PECCOE

AHWG ERS

London, 7th – 8th March 2013

1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair, Gylfi Geirsson, Iceland, opened the meeting and welcomed the delegates from all Contracting Parties.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted in the form circulated before the meeting. The Secretary was appointed as rapporteur.

3. Reviewing and continuation of work according to the mandate from the NEAFC 2011 Annual Meeting

The Chair summarised the work already been done, mentioning the report of the January meeting of AHWG ERS and noting that PECCOE will not need to go through ERS technical details. The Chair also noted that CPs will not necessarily have identical ERS systems and that the WG focus should be the data to be transmitted, assuming that XML will be used pending AGDC discussion on this specific issue. He also noted that the AHWG is not in any way designing the CPs ERS systems nor interfering with data transmission between vessels and FMCs. Immediate questions would be the data storing in the Secretariat, independently of the data transmission system (pushing or pulling). The Chair mentioned the working paper already produced (Document 3) containing the data elements needed for transmission for control purposes; data elements marked with an “*” were discussed at AGDC as required. The Chair also mentioned the schematic drawings of the system improved on the basis of discussions during last meeting (Documents 4 and 5).

Norway noted that the report of the previous meeting did not clearly mention agreement when agreement had been reached, but rather just reflected discussions. The report of the present meeting should clearly mention when agreement is reached.

Iceland presented Documents 4 and 5 explaining the content of the drawings and the data low details.
DFG questioned if time critical messages would be pushed to inspecting FMCs only or to all CPs.

The Chair explained that under the current system inspecting FMCs are the only ones receiving vessels data; in specific circumstances (i.e. the redfish fisheries) CPs may receive vessels data permanently to better prepare operations (risk management); ERS based system should forward time critical messages to inspectors at sea eventually taking some of the burden from the inspecting FMC.

Norway considers that the system should be discussed in two separate issues: 1. How data is transmitted to NEAFC and 2. How data is made available to inspectors. Norway agreed with the drawing on the first point, noting that CPs should decide if acknowledgement to vessels should be done by a single return report or two return reports, one from FMC the other from NEAFC; vessels should at least receive the return report from NEAFC. On the second point Norway disagreed on the “on request” data transfer from the Secretariat to the inspectors at sea.

EU agreed with Norway on separating discussions of separate issues. EU considers the following; 1. How vessels communicate with flag State FMC is not open for discussion including whether the vessel receives one or more return messages, 2. How flag State communicated data to NEAFC and 3. How NEAFC communicate data to inspectors. EU’s opinion was that NEAFC should have the possibility of making relevant data available to the inspectors without inspecting CP receiving by default complete logbook data; data should flow from vessel flag State to inspector through NEAFC. The Secretariat should act as a “filter” of the relevant data that is made available to inspectors; in any case NEAFC should not base solution for the future on technologies from the past.

The Chair concluded that this was a good general discussion and that participants should now focus on the specific agenda points.

3.1. Define appropriate data requirements (control and enforcement, catch and activity reporting), which are to be included in a NEAFC ERS

The Chair presented Document 3 containing the data elements to be transmitted; the aim is to discuss point by point and to update the tables when agreement is possible. The Chair invited the AGDC Chair to comment on the elements marked with an “*”.

The AGDC Chair explained that it would be difficult for AGDC to advise on this before a decision is taken on the overall architecture of the NEAFC ERS system. When such decision is taken by NEAFC, AGDC will be in a position to advise on the specific technical elements. The next AGDC meeting will be in June and these issues may be revisited if a decision is reached on the architecture of the system.

Participant discussed every element on the different tables and a revised Document 3 was produced.
3.2. Define the requirements and the necessary accessibility of relevant information from NEAFC ERS for inspection purposes during inspections at sea

The Chair introduced the point mentioning that the previous point dealt with “what” should be transmitted and the present point deals with the “how” regarding availability of information/data.

EU made a presentation on a possible system architecture and how data would be transferred. It was mentioned that the Secretariat did need to have a database, that being expensive, and even if the presentation did not reflect EU final view on the issue, it could nevertheless be a starting point for the discussion. The essential reports were considered to be advance information on entry, daily activity, range of activities, advance transhipment information, advance exit information.

Iceland noted that the system can be based on web services by the FMCs and the Secretariat and that allows for multiple solutions; nevertheless a clear distinction between the transportation layer and the data layer is recommended.

Norway noted that this discussion has been going on for years. Either data will be pushed to, or pulled by NEAFC, that is a technical issue. Norway would prefer that catch and activity data from the NEAFC Regulatory area are pushed from the vessel to NEAFC via the Flag State to have a system that is simple to control and that is enforceable. Furthermore, this will secure that the responsibility to fulfil the reporting requirements are maintained at the level of the masters. Furthermore, Norway would prefer pulling as a method for giving inspectors access to additional and historical data.

DFG noted that whatever solution was found, overall information available to inspectors should not be less than what is presently available; DFG agreed that notification on entry, daily catch, notification of transhipment and notification of exit are the required information.

Russia noted that under Russian law access to logbooks will be forbidden, and so relevant vessel data should be stored in the Secretariat only.

