First ERS Implementation Group meeting  
18 December 2018

Report

1. Opening of the Meeting

2. Appointment of the rapporteur
   The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3. Election of the Chair
   EU noted reservations that this group be chaired by the PECMAC Chair noting its view that the PECMAC chair should step down when dealing with this subject during meetings. Norway expressed its view that it has been the practice within NEAFC, in particular with regard to the AHWG-ERS for the Chair to be the same as the PECMAC Chair. EU noted that the Chair was different when the AHWG-ERS finally reported to PECMAC.

   Thord Monsen, PECMAC Chair was elected chair of the ERS IG.

4. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
   The Agenda was adopted with an agreement to change the wording of the title of item 6.4 from ‘filtering/downgrading’ to circulating.

5. ToR - ERS Implementation Group

6. Identifying Outstanding ERS Issues

   6.1 Updating the FLUX standard to include transmission time, and possibly other time stamps
   The JAGDM advice in document 2018-01-03 was discussed. The advice was that the best approach was to update the FLUX International Standard to contain a separate optional data element ‘transmission time’. EU updated the meeting that the deadline for submitting papers in relation to such a change was in January, which is the start of the formal process for inclusion, following the UN/CEFACT system. As stated in the JAGDM advice, EU were happy to finalise the
paperwork, as they have experience in doing so, if NEAFC provided a rationale for the change. The Secretariat agreed to make a first draft of such a rationale.

6.2 ERS Business

6.2.1 How to report [nil] catches on days where fishing activity = nil

It is stated in Article 12.3 that “On days when no fishing operations have been conducted or no catches have been taken a nil report shall be transmitted”. It was agreed to follow the rationale that on days where there had been gear in the water then Nil catches were to be reported as MZZ = 0 (as stated in Annex IV) or as a fishing activity report with 0 Kg of catches, and that on days where the vessel did not deploy gear, then the vessel activity = STE (or some other non-fishing value from the activity list).

6.2.2 Clarify the use of some codes and code lists

The code lists FA_NEAFC_STOCK, FLUX_VESSEL_ID_TYPE, VESSEL_ACTIVITY & FA_TRIP_ID_TYPE were tabled for this meeting in document ERS-IMPL-2018-01-09 Provisional Code Lists.

VESSEL_ACTIVITY: It was confirmed that harmonised list of vessel activity produced by the previous ERS should be included in its complete form, even though it contains activities which are not currently reported within NEAFC.

FA_NEAFC_STOCK: Was confirmed as presented

FLUX_VESSEL_ID_TYPE: It was agreed that the non-existing Vessel Identifiers be removed, and the list be re-considered at the next meeting.

FA_TRIP_ID_TYPE: It was agreed that the list be updated to include the Regular Expression proposed by JAGDM as the format for the trip number. Noting that the status of trip number remains optional in Annex IV.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would put together all the codes lists for the Master Data Register to be reviewed at the next meeting. In response to the draft report EU noted that the ERS IG can make proposals for changes to EU MDR code lists as they see fit. In EU there is a process to approve proposed changes to code lists.

Therefore, once the proposal is agreed in the ERS IG, EU will start the EU internal process to adopt the changes. Should there be any incompatibility that cannot be solved, a new code list for NEAFC could be created.

However, EU strongly advises to use common code lists wherever possible.
6.2.3 Gear Characteristics

The document **ERS-IMPL-2018-01-04: Norwegian Proposal on Gear Codes** was discussed under this agenda point. This document shows the mapping between gear and gear characteristics, including devices and attachments. These codes are present in the existing Scheme but without a mapping. This document to describe what could be reported via ERS in relation to gear, simply which characteristics and devices apply to which gear.

It was agreed that this mapping be confirmed within other Contracting Parties and that there would be further discussion on where to place such information at the next meeting.

6.2.4 Setting gear one day and retrieval another day

If setting and hauling need to be reported on separate days then in the fishing operation report for the first day AC = SET (only), for the report on the day of retrieval AC = HAU, detail of the fishing operation (duration, catch etc.) will be included in the FO report where AC = HAU.

