1. Opening of the meeting
1.1 The Chair, Thord Monsen, Norway, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. All Contracting Parties were represented.

1.2 In his introductory comments, the Chair highlighted the high importance of PECMAC resolving the outstanding issues related to the introduction of the proposed NEAFC Electronic Reporting System (ERS). The Chair also explained that he had considered a request for attendance of industry representatives at PECMAC, but had declined this. He suggested this may be an issue to be considered by PECMAC at some future time.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur
2.1 The Secretary was appointed as rapporteur.

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda
3.1 The agenda that had been circulated before the meeting (document PE 2018-02-01) was adopted subject to four items being added under Agenda Item 10 “Any other business”. It was also noted the representatives of applicant States for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status had been invited to attend to present their information during the relevant agenda item.

3.2 The numbering in this report reflects the agenda as it was adopted.

4. Scheme of Control and Enforcement
4.1 Overall compliance evaluation
   4.1.1 Port State Control - Overall implementation evaluation
4.1 Iceland introduced document PE 2018-02-18, which set out its assessment of NEAFC PSC 3 forms submitted by Contracting Parties following Port State inspections. In its assessment Iceland had compared the forms with certain selected criteria of Inspection procedures (in Annex XVIII) and it was noted by Iceland that vital information was missing from a high number of forms and that this made it difficult to assess PSC performance. Examples were given of forms lacking several fields of information or lacking signatures. Iceland concluded that information from Contracting Parties regarding fulfilment of Inspection thresholds would need to be adjusted accordingly.

4.2 In discussion it was agreed that the issue needed further investigation. This included the examination of potential issues such as significant shortcomings in port state control, such as failure to comply with the inspection benchmarks, lack of proper port state inspection means and inspections conducted on discriminatory basis. Reference was also made to the suggestion in the previous PECMAC meeting to identify the mandatory information for the PSC3 forms to be considered as valid and the technological advancements in this field.

4.3 At the suggestion of the European Union, PECMAC considered setting up a dedicated group to look at some of the issues raised in the discussion, with the aim to address some of the issues on PSC.

4.4 The European Union undertook to develop draft Terms of Reference for the proposed group, tabled a working document for PECMAC to consider. This document included elements on inspection procedures for landings and transhipments, compatibility between the PSC3 forms and those used by under national procedures; compliance with inspection benchmarks; risk assessments and practice on issuing warnings instead of fines.

4.5 In conclusion PECMAC could not agree whether all the issues raised were within its remit to assess, nor whether the timing of a setting up a 2019 group with such a scope was appropriate. The Chair concluded that further reflection was needed. The European Union stated that it was pressing to address the identified shortcomings and that it would table a proposal at the Annual Meeting and invited comments from Contracting Parties on the European Union working document.

4.1.2 Compliance report 2017 to the Commission


4.7 Following discussion on the content of the report, the Chair directed the Secretariat to (re-) introduce tables on Redfish catch, the status of infringements, FMC performance and acknowledgment messages. Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) also requested that its information in certain tables should be divided between Faroes and Greenland, while the European Union required its information to be presented at Contracting Party level.
PECMAC agreed that the revised Compliance Report Document PE 2018-02-41 Rev2 should be presented to the Annual Meeting, subject to the agreed changes and relevant editorial amendments.

4.1.3 Possible amendments to forms for:

4.1.3.1 Contracting Party annual reports (articles 25, 32, 33 and 43)

4.8 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-13 which related to discussions held at the April meeting of PECMAC regarding the listing of infringements reported in EEZ’s of Contracting Parties in annual reports. Norway noted that according to Article 2, the scope of the Scheme is limited to the Regulatory Area unless otherwise provided. However, the port State control measures apply to the Convention Area and hence, infringements in the EEZ’s of the Contracting Parties could be included in the annual reports if they relate to the port State control measures. However infringements within the EEZ of the port State should be separately reported. Some Parties expressed the view that NEAFC reports should contain information on infringements of NEAFC measures and port state control covering all NEAFC Convention Area as part of the NEAFC Scheme. Infringements of national measures not corresponding to the NEAFC Scheme should not be reported in the NEAFC context.

4.9 Following the discussion, the Chair returned to the issue of forms and templates for the Contracting Party reporting, including the views from discussions at PECMAC 1. The additions to the template would include a column for more remarks or comments on infringements status, justifications for cases closed without an economic sanction etc. Also that administrative fines and Port States infringements and any IUU reporting would also be compiled into the results reporting template.