The Chair concluded that there was agreement that inspectors should get in real time:

- Prior notification of entry into the RA;
- Prior notification of transhipment;
- Prior notification on exit the RA.

Regarding catch data participants had different views. Norway wanted catch data to be automatically sent to inspectors while other CPs are of the view that catch data should be available for access by the inspectors.

There was a common understanding that access to logbook data should be available for the whole fishing trip (i.e. port to port), although Russia reserved its position on this.

The Chair encouraged the AHWG to continue to discuss the issue of full access to logbook or limitations to the full access.
3.3. Consider how appropriate additional data for statistical and scientific purposes can be included in the NEAFC ERS

The Chair presented Document 8, prepared by PECMAS on relevant data required for scientific purposes.

The Secretary noted that this document had been discussed at the previous AHWG ERS meeting. At the previous meeting there was agreement that requirements on items “A” and “B” were generally included in paper logbooks and therefore will be included in the ERS systems of the CPs. Requirements on item “C” are normally not available on logbooks and it will not be available. At the previous meeting it was noted that the Secretariat’s database could accept such data if available. Presently it is not agreed that the Secretariat would be the right place to store scientific data for future scientific work.

The Chair concluded that the group will need to revisit this issue before concluding the work.

3.4. Define how the flow of data should be organised, and the role of the Secretariat in this process, including resource implications

The Chair noted the drawings in Documents 4 and 5 and how the data flow should be organised. Regardless of how data will be transmitted (pushed and/or pulled) the question should be where data is going to be stored, at FMCs or at the FMCs and the Secretariat.

It was agreed that data should go to the inspectors through the Secretariat.

The Chair raised this issue of whether data on vessels’ activities in the RA should be stored at the Secretariat?

EU stated that it would not be necessary to store all the data at the Secretariat, depending on the design of the system. EU would prefer a system where data would go from FMCs to the inspectors trough the Secretariat without the Secretariat storing such data. EU noted that the legal “logbook” will be stored at the FMCs. Storing data at the Secretariat could create problems when cancelling and correcting data, possibly resulting in inconsistencies between what is stored at the Secretariat and the actual legal logbook.

Norway preferred the data to be stored at the Secretariat, stating that cancellations and corrections would not be a big problem. Furthermore, it is only the Secretariat that could and should have the “full picture” of catch and activity data from the Regulatory Area.

DFG noted that only the Secretariat could provide an “overall picture” of the activity in the RA to the inspectors.
Iceland preferred that all time critical messages be sent to the Secretariat and stored there. Other data should be available for inspectors to pull when necessary. Corrections to data may have implication of data use for scientific purposes.

The Chair raised the issue of data of cooperating NCP vessels, and whether that data should be stored at the Secretariat?

The Secretary noted that recent experience showed that CPs are not necessarily willing to (or actually able legally) to provide scientists with all the data that is gathered for control and enforcement purposes.

The Chair concluded that participants agree that data will circulated through the Secretariat and that there are different opinions on the storing of data at the Secretariat. Also there are different opinions on data transmission (should data be pushed or pulled). The Chair invited participants to look into the possible solutions presented and to try to reach a common understanding on the system design.

3.5. Develop a time frame for the implementation of the system

The AGDC Chair noted that the timeframe for implementation was also discussed in AGDC and the conclusion was that without a clear blueprint of the system it is very difficult to project an implementation timeframe. AGDC warned that implementation of an ERS system for NEAFC will be complex and will take time. Specifications will have to be defined and tenders will have to be called for.

EU agreed with the views expressed by the AGDC Chair and noted that possible dates for inception were 2015 or 2016. EU would prefer to aim at having a system ready by 2015. Budget implications of this aim should be taken into account from the current year.

The Chair concluded that CPs need to agree on a target date for the implementation of the NEAFC ERS system. Otherwise it will be difficult to allocate financial resources.

4. Identification of the Articles in the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement that may be affected by introduction of a NEAFC ERS

4.1. Drafting new and/or amended articles to the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement

Norway presented document 6. The document was produced after the previous AHWG ERS meeting and it was based on what seemed at the time to be the common view. Positions on the architecture of the system at this meeting indicate that such common view does no longer exist and therefore the document may not be as relevant as it was intended.

Russia noted that the document will have to be evaluated in substance and that will require a significant amount of time.
The Chair thanked Norway for the preparation and presentation of the document and noted that since the design of the system was not yet agreed by CPs it would be premature to have a discussion on specific articles and annexes to be amended and/or added to the Scheme. The Chair concluded that this item will need further discussion and that the work already done by Norway would prove useful when this issue would eventually be discussed.

5. Report to the October 2013 meeting of PECCOE

The report of the meeting was adopted through correspondence following the meeting.

6. Any other business

No issues were raised under this agenda item.

7. Next meeting

The Chair informed that the next PECCOE meeting will take place on 16-17th April and that the next AGCD meeting will take place on 25-26th June. PECCOE is expected to advise on the way forward after being informed on the work done so far. The Chair invited delegates to prepare and submit documents for the next meeting so that the work could be advanced. Iceland agreed to review the schematic drawings presented (Documents 4 and 5) taking into account the comments from the delegates.

The Chair thanked all participants and wished them a safe journey home.