6.2.5 Business rules for sequence and timing

The current Scheme has Return Error Codes for messages and reports which arrive out of sequence. In addition, the Articles of the ‘New’ Scheme have rules in relation to time, which are not part of the current NEAFC system or the EU model on which the business rules currently proposed for Annex IX / implementation document are based. Some CPs consider that without such rules it will be more difficult to understand the actual activity of the vessels in the area.

It was noted that the Scheme allows for data to be sent either as logbooks or as individual reports. How this impacts on the ability to understand the sequence of activities in real time and therefore understand whether or not events comply with the rules in the Scheme Articles has yet to be fully analysed.

Annex IX D2b of the current Scheme lists 5 return error codes in two levels of warning (one requiring follow up, one without follow up) for messages received out of sequence, including ENT without COE, and COE/CAT/COX without POS, which seem to be relevant to sending either logbooks or individual messages. Such checks do not seem to be part of the EU internal business rules for the system.

There are clear rules on time periods for prior notification and cancellation stipulated in the Scheme Articles, but it is not clear if there is a common understanding of how the new system will track these events and if it will be possible to know how closely actual activities relate to the rules.

It was agreed to return to this question for a detailed discussion about specific rules at the next meeting.
6.2.6. Duplicates: where content is duplicated but identifiers are not

Information and two possible solutions were contained in the document ERS-IMPL-2018-01-03 advice from JAGDM.

It was agreed that JAGDM would continue looking into possible solutions and that NEAFC service provider Trackwell be included in these discussions. EU noted that this type of duplicate checking was not currently part of the internal EU implementation, and advised that the more changes proposed for a phase 1 deployment, the later any deployment was likely to be.

6.3 NEAFC Master Data Register

This was also discussed under 6.2.2 on code lists. It was agreed that the Secretariat would put together all the codes lists for the Master Data Register to be reviewed at the next meeting. It was agreed that the updating of the MDR must be always synchronized between the Secretariat and the Parties, with the starting MDR being at the moment the EU's MDR.

6.4 Details of circulating data for Inspectors

It was agreed that discussion on this point be left to a future meeting.

6.5 Any other issues?

Document ERS-IMPL-2018-01-10 Business Continuity: ISMS Recommendation, which was adopted by the Commission in November, was tabled under this point for information.

No other issues were identified.

7. Identifying issues to be referred to JAGDM if any

It was agreed that JAGDM would continue to look into the question of duplicates.

8. ERS Implementation Document

This document can be finalised only when the business issues listed in 6.2 are agreed. However, the EU agreed to provide an interim revision for the group to go through. There was some discussion regarding whether or not this document should finally be a Scheme Annex, or a document with some other status.

Pros and cons were identified to each approach and it was agreed to return to this question.
9. Criteria to assess whether the technical preparations are completed

This item was introduced and the group was reminded of the 01 Feb deadline in the Measure which created the Working Group. Iceland said that it was important that every possible outcome for every message was tested sequentially and so part of the criteria would be a long checklist.

EU had a different view, that there were 5 top level criteria which must be fulfilled, but that each top level criteria could include as much detail as CPs felt was necessary. The criteria defined by EU were; 1) finalised ERS Implementation document (specifications), 2) Business Rules implemented according to the specifications 3) NEAFC-XNE system available 4) produce fall back procedures for masters in cases where XNE system is unavailable, 5) Testing between the Secretariat and the EU did not result in relevant technical failures.

It was agreed to return to this at the next meeting when participants had had time to reflect further.

10. VMS Implementation

It was agreed that some further discussion of VMS was necessary to formalise arrangements, although it was not anticipated to be problematic as VMS is well understood. EU noted that the descriptions in document AHWG ERS Implementation 2018-01-08 reflected differences in implementation of VMS in NEAFC and internally within EU (described in the Vessel Position Implementation document). EU pointed out that the speed and course are indeed compulsory except for EXI reports; The Implementation Document mentioned these were optional. This is being addressed already. EU also pointed out that the value of the timeout parameter (TODT) should be carefully considered and added that a timeout of 24 hours is not advisable.

There was little time left for discussion at this meeting. The Secretariat agreed to produce a paper on VMS for the next meeting.

11. Next Meeting

28th January was proposed for next meeting. 11:00 – 14:00 UTC

12. AoB