4.10 It was agreed that that the Chair and Secretariat would improve the form in time for the reporting requirement on 1st March 2019.

4.1.3.2 C-NCP annual reports (articles 34 and 35)

4.11 No discussion under this item, no desire for a new CNCP template was expressed. It was also noted that the Secretariat had written to CNCPs reminding them of the Flag State performance review process.

4.2 Non-Contracting Parties

4.2.1 NCP activities in the RA (article 43)


4.2.2 Cooperating NCP status and activities in the RA

4.13 Following an earlier PECMAC invitation to applicants for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status to attend the meeting to present their applications, the session was attended by representatives of Bahamas, Curacao, Liberia, and Panama. Canada and New Zealand sent apologies. All applicants sent supporting documentation, although those of Canada and Liberia were received after the relevant session of the PECMAC meeting.
In his welcoming statements, the Chair explained the need for all Flag States involved in NEAFC to meet the relevant Scheme requirements. In addition, there was a current global focus on a level playing field in terms of compliance by all Flag States and on the issue of IUU fishing not being enabled by transhipping. The European Union pointed out that CNCPs should be complying with the same requirements in NEAFC as Contracting Parties. The CNCPs present were able to answer detailed questions on their MCS, registry and Flag State arrangements, inspections means and sanctioning regimes in respect of their international fleets.

The Chair thanked the applicants for their attendance and explained that they would be informed of the PECMAC recommendations to the AM.

4.2.2.1 Application for renewal - Bahamas
The Contracting Parties discussed the application from Bahamas for renewing the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 18-02-06 and PE 18-02-49).

The European Union stated that they were not in a position to support renewing the Bahamas’ CNCP status. This was due to the lack of a clear link between the applicant registry, and the fisheries administration and relevant Government departments. In the view of the European Union, from the answers provided by the candidate CNCP it was clear that Bahamas had no inspection means for their international fleet and there was no sanctioning system in place in case the NEAFC measures are infringed. The European Union highlighted its view that accepting certain CNCPs risked exposing NEAFC to potential IUU activities.

It was agreed to report to the NEAFC Commission that there was no consensus in PECMAC on any recommendation to the NEAFC Commission on the application of Bahamas for renewal of the cooperating non-Contracting Party status.

It was noted that despite the lack of a recommendation from PECMAC, the application from Bahamas would be a meeting document for the Annual Meeting in November, and that this issue might have to be resolved by holding a vote at that meeting.

4.2.2.2 Application for renewal – Liberia
The Contracting Parties discussed the application from Liberia for renewing the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 18-02-04 and PE 18-02-56).

The EU stated that they were not in a position to support renewing Liberia’s status, noting their desire for further information in writing from Liberia. In the view of the European Union, from the answers provided by the candidate CNCP it was clear that there was no genuine link between the Country of Liberia and the external registry, Liberia had no fishery inspection means for their international fleet and there was no sanctioning system in place in case the NEAFC measures are infringed. The European Union mentioned the reasons for issuing the IUU “yellow card” to Liberia and highlighted its view that accepting certain CNCPs risked exposing NEAFC to potential IUU activities.

It was agreed to report to the NEAFC Commission that there was no consensus in PECMAC on any recommendation to the NEAFC Commission on the application of Liberia for renewal of the cooperating non-Contracting Party status.
4.23 It was noted that despite the lack of a recommendation from PECMAC, the application from Liberia would be a meeting document for the Annual Meeting in November, and that this issue might have to be resolved by holding a vote at that meeting.

4.2.2.3 Application for renewal – Canada

4.24 PECMAC discussed the application by Canada for renewing the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 18-02-07 and PE 18-02-49).

4.25 It was agreed to propose to the NEAFC Commission that Canada be granted the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party to NEAFC for the year 2019.

4.2.2.4 Application for renewal – New Zealand

4.26 PECMAC discussed the application by New Zealand for renewing the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 18-02-08 and PE 18-02-47).

4.27 It was agreed to propose to the NEAFC Commission that New-Zealand be granted the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party to NEAFC for the year 2019.

New Applications:

4.2.2.5 Application by Panama

4.28 PECMAC discussed the application by Panama for the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 18-02-05 and PE 18-02-50).

4.29 It was agreed to propose to the NEAFC Commission that Panama be granted the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party to NEAFC for the year 2019.

4.2.2.6 Application by Curaçao

4.30 PECMAC discussed the application by Curaçao for the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party (PE 2018-02-09 and PE 18-02-44).

4.31 It was agreed to propose to the NEAFC Commission that Curaçao be granted the status of a cooperating non-Contracting Party to NEAFC for the year 2019.

