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REPORT

1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair, Gylfi Geirsson (Iceland), welcomed the participants, noting that resuming the work of the working group was a positive sign and that consensus could be achieved. The Russian Federation was not represented at this meeting. The detailed list of the 22 Participants is annexed to this report as document 2016-01-02.

2. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The draft Agenda was approved as circulated and is annexed as document 2016-01-01. The Secretariat was nominated as rapporteur.

3. Mandate from the Extraordinary Meeting 2015 regarding ERS

The Chair introduced document 2016-01-05 containing an extract of the text on ERS from the 2015 Extraordinary Meeting report.

Additionally the Chair also introduced document 2016-01-06 containing the 2009 Terms of Reference on ERS for PECCOE.

Finally the Chair introduced document 2016-01-07 with a 2012 proposal for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on ERS.

The Participants noted the documents and no questions were raised on these issues.

4. Review of the work already done by the AHWG ERS

The Chair introduced document 2016-01-04 containing the main findings from the AHWG ERS meeting of June 2013. It was the view of some Participants that some of the assumptions described on the documents up to 2013 no longer described the technical solutions found by the CPs since then.

Additionally the Chair introduced document 2016-01-08 containing the ERS status in NEAFC prepared by the Chair and presented to PECCOE in 2014.

Finally the Chair introduced document 2016-01-10 prepared in 2013 by the Russian Federation containing a comparison table on the ERS reports and data-elements from the ERS agreements between CPs, NEAFC and NAFO existing VTI reporting systems.
The Secretariat noted that a phased approach should be developed with five distinct phases. These phases would include the definition of report types, their description and timeframes; definition of the content of each report; definition on correction and cancellation of reports; security issues and finally report transmission issues. The Participants noted this phased approach as a possibility for the way forward.

The Participants noted the documents and no questions were raised on these issues.

5. Continuation of work according to the mandate from the NEAFC 2011 Annual Meeting

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

The Chair introduced document 2016-01-03 containing the different reports and report components to be transmitted under ERS. He proposed to address first the common components (header) and then the individual reports independently.

The common understanding was that the existing bilateral ERS agreements would be the basis for ERS in NEAFC; this is reflected in document 2016-01-03 Rev 1.

It was, however, discussed whether to use the existing NAF codes and make new codes as needed, or use the UN/CEFACT codes instead. In this context the EU volunteered to prepare a document showing the UN/CEFACT codes side by side with the NAF codes.

It was agreed that after the EU has produced their mapping to UN/CEFACT codes, a new revised document would be sent to the JAGDM together with a request from the Chair for their advice. All Contracting Parties must take the work with this issue in JAGDM very seriously in order to achieve a good progression.

There was a discussion about the use of both IMO numbers and International Radio Call Signs as vessel identifiers. It was noted that, in practical terms, inspectors on the high seas use IRCS initially, as this is mandatorily displayed.

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

It was decided that it was premature to conclude on this item. However the common understanding was that there should be an interface at the NEAFC’s website where inspectors could log in and get detailed information regarding vessels in their area.

It was also made clear that the CPs would still require all relevant information be transmitted to them from the Secretariat, but it was emphasised that inspectors in the RA would need to receive in real time all time critical information. This item would be addressed further at future meetings.

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

The EU noted that additional data for scientific purposes could be supplied if already contained in the national ERS. The daily activity report may contain some of this data.
DFG noted that detailed relevant data is included in the ERS but some specific data like cloud type or sea temperature is not included.

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

The Chair briefly summarised the objectives of the agenda point and invited the Participants to comment on these issues.

The Chair introduce document 2016-01-17 prepared by Norway and Iceland on outlines of a possible system where data is transmitted by the fishing vessels to the flag State FMC which forwards it for storage to the NEAFC Secretariat. The Secretariat would in return forward the data to the CPs with an active inspection presence in the Regulatory Area.

It was mentioned that regular data such as regular catch reports would be forwarded daily but time critical reports such as “Catch on Entry”, “Prior Notification of Transhipment” and “Catch on Exit” would be forwarded in real time from the fishing vessel via the flag state FMC to the NEAFC Secretariat and onwards to inspecting CPs.

Norway noted that its Coast Guard is working on a new system that will improve the display of pushed NEAFC data in maps. Norway favours pushing of data from the Secretariat to the CPs, but it is also important that the inspectors have the possibility to find relevant information on the NEAFC web including the possibility of pulling data.

EU stressed that data availability will have to be reciprocal and will not engage in data exchange until all CPs are ready to reciprocate. Other than the reciprocity issue EU has no reservations on data sharing between CPs under NEAFC agreed conditions.

The Chair noted that the Secretariat will have to develop and maintain a stable database and data exchange system but it would be premature to elaborate on any possible need for additional staff.

5.5. Develop a timeframe for the implementation of the system

The Chair considered that it would be premature to elaborate any timeframe for ERS implementation until the final design of the system. He also noted that the CPs should not expect implementation shortly after the approval of the NEAFC ERS.

The Secretariat considered that realistically 9 months to one year after approval, the system could be fully functional.

The Participants agreed the importance of having enough time to test the system before its implementation and agree that one year after approval was reached was a more realistic timeframe.

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

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

The Participants noted the need to amend the Scheme but considered it premature to start working immediately on the issue.
The Chair invited the CPs to do an initial identification of the articles and annexes that would require amendments and to submit it prior to the April meeting of the AHWG ERS. The Secretariat will then compile these documents into a working document for the meeting. Additionally the Chair considered the possibility of requesting JAGDM to also address this issue in particular regarding the Annexes.

7. Bilateral ERS agreements (for information)

Norway informed that their first ERS agreement (document 2016-01-16) was with the EU in 2011 and that this agreement to exchange data between the two parties is still in use. The system used is the Common Regional ERS Web Service (CREWS). This system is also used in all later ERS agreements.

Furthermore, Norway summarised the existing ERS agreements between Norway and Iceland (document 2016-01013), and the Russian Federation (document 2016-01-14) and Faeroes (document 2016-01-15). ERS data is currently being exchanged under these agreements with the exception of the Russian Federation that is not yet implemented.

The EU summarised the existing ERS agreement between the EU and Norway (document 2016-01-16) noting the similarities and differences between their internal system and of that used with Norway.

8. Any other business

The Secretariat presented document 2016-01-11 briefly explaining the web based applications available for inspectors. It was also presented document 2016-01-12 on the pilot project to allow FMCs to enter VTI data directly into the Secretariat database using a web base application.

9. Report to the April 2016 meeting of PECMAC

The Secretariat circulated the draft reports to all participants and amended the text according to the comments received.

The Chair will present a summary of the report to the next PECMAC meeting that will take place in London on the 14th and 15th of April.

10. Date and place of next meeting

The next meeting will take place at the Secretariat in London on the 12th and 13th April.

11. Closure of the meeting

The Chair closed the meeting thanking the Participants for the fruitful meeting and wished all a safe return home.
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