Meeting of the AHWGERS

4th – 5th June 2013 Reykjavík

Participants:

Gylfi Geirsson ........................................ Chairman
João Neves ........................................ Secretariat

Mads Lund ........................................... Denmark (in respect of Faro Islands and Greenland)
Francky Callewaert ............................. European Union
Jim Shalloo ................................. European Union
Gerard Reijmer .............................. European Union
Kristján Freyr Helgason .................. Iceland
Elín Sighvatsdóttir ........................ Iceland
Björgólfur Ingason ........................ Iceland
Thord Monsen .............................. Norway
Hanne Østgård ............................. Norway
Victor Volkov .............................. Russian Federation
Boris Krichevets ........................... Russian Federation

The meeting was held at the premises of the Ministry of Industry and Innovation in Reykjavík started at 10H00 on the 4th of June 2013.

Introduction of the current NEAFC reporting system for Control and Enforcement

After adoption of the agenda which is attached as Annex I the Chairman gave a briefing on the current system used in NEAFC for control and enforcement with special emphasises on the reporting from the fishing vessels via their Flag FMC to the NEAFC Secretary and forwarding to Contracting Parties with an active inspection presence.

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

The WG revisited the earlier produced draft list of data elements for control and enforcement, catch and activity reporting. The new data elements list is attached as Annex II. The earlier data elements list had an asterisk (*) on number of data elements which was used to indicate that these needs to be dealt with by AGDC.

Now an asterisk has been added to the field code column of several new data elements to indicate that the field code should be addressed by AGDC.
While going through the list the WG noted few items:

- The Working Group did not conclude on the issue of adding the data element Trip Number to the header elements. Furthermore, the Working Group agreed that a definition of a fishing trip should be considered by PECCOE.
- That the current COE and COX reports may be incomplete if quantities on board are changed for any reason after transmission and in that case, a corrected COE or COX report shall be transmitted no later than crossing the boundaries of the Regulatory Area.
- That the frequency of MAN reports should be discussed and eventually increased.
- That changes from weekly to daily reporting is a significant step providing information for control and enforcement. However some CPs are of the opinion that an haul by haul approach would be beneficial, even if it would create technical problem.

The WG managed to re-draft some items in the list of data elements, lifted some brackets and added description where that was missing or incomplete. Finally the WG agreed to suggest insertion of a “Quantity on board” data element in the Pre-Notification on Exit from the Regulatory Area to report total quantity on board. That would indicate what might have been brought into Regulatory area, what was taken during the vessels stay there, minus what may have been transhipped from the vessel.

Define the requirements and the necessary accessibility of relevant information from the NEAFC ERS for inspection purposes during inspections at sea

The WG continued its work on defining the requirements and the necessary accessibility of relevant information from the NEAFC ERS for inspection purposes during inspections at sea. In that respect the WG agreed that inspectors and/or inspection services should get in real time the following information;

- Prior notification of entry into the RA
- Prior notification of transhipment
- Prior notification on exit from the RA
- VMS data and manual position reports
- Surveillance entry and exit and their observations

To facilitate for easy access for the inspectors and inspection services to other defined data the WG agreed to recommend that a centralised access point for inspectors and inspection services of the CPs should be established at the Secretariat where all relevant information for control and enforcement is available for inspection purposes. Guidance for the Secretariat is needed on how the web services shall be made.

It was agreed that inspectors should have access to the latest logbook information and should also be able to see any corrections that may have been made to the logbook entries.

However, it was noted by Norway that how and what data the inspectors get access to is interlinked with how the flow of data will be organised.
The issue of the inspector at sea being able to view historical logbook data, *inter alia* data from the vessel’s activity before entering into the NEAFC Regulatory Area was discussed. It was however made clear by one CP that it wold not be possible due to national legislation. (However this is possible at present with the paper logbook)

It was raised that it would be possible to automatically send notifications in E-mail from the NEAFC Secretariat to inspectors and/or inspection platforms after receipt of a Surveillance Entry report, which contains the name of the platform and ID numbers of the assigned inspectors by linking that to the e-mail addresses received in notifications from the CPs. It was also raised that it would be possible to filter the flow of information to the inspectors according to the geographical area that they would be working in.

**Consider how appropriate additional data for statistical and scientific purposes can be included in the NEAFC ERS**

The WG has concluded earlier that requirements on items “A” (General Information) and “B” (Gear Type) were generally included in paper logbooks and therefore will be included in the ERS systems of the CPs. Requirements on item “C” (Additional Information) are normally not available on logbooks and it will not be available. There were no additional comments made during this meeting. Point A, B and C are those suggested by PECMAS.

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

The WG had earlier agreed that data should go to the inspectors and relevant inspection services through the Secretariat. There were however different views on the methods of data transmission as well if the data should be stored at the Secretariat.

Denmark (in respect of Fareo Islands and Greenland), Iceland, Norway and Russia were all of the opinion that data should be pushed to the Secretariat and stored there. The main reasoning for data storage at the Secretariat was that this would make a “one stop shop”, would be useful for statistics, ICES and to compare what is happening in the area. The EU questioned the need of storing all data at the Secretariat as the complete logbook data would be available at all times at the Flag State FMC were it could be pulled by the inspectors via the NEAFC Secretariat when needed.

An advice from the AGDC on the issue of communication methods and data storage is needed but it may however be necessary for PECCOE to set the general rule first.

The issue of how to handle data storage when dealing with co-operating Non Contracting Parties was raised. If the solution would be that data is only stored at the individual FMCs, would NEAFC accept the same solution for co-operating NCPs.

The possibility of a hybrid solution was also discussed, meaning that the NEAFC Secretariat should be able to handle communication different systems. That may however increase the cost and make maintenance more cumbersome.
Two different schematic drawings of a possible NEAFC ERS were presented at the meeting, one a joint proposal by Iceland and Norway and the other one from the EU. These are attached as Annex III and IV. The main differences are method of communication; *inter alia* push or pull and data storage.

A comment was made by one CP that a new system with web services should be phased in by starting with VMS data. However a roadmap should be made showing how this should be built up gradually to include other reports.

Under this agenda item, the possibility of sharing information with other RFMOs was raised.

**Develop a timeframe for the implementation of the system**

The CPs reported following regarding when they would be up and running with their national ERS:

- Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland)
  - Greenland......................................... 1st January 2014
  - Faroe islands ................................. N/A
- European Union ................................. The current system needs improvement.
  - Will be ready 1st January 2015
- Iceland............................................. 2014
- Norway............................................. Ready
- Russia ............................................. 2015/16

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

Norway had presented a document at earlier meeting, identifying the Articles that may be affected. As some basic questions remain unsolved it was deemed premature to work further on this issue at this point of time.

**Next meeting**

The WG does not consider it necessary to have another meeting of the group before the autumn meeting of PECCOE.

The meeting was adjourned at 16H45 on the 5th of June 2013

**Attachments:**

- Annex I – The agenda of the meeting
- Annex II – The new data elements list
- Annex III – Schematic diagram of the NEAFC ERS by Iceland and Norway
- Annex IV – Schematic diagram of the NEAFC ERS by the EU
- Annex V – The main findings of the WG