4.3 IUU activities in the Regulatory Area (RA)

4.3.1 Review of IUU List A and possible amendment of IUU List B

4.32 PECMAC considered the latest version of the IUU B List (PE 18-02-35 Rev1) and information provided by the North Pacific Fisheries Organisation (NPFO) (PE 18-02-10), the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) (PE 18-02-04) and the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) (PE 18-02-43).

4.3.2 Review of Scheme Art. 44 paragraph 5 and 6

4.33 The Secretariat explained that under Article 44 of the Scheme there were reciprocal arrangements in place for automatic updating of IUU lists with NAFO and SEAFO. While CCAMLR was listed in the Article, reciprocal arrangements did not currently exist. Other RFMO IUU lists, while normally circulated to Heads of Delegation, required decisions by PECMAC to
add them to the NEAFC lists. The Chair asked PECMAC if other arrangements would be appropriate.

4.34 In discussion PECMAC considered the potential to provide web links to other RFMO IUU lists, but noted this had no enforcement implications under the Scheme. It was also noted that one option was to amend the wording in article 44 to include certain principles for sharing lists without specifying the RFMOs. The item was closed with no conclusion.

4.4 Possible amendments of the Scheme

4.4.1 Article 7; Abandoned, Lost and Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG)

4.35 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-20 regarding reporting and retrieval requirements related to Abandoned, Lost and Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG). The proposal included widening the current requirements for retrieval of lost gear to all gears, not just fixed gear. Norway noted that whereas the Scheme included provisions dealing with ALDFG, there was no (compliance) reporting back on the issues by Contracting Parties. Hence, there were no NEAFC reports available to the public, despite this being a high profile issue.

4.36 In general, Contracting Parties shared the concerns expressed by Norway. In discussion the problem of ghost fishing and the need to reduce marine litter was noted, as well as the potential to report and map lost gear, including via the use of mobile phone apps. Nevertheless one party indicated that it would need more time to consider the proposal, including consulting the industry. Another party considered that it would opportune to develop a more comprehensive approach in respect of this issue.

4.37 PECMAC noted that Norway would return with a proposal on ALDFG at the 2018 Annual Meeting.

Article 21

4.38 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-11Rev1 on the designation of ports. This introduced a new draft form for the designation of ports as an Annex XIX, as well as amending Article 21 of the Scheme accordingly.

4.39 In discussion other Contracting Parties agreed with the approach, subject to some minor amendments to the requirements for a geographical position and to harmonise the table with the FAO PSMA.

4.40 Following the revisions to the document, PECMAC agreed to adopt an amendment to Article 21 of the Scheme as set out in document PE 2018-02-11 Rev2

Article 25

4.41 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-12 Rev1. Norway explained that whereas Article 25 of the Scheme introduced a 3-year review period for inspection levels, given the difficulty of reaching compromise on inspection levels in the first instance, it would be better to remove the review provision.
4.42 Given the provision for review remained if so requested by a Contracting Party, **PECMAC agreed to adopt an amendment of Article 25 of the Scheme as set out in PE 2018-02-12 Rev1.**

**Article 22 and 23**

4.43 Iceland presented document PE 2018-02-19 which proposed an amendment of Articles 22 and 23 of the Scheme to more clearly link the ETA of a notification of entry to port to the commencement of landing or transhipment. Having consulted other Contracting Parties Iceland had included text to allow permission by the competent authorities for commencement before the ETA, but nevertheless would allow timely arrival of inspectors to attend the whole unloading.

4.44 In discussion there remained queries including on when vessels should make clear that they wanted an earlier entry than the ETA, and on the other parts (D and E) of the PSC form. It was also noted that the NEAFC system still used the term Port State Control, when language harmonised with the FAO suggested the need to switch to the term Port State Measures.

4.45 After the discussion, Iceland concluded that the drafting would need reconsidering.

4.46 PECMAC noted that Iceland would return to a future meeting with a revised proposal.

**PSC 3 Form**

4.47 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-14 rev1. Norway explained that the introduction of Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) to the NEAFC PSC 3 form would help reduce the risk of errors with the use of different local time according to location. The proposal also introduced an automatically generated number for the form; the “EPSC reference number”

**Article 29**

4.48 Norway presented document PE 2018-02-33 on an amendment to Article 29 of the Scheme to include other use of port services in the serious infringements definitions, noting that this document had already been agreed at the April meeting of PECMAC.

