whether they should be clarified and/or completed,
- Where appropriate, elaborate amendments to the Scheme in order to adapt the current obligations to joint fishing operations.

Conversion factors PECCOE Mandate 5

During the first meeting of PECCOE, February 2001, Contracting Parties communicated a summary of the conversion factors used by their national fishing vessels which have been compiled by PECCOE in Document 01/12. In order to establish a list of reference conversion factors to be used for the conversion of product weight to live weight of regulated species, PECCOE shall:

- Compile available experimental data issued from technical and scientific studies on conversion factors carried out by Contracting Parties,
- Identify, for each regulated resource, and product concerned, the most adequate minimal/maximum range of values corresponding to the ratio from the product weight of the processed product to the live weight of the fish caught
- Compare the minimal /maximum range of values with the complete summary of the data provided by Contracting Parties in PECCOE, February 2001

The Chairman went through the requirements in the mandate. Conversion factors have been collected, but no reports have been submitted by Contracting Parties recently qualifying these factors.

The Norwegian representative drew attention once again to the joint Norwegian-Russian experiments in the Barents Sea. He agreed that the only meaningful discussion was on the basis of the various factors in use. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) reported that Greenland had looked into the matter revising factors. These studies would be available in two months. The Icelandic representative informed the meeting that Iceland had not discussed conversion factors bilaterally. He had no material in English, but would present information to the meeting the following day. The representative of the Russian Federation would also be able to present data and thought information from studies of one species could be transferred to others. The Norwegian representative agreed that the methodology could be discussed and inference made from one stock to another. With respect to redfish, he would be interested to learn if any Contracting Party had made observations covering both the Regulatory Area and national waters.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed the meeting that they had used the same method. This resulted in conversion factors, which were averages taking into account all sources of variation. These did not fit all situations and seasons and may not correspond with production factors observed by industry. These averages should be discussed with the industry to get their acceptance. However, he found the approach sound. The Chairman accepted that there were a number of sources of variation. The scientific approach was valid, but the Committee should not redo the work of the scientists. Contracting Parties should have a chance to look into the matter, validate the Norwegian-Russian methodology and make comments for the next meeting of PECCOE.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) supported the idea of presenting factors used by Contracting Parties and then attempting to establish a realistic range. The Norwegian representative informed the meeting that he had made a number of experiments on Japanese cut. Even if there appeared to be differences between stocks of redfish in Norwegian waters and the NEAFC Regulatory Area, these investigations could assist the process of limiting the range of conversion factors.

The Chairman wanted to continue the attempt to establish realistic ranges. He asked if the methodology had been used outside the Barents Sea. Information on specific factors could be submitted to NEAFC. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) reported that Greenland had carried out measurements on redfish on a single vessel in the Irminger Sea, but would not claim that the results had a strong scientific basis. The Icelandic representative and the representative of the Russian Federation had nothing to add.

The Chairman stated that the Committee was not in the position to fulfil the mandate because of the lack of basic data. CPs had to consider organising and funding the necessary research and the methodology presented to the meeting. The aim was to establish a realistic range of factors, especially for redfish in the Irminger Sea. The issue should be kept on the agenda of the next meeting of the Committee.

6. PECCOE Mandate from the Extraordinary Meeting of 2002

- Evaluation of possible consequences of the deletion of Article 8 of the Scheme
- Compilation of a list of known IUU vessels which are operating, or have operated, in the Regulatory Area (including details of flags of convenience, owner and/or charterer)

Deletion of Article 8 of the Scheme

The NEAFC Heads of Delegations have agreed to investigate means of changing the compilation of data of quota uptake. The present system (Article 8) does not work and the resulting statistics are incomplete and of little use. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted that, before the introduction of the Scheme, NEAFC was able to compile statistics on quota uptakes efficiently and timely. He would support a revision of the system to make it efficient and useful. The EU representative asked how the old system had worked. The Secretariat explained that the report at that time included regulated species in international waters and waters under coastal state jurisdiction. The Scheme calls for reporting of a long species list by "ICES areas".

Some Contracting Parties have responded that they need a longer reporting period to be able to report on "ICES Areas"; others report on time, but then make substantial revisions to the figures later. The Secretariat pointed out that no organisation today produced statistics split between international waters and national jurisdiction. ICES took care of reporting on ICES "areas".

The EU representative drew attention to the mandate to consider the deletion of Article 8 of the Scheme. After some exchange of views on how to get accurate and timely data, there seemed to be consensus that timely data on quota uptake was more important than more detailed data. The Chairman stressed that the meeting should be concentrating on which catch data were important for control and enforcement. It could be

construed that the report of total catches was an element of control. There is detailed information from VMS on where catches have been taken.