4.49 Whereas some Contracting Parties considered that the amendment had been agreed at an earlier meeting, the European Union pointed out that the approach for serious infringements should be based on the risk factor. Its view was that when vessels use ports for other purposes that have not entailed any landing or transhipment, this would be considered as infringement, but should not trigger a serious infringement. Norway expressed concern over this.

4.50 PECMAC was unable to agree on the proposal.

4.51 PECMAC agreed to the proposal, subject to addition of UTC data in a revision of the document. **PECMAC agreed to adopt an amendment of the PSC 3 form as set out in PE 2018-02-14 Rev1.**
4.4.2 Annex I, Regulated Resources

4.52 Norway introduced document PE 2018-02-16 proposing to include porbeagle, basking shark and spurdog to the Annex 1B of the NEAFC Scheme. Norway explained that as NEAFC had adopted management measures (a ban on targeted fishing and requirement for prompt release of unharmed by-catches) for these species, they should be added to Annex 1 of the Scheme, in order to enable the Contracting Parties to comply with reporting requirements. Norway noted that the AM 2011 had agreed that the porbeagle, basking shark and spurdog should be added to the lists in relevant NEAFC instruments including the Scheme, however this had still not been actioned. Norway proposed therefore to add the stocks to Annex 1B of the Scheme.

4.53 While several Parties supported the proposal, one Contracting Party pointed out that the NEAFC Convention excluded the management of highly migratory species managed by other RFMOs. Two of the species were highly migratory sharks and for one of them ICCAT had already adopted a recommendation not allowing landings of that species. The ongoing changes to the ICCAT Convention were mentioned. Norway agreed that ICCAT had adopted a recommendation for porbeagle, but explained that, as ICCAT currently did not have a mandate to manage shark fisheries, the recommendation only applied to bycatches of porbeagle in fisheries managed by ICCAT. Norway further noted that although ICCAT was in the process of amending its Convention to include elasmobranchs that are oceanic, pelagic, and highly migratory, an amended Convention had not been adopted yet. Hence, until ICCAT had the mandate to manage shark species, Norway was of the opinion that the three species mentioned should be included in Annex 1. Another Party reminded PECMAC of the NEAFC convention text that enabled NEAFC to adopt appropriate measures. In trying to find a compromise, an alternative proposal discussed was to delete Annex 1B altogether or, alternatively, to add an Annex 1C for such bycatch species.

4.54 The Chair reminded PECMAC that NEAFC had in fact adopted legally binding management measures on these three species and furthermore in 2011 had already mandated their addition to the Scheme lists.

4.55 Given no consensus could be achieved, the Chair concluded that the issue should be brought to the attention of the Annual Meeting, and additionally, given the differing interpretations of the NEAFC Convention, to the attention of Heads of Delegation.

5. Annual Meeting issues referred to PECMAC

5.1 Implications for the Scheme of the use of electronic fishing logbooks (ERS)

5.1.1 Report from the AHWGERS meetings in 2018

5.1 The Chair briefly introduced the progress made at the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Electronic Reporting Systems. The meeting reports were covered in documents PE 2018-02-30, PE 2018-02-31, PE 2018-02-32 and PE 2018-02-52. PECMAC noted that the outputs of the Working Group would be sent to the Annual Meeting, subject to the remaining open issues to be resolved by Contracting Parties under this agenda item.
5.1.2 Possible amendments to the Scheme

5.2 The Chair introduced PE 2018-02-23 explaining that this was a document produced by the AHWGERS Chair to help align (as far as possible) the existing NAF based Scheme with the new Scheme enabling electronic fishing logbooks using the UN/CEFACT format. This would aim to help harmonise the requirements of the two schemes during the ERS two year transition period as set out in Recommendation 16:2018.

5.3 The European Union pointed out its view that complex documents were submitted shortly before the meeting and this particular document was not finalised by the ERS working group. In discussion the European Union explained its understanding that there would be no differences in obligations in reporting requirements and information available for control and inspection purposes in the two year transition period. Its view was that the established principles should establish a level playing field with automatic expiry of the old scheme after the two year transition period.

5.4 The Chair reminded PECMAC that the document was implementing the agreement of the Annual Meeting in 2017; “It was agreed to adopt the UN/CEFACT International Standard for Communications between NEAFC Secretariat and Fisheries Monitoring Centres, implemented no later than June 2019 with a transition period of up to two years”.

5.5 It was agreed to table document PE 2018-02-23 ‘Amendments of the current Scheme of Control and Enforcement’ at the Annual Meeting. This would be subject to the addition of a new Article 47 setting out the details of the 2 year transitional period. This would be subject to consideration of the reservations and alternative wording proposed by the European Union in document PE 2018-02-55 and noted at the relevant points of the text of the amended articles.

5.6 The Chair introduced Documents PE 2018-02-26 Rev1, PE 2018-02-27 and PE 2018-02-29. These documents set out the output from AHWGERS in the form of Articles for the new Scheme in a clean version; PE 2018-02-26 Rev1 and a tracked change version, PE 2018-02-27. In PE 2018-02-29 the Chair of AHWGERS had summarised the Key changes in a series of bullets. PECMAC proceeded to discuss the proposals article by article.

5.1.2.1 Articles

5.7 In discussion On article 13.2 it was noted that the wording on correction of transhipment declarations in the latter part of Art 13.2 square brackets “[The Transhipment declaration ... the Regulatory Area]” had not been agreed. However, Denmark in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland requested to keep for consideration the bracketed proposal in the text.

5.8 Some minor editorial corrections were made to the text. Otherwise the text of PE 2018-02-27 remained unchanged, noting that the European Union indicated it had several reservations and proposed amendments, as set out in its document PE 2018-02-55. The European Union stated that it was appropriate for PECMAC to address implications of technical work carried out by the ERS working group, in particular the link between reporting requirements and control and sanction provisions. Other Contracting Parties indicated that
they needed further time (after PECMAC) to consider the changes proposed by the European Union.

5.9 **PECMAC agreed to table document PE 2018-02-27, the amended articles NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement in tracked changes, at the Annual Meeting. This would be subject to consideration of the reservations and alternative wording proposed by the European Union in document PE 2018-02-55 and noted at the relevant points of the text of the amended articles.**

  5.1.2.2 Annexes and appendixes

5.10 The Chair introduced Documents PE 2018-02-36, which set out the amended annexes to the Scheme. He noted that in association with this some requests for advice had been sent to the JAGDM in document PE 2018-02-40. In addition the Secretariat had provided a provisional reports mapping implementation documents in PE 2018-02-42.

5.11 It was noted that document PE 2018-02-37, the European Union’s draft FLUX ERS implementation document needed updating by the European Union before it could become one of the Annexes of the Scheme in document PE 2018-02-36.

5.12 There was a somewhat lengthy session on some of the detail set out in the various tables in document PE 2018-02-36. The European Union stated it had a general reserve on some of the proposed elements that had not been agreed by the ERS working group; predicted time and location of start of activity, fishing and bottom depth at start and end of activities.

5.13 The Secretariat reiterated the information previously given that changes proposed after September 2018 may impact on the currently agreed timeline for implementation of the new system. The Chair reminded PECMAC that the wording in the documents from AHWGERS reflected many years of work and the earlier agreements, PECMAC would therefore need to deliver solutions to the Annual Meeting.

5.14 **PECMAC agreed to table document PE 2018-02-36, the amended Annexes of the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement at the Annual Meeting. This would be subject to consideration of the reservations and alternative wording proposed by the European Union in document PE 2018-02-55. The document would be subject to minor editorial work and input from JAGDM and would also include an updated version of the European Union FLUX ERS implementation documents (VMS and ERS), requested from the European Union to be sent as soon as possible.**

  5.1.2.3 Implementation Document

5.2 **Expansion of the role of the Secretariat in monitoring the activities of fishing vessels operating in the Regulatory Area**

5.15 No document on this item. **The Chair concluded that Contracting Parties were content with the current activities of the Secretariat in this regard.**
5.3 Flag State Performance Review

5.16 The Chair set out the process that the Annual Meeting 2017 had agreed on self-review of flag State performance, for reporting to the 2020 AM. The plan was for a first draft submitted to PECMAC 1 in 2019 with a finalised version by PECMAC 2 2019. This would allow time for PECMAC to provide its summary report to the AM 2020 via a drafting group working under the two PECMAC meetings in 2020.

5.17 The Contracting Parties noted their intentions to meet the deadlines and thanked Norway for its early report PE 2018-02-22. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted that it would not be able to deliver its first draft by the April 2019 PECMAC meeting. The European Union pointed out that it would only be appropriate for it to provide a final version of their assessment according to the timeline agreed at the Annual Meeting. Iceland noted their intention to deliver a first draft by the April 2019 PECMAC meeting and the final version in time for the September meeting.