There was no general agreement on the deletion of Article 8, but precision could be relaxed. PECCOE could recommend that the Article should not be deleted, but that catches should be reported in international waters and waters under the jurisdiction of the coastal states. The long list of species may not be required either, but would probably not cause problems. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed and pointed out that notification only referred to the larger area, and perhaps it would be enough to report on stocks for which there were management measures in place. Iceland concurred. He had no problems in reporting in a more detailed way, but needed more time for that. The EU also agreed and did not think the species list was the problem. The Norwegian representative and the representative of the Russian Federation concurred.

Actions arising: PECCOE recommends that the reference to ICES area under “Relevant area” in Annex V is deleted.

List of IUU vessels

The Chairman proposed discussing criteria for including vessels on such a list. He suggested that the Secretariat should circulate a preliminary list of non-Contracting Party vessels observed fishing in the area together with their compliance. The Commission has to decide on how vessels are included in the list and how they are removed from it and text has to be developed to cover this.

The Secretariat drew attention to paragraph 11 of the non-Contracting Party Scheme. This opened up many scenarios for interpretation. Other elements mentioned were that non-Contracting Parties should be given some time to comply with NEAFC rules, re-flagging, regional cooperation, and opportunities for non-Contracting Parties to join RFMOs.

The Norwegian representative informed the meeting about their experience with blacklisting vessels. They had found that this was a very efficient tool to make vessel owners and others that operate in contravention of agreements aware of the serious implications. The Chairman pointed out that all RFMOs are striving to implement the IPOA on IUU. It may be worthwhile for PECCOE to draw up the main guidelines and produce legal text after a further mandate from the Commission. The whole problem may then be seen in the context of what other organisations decide. (ICCAT is currently holding a conference on this issue in Japan). He invited Contracting Parties to submit papers on this issue.

This item could be revisited at the next PECCOE meeting and proposals prepared for the 21st Annual Meeting.

7. The Norway/Iceland proposal to the 2nd PECCOE Meeting, October 2001

The Norwegian representative introduced the proposal, which had been presented to NEAFC on several occasions. The main reason for the proposal was time limits for reporting entry and exit from the Regulatory

Area for some vessel groups, which seemed to be unnecessarily restrictive. This had been discussed bilaterally with other parties and he felt that there was growing understanding that the NEAFC measures had to be compatible with bilateral arrangements on time limits. The debate on reporting in different for a, trying to establish a common reporting system for the North Atlantic, had led Norway and Iceland to suggest, on reflection, that this could be a special topic at the next PECCOE meeting. For the time being it should be put aside pending further considerations. The Icelandic representative indicated that they agreed with the Norwegian representative on postponement. They would, however, pursue the issue at future meetings as it was a real problem.

8. Discussion on the future management of the North Atlantic Format

The Committee went through Doc. PE 03-04 (Annex E) prepared by the EU page by page. Apart from small editorial changes, the following comments were made.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) wanted consistency in the use of abbreviations in the text and footnotes, and the Secretariat will amend these. He wished to stress the advantages of the NAF, for example the possibilities for manual and computerised handling and flexibility. The Icelandic representative accepted the flexibility, but stressed that changes should be agreed between international organisations. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) pointed out that the description of the registration number and call signal was confusing and the text should be amended.

In the annexes, the Chairman suggested that the list of communication centres should be updated by Contracting Parties, where necessary. He asked the Secretariat to screen the annexes for errors in spelling, format and content. Doc. PE 03-04, which is for information, will be presented to the Commission in November. It has been agreed that national centres should report their use of NAF to NEAFC and the Secretariat will keep track of its use by other RFMOs. The Norwegian representative hoped there would be a chance for all Contracting Parties to go through the report carefully and inform the Secretariat of any problems. The Chairman also suggested that an updated version should be put on the NEAFC website. This could also include names of contact persons, if these agreed.

The Icelandic representative reflected on the NAF. The multipurpose scope was important and also the reporting of use, but there should be a custodian to monitor the introduction of new data elements. The Chairman felt that this was very much a question of timing. FAO controls species codes and, at some stage, NAF could have a similar arrangement. New codes would then be delivered by that body and this would guarantee that codes did not clash. However, this would be a less flexible system with a long response time and it is questionable whether this is practical at present. He suggested that the NEAFC Secretariat should take on the role as monitor in the interim until it became practical to transfer it to another body. There seemed to be general support for this.

9. Any other business

The Committee discussed the need for a further meeting before the Annual Meeting. The Chairman went through a list of those mandated tasks that had not been fulfilled. He mentioned conversion factors, port state control (which may need a new mandate), and IUU fishing. He also felt that an annual report, prepared one month in the advance of the Annual Meeting, would be helpful. There are also a few issues in the pipeline which have not been discussed, in particular the format of inspection reports raised by the Icelandic

representative. He considered that it would up to the President to decide on an additional meeting. The Icelandic representative was in favour of a meeting in October. The representatives of Norway, Russia and Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) concurred. At the 20th Annual Meeting, the EU had indicated that it would host a second meeting of PECCOE in mid-October in line with the timing of the meeting last year.

Actions arising: PECCOE recommends that the Committee has a meeting in advance of the 21 st Annual meeting, mid-October. The EU has indicated that it will host the meeting.
--

10. Adoption of the report

The Secretariat will provide verbatim reports for the two days to participants. Based on these, a summary report will be circulated for final agreement.

11. Closure of the meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 15:15 pm on 29 May 2002 by thanking all participants for their cooperation. He regretted that the 30 day deadline for submission of documents had not been observed, but this would hopefully improve next time. He wished everybody a safe journey home.

MEETING OF PECCOE
28 AND 29 MAY 2002
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NEAFC SECRETARIAT

Hoydal, Kjartan

Neves, João

DENMARK IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND

Toftum, Jens Helgi

Hansen, Kjartan

Nedergaard, Mads

EU

Koster, Harry (Chair)

Newman, Martin

Thomson, Andrew

Assmann, Joachim

Bogelius, Anders

Ducamin, Laurent

Eliassen, Jorgen

Feldthaus, Sonja

Ferreira, Carlos

Galbraith, Phil

Gooding, Nigel

Pott, Hermann

Rios, Manuel

Velasco, Borja

Vonk, Harry

ICELAND

Geirsson, Gylfi

Steinarsson, Höskuldur

NORWAY

Thorvik, Thorbjørn

Ellingsen, Einar

Johnsen, Stein-Åge

POLAND

Kasperek, Stanislaw

RUSSIA

Latyshev, Pavel

Mishkin, Valentin

Romanov, Alexei

Samoylova, Elena

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT TITLE
PE 03/00	List of documents
PE 03/01	Draft agenda
PE 03/02	Preliminary list of participants
PE 03/03	Mandates to PECCOE
PE 03/04	Joint Icelandic/Norwegian Proposal
PE 03/05	Monitoring, Inspection and Surveillance Communication System
PE 03/06	Implementation of Surveillance Related Procedures by Contracting Parties
PE 03/07	NAFO Port inspection scheme
PE 03/08	List of NCP vessels observed in the NEAFC RA
PE 03/09	Proposed amendment to the Scheme + revision
PE 03/10	Joint report on Norwegian-Russian cooperation

Third PECCOE meeting
London– 28 – 29 May 2002

AGENDA

12. Opening by the chairman, H. Koster (EU)
13. Appointment of the rapporteur
14. Adoption of the Agenda
15. Running in the Schemes
 - Implementation by the Secretariat
 - Implementation by Contracting Parties
 - Implementation by non-Contracting Parties
16. 20th Annual Meeting mandate to PECCOE
 - Port State Control
 - Evaluation of return (RET) messages and record number (RN) data element
 - Transshipment operation
 - Joint fishing operations
 - Conversion factors
17. Mandate to PECCOE from the Extraordinary Meeting of 2002
 - Evaluation of possible consequences of the deletion of Article 8 of the Scheme
 - Compilation of a list of known IUU vessels which are operating, or have operated, in the Regulatory Area (including details of flags of convenience, owner and/or charterer)
18. The Norway/Iceland proposal to the 2nd PECCOE Meeting, October 2001
19. Discussion on the future management of the North Atlantic Format
20. Any other business
21. Adoption of the report
22. Closure of the meeting

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE SCHEME OF CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT**

Concerning the definition of specific requirements regarding transshipment and joint fishing operations

The PECCOE received a mandate for introducing changes in the Scheme concerning transshipments and joint fishing operations. The following amendments are proposed for the regulation of these questions. These amendments provide for prior authorisation by the flag State authorities and a clarification of the rules concerning recording and reporting of catch.

Add the following new definitions to Article 1 – Definitions:

“f) “transshipment operation” means the transfer, over the side, of any quantity of fish, molluscs, crustaceans and/or fishery products retained on board, from one fishing vessel to another.”

“g) “joint fishing operation” means any operations between two or more vessels where catch is taken from the fishing gear of one fishing vessel to another.”

Amend Article 3 – Authorisation to fish :

The existing text shall be numbered paragraph 1 and the following point added:

“e) Ensure that only authorized fishing vessels may engage in transshipment operations or joint fishing operations in the Regulatory Area.

The following paragraph 2 shall be added:

“2. A master of a fishing vessel shall not engage in transshipment or joint fishing operations with non-Contracting Party vessels [presumed to be undermining the effectiveness of Recommendations established under the Convention.]”

The following paragraph 3 shall be added:

“3. A master of a fishing vessel engaged in transshipment operations which on-loads quantities on board shall not engage in fishing activity, including joint fishing operations, during the same trip.”

Amend Article 7 – Recording of catch and fishing effort :

Add the following sentence to paragraph 1:

“However, a Contracting Party may exempt from keeping a fishing log book a vessel engaged in transshipment operations which on-loads quantities on board.”

Add the following sub-paragraph to paragraph 2:

“d) on each occasion a vessel engaged in a joint fishing operation shall record:

- i) where the catch is taken on board:
 - the date and time (UTC);
 - the location (longitude/latitude);
 - catches taken on board and any catch discarded from the vessel;
 - the name and international radio call sign of the fishing vessel from which the catch has been taken.”

- ii) where the catch is not taken on board:
 - the date and time (UTC);
 - the location (longitude/latitude);

- that no catch has been taken on board;
- the name and international radio call sign of the fishing vessel which has taken the catch on board.”

Add new paragraph 5:

“5. Vessels exempt from keeping a fishing log book pursuant to paragraph 1 shall record in a production logbook or stowage plan:

- the information under paragraph 3 a) and b);
- the date and time (UTC) of the transshipment operation;
- the location (longitude/latitude) of the transshipment operation;
- the quantities of species on-loaded;
- the name and international radio call sign of the fishing vessel from which the catch has been off-loaded.”

Renumber paragraph 5 as paragraph 6.

Amend Article 10 – Communication of catches :

Replace sub-paragraph c) with the following text:

“c) when exiting the Regulatory Area. This report shall be made no more than 8 hours and at least 6 hours in advance of each exit from the Regulatory Area. It shall include where appropriate, the number of fishing days and the catch taken in the Regulatory Area since the commencement of fishing, or since the last catch report..”

[Add the following new section to point 1 of Article 10:

e) the quantities retained on board taken from the fishing gear of another vessel during the vessel's stay in the Regulatory Area

The relevant provisions of Annex VII 4) shall be amended to include transfers in joint fishing operations as well as transshipments.]

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE SCHEME TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE BY
NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES**

Concerning the definition of specific requirements regarding transshipment and joint fishing operations

Delete Article 9.

JOINT ICELANDIC/NORWEGIAN PROPOSAL

On the basis of its mandate (AM 19/44), PECCOE is requested to examine the joint Icelandic/Norwegian proposal submitted at the 20th Annual Meeting of NEAFC (AM 20-42) and reproduced below.

In particular PECCOE shall analyse whether the joint Icelandic/Norwegian proposal concerning amendments to the Scheme on Control and Enforcement (the Scheme) takes care of the control aspects of the Scheme.

Before 1 October 2002 PECCOE shall report back to the Commission about its findings regarding the joint Icelandic/Norwegian proposal.

Changes of the NEAFC Scheme. Joint Norwegian/Icelandic Proposal submitted at the 20th Annual Meeting of NEAFC. London 5.-9. November 2001.

Article 9

1.
 - a)

See proposed changes in Annex VI (4) (below) specifying the reporting frequency of VMS inside the Regulatory Area. (2 hours frequency is proposed instead of 6 hours according to current rules)

Article 10

- 1.

See the Annex VII (below) concerning the following proposed **new** message types and their specification:

Catch on entry, COE, manually generated message type, instead of ENT

(ENT will hereafter be an automatically generated VMS message transmitted in real time in connection with entering the Regulatory Area.)

Catch on exit, COX, manually generated message type, instead of current EXI

(EXI will hereafter be an automatically generated VMS message transmitted in real time in connection with exiting the Regulatory Area.)

a)

The following text to be added at the end of the paragraph:

These time limits do not apply when vessels are fishing on a quota allocated from the same Regulated Resource inside and outside the Regulatory Area. However, an inspection vessel present in the area can contact the vessel upon entry into the Regulatory Area and require it not to start fishing for up to 6 hours, with the intention to carry out an inspection.

c)

The following text to be added at the end of the paragraph:

These time limits do not apply when vessels are fishing on a quota allocated from the same Regulated Resource inside and outside the Regulatory Area. However, an inspection vessel present in the area can contact the vessel and delay the vessel's exit from the Regulatory Area for up to 6 hours, with the intention to carry out an inspection.

Comment: The proposed changes in Article 10 a) and c) must be seen in conjunction with proposed reduced reporting frequency of 2 hours when operating inside the Regulatory Area, see Article 9 above and Annex VI (4) below.

Article 16

New:

- 4. The Secretary shall make available as soon as possible the information received under this Article to other Contracting Parties with an active inspection presence in the Area. All reports and messages shall be treated in a confidential manner.

Comment:

This follows implicitly from Article 12 and should have been stated explicitly from the start.

Annex VI

4.

New:

”..... upon entering into or exiting from the Regulatory Area and at least once every two hours when operating in the NEAFC Regulatory Area.....

Annex VII

COMMUNICATION OF CATCHES

“CATCH ON ENTRY” report

Data Element:	Field Code:	Mandatory /	Remarks:
----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------

	Optional		
Start record	SR	M	System detail; indicates start of record
Address	AD	M	Message detail; destination, "XNE" for NEAFC
Sequence Number	SQ	M	Message detail; message serial number in current year
Type of Message	TM	M	Message detail; message type, "COE" as catch on entry report
Radio call sign	RC	M	Vessel registration detail; international radio call sign of the vessel
Trip Number	TN	O	Activity detail; fishing trip serial number in current year
Vessel Name	NA	O	Vessel registration detail; name of the vessel
Contracting Party Internal Reference Number	IR	O	Vessel registration detail; unique Contracting Party vessel number as ISO-3 flag state code followed by number
External Registration Number	XR	O	Vessel registration detail; the side number of the vessel
Latitude	LA	M	Activity detail; position at time of transmission
Longitude	LO	M	Activity detail; position at time of transmission
Quantity on board species live weight	OB	M M	Activity detail; quantity by (Annex I) (Attachment II) species on board, in pairs as needed. FAO species code Live weight in kilogram, rounded to the nearest 100 kilogram
Date	DA	M	Message detail; date of transmission
Time	TI	M	Message detail; time of transmission
End of record	ER	M	System detail; indicates end of the record

“CATCH ON EXIT” report

Data Element:	Field Code:	Mandatory / Optional	Remarks:
Start record	SR	M	System detail; indicates start of record
Address	AD	M	Message detail; destination, “XNE” for NEAFC
Sequence Number	SQ	M	Message detail; message serial number in current year
Type of Message	TM	M	Message detail; message type, <u>“COX as catch on exit report”</u>
Radio call sign	RC	M	Vessel registration detail; international radio call sign of the vessel
Trip Number	TN	O	Activity detail; fishing trip serial number in current year
Vessel Name	NA	O	Vessel registration detail; name of the vessel
Contracting Party Internal Reference Number	IR	O	Vessel registration detail; unique Contracting Party vessel number as ISO-3 flag state code followed by number
External Registration Number	XR	O	Vessel registration detail; the side number of the vessel
Latitude	LA	M ⁽¹⁾	Activity detail; position at time of transmission
Longitude	LO	M ⁽¹⁾	Activity detail; position at time of transmission
Weekly Catches species live weight	CA		Activity detail; catch by species retained on board, since last communication of catches, in pairs as needed. FAO species code. Live weight in kilogram, rounded to the nearest 100 kilogram
Weekly Catches	CC		Activity detail; catch by species retained on board, since

Deleted: ¹

Deleted: ¹

species			commencement of fishing in the R.A., in pairs as needed
live weight		M ⁽²⁾	FAO species code.
		M ⁽²⁾	Live weight in kilogram, rounded to the nearest 100 kilogram
Days Fished	DF	M	Activity detail; number of days spent in the Regulatory Area since last communication of catches
Date	DA	M	Message detail; date of transmission
Time	TI	M	Message detail; time of transmission
End of record	ER	M	System detail; indicates end of the record

Deleted: fishing

Deleted: commencement of fishing or

Deleted: "Catch" report

Deleted: ¹ Optional if a vessel is subject to satellite tracking in accordance with Article 9(1a).[¶]

¹ Optional if a vessel is subject to satellite tracking in accordance with Article 9 1a.

² Whichever one is appropriate