5.18 The Chair indicated he would update the Annual Meeting accordingly.

5.4 Review and possible amendments of the requirements for CNCP application (Art 34)

5.19 The European Union presented document PE 2018-02-21 which set out their proposals to make the process for annual assessment of applications by Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties more rigorous. Their proposals, amending Article 34 of the Scheme were aimed at alignment with the FAO PSMA and FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Flag State Performance Review.

5.20 In general Contracting Parties were supportive of the document subject to some minor amendments to drafting.

5.21 PECMAC agreed to adopt the amended document PE 2018-02-21 Rev1, setting out proposed amendments to Article 34 of the Scheme.

6. Evaluation of the redfish fisheries special control measures

6.1 Irminger Sea

6.1 The Secretariat presented its tables on compliance by Contracting Parties with special control measures regulating catches in the Redfish fisheries in the Irminger Sea (PE 2018-02-17).

6.2 In discussion it was noted that only two Contracting Parties had met the requirements for weekly reporting of landings. Iceland regretted this situation and ongoing attitude towards a NEAFC recommendation as fulfilling the requirements could not be considered a heavy workload. It was also suggested that the tables could be made clearer by the introduction of columns setting out transfers of quota and any other adjustments.
6.3 PECMAC adopted PE 2018-02-17 Rev1 on Redfish, which included additional information on transfers as indicated above.

7. Possible amendments to Recommendations adopted by the Commission

7.1 Recommendation 14:2017 to Provide VMS and Catch Data to ICES for Scientific Purposes

7.1 The Secretariat presented document PE 2018-02-35 on Recommendation 14:2017. This followed correspondence from the President to the Chair of PECMAC, following a request from ICES, on a way forward to allow the Secretariat to send VMS data to ICES on a yearly basis rather than a six-monthly basis. At the same time the current Recommendation was due for renewal the end of 2018. In making this request, the Chairs of PECMAS and JAGDM had also been copied in given their interest in the data.

7.2 PECMAC expressed no concerns with the change in reporting frequency, and accordingly the European Union submitted a proposal to amend draft Recommendation PE 2018-02-53, extended to 2021.

7.3 PECMAC adopted PE 2018-02-53 to submit to the Annual Meeting; a draft Recommendation to replace 14:2017. The Secretariat was requested to update the Chairs of PECMAS and JAGDM.

7.2 Recommendation 1:2018 on Redfish in the Irminger Sea

7.4 No comments by PECMAC on the Recommendation.

7.3 Recommendation 19:2014

7.5 No comments by PECMAC on the Recommendation.

8. International cooperation

8.1 The Secretariat briefly updated PECMAC on its international cooperation. This included with the World Maritime University, FAO (on PSMA and the global Vessel Record), attendance at a workshop on technological tools for areas beyond national jurisdiction, and finally on a WTO meeting on IUU.

9. Data security and confidentiality – ISMS

9.1 Identification of final documents

9.1 In discussion the issues of data protection regarding documents and presentations were noted. The European Union explained that under its legislation vessel names and
inspectors identity numbers were considered personal information, so even in a restricted forum such information should only be used if absolutely necessary. **PECMAC identified meeting document PE 2018-02-18 as needing to be marked restricted for public access.**


**9.2** PECMAC agreed that the Annual Compliance report from last year i.e. for 2016 should not be restricted, therefore would be made available on the NEAFC Website.

**10. Any other business**

**10.1** Norway presented document PE 2018-02-15. It explained that it had planned to propose that FAO be provided with a link to the NEAFC designated ports list rather than individual Contracting Parties having to send these to FAO. However a recent proposal for the same approach had been rejected at the NAFO annual meeting, therefore Norway would withdraw the paper for now, at least until a consistent approach could be agreed with other RFMOs such as NAFO.

**10.2** Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) presented document PE 2018-02-45 on the work of the Nordic Fisheries Control Network. PECMAC thanked Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) for the information on project, workshop and cooperation.

**10.3** Iceland presented document PE 2018-02-54 proposing amendments to Part C of PSC 1 and PSC 2 forms. The amendment was to make clear that vessels which had caught fish in both NAFO and NEAFC waters were only authorised by the forms to land the NEAFC catch. Reciprocal changes had been made at NAFO under its STACTIC committee.

**10.4** Contracting Parties considered the proposals sensible subject to some clarifications in the drafting.

**10.5** PECMAC agreed to adopt PE 2018-02-54 Rev 1 proposing amendments to Part C of PSC 1 and PSC 2 forms. This was subject to any minor editorial corrections that the Secretariat was requested to make.

**10.6** Norway alerted PECMAC to the latest global fisheries enforcement training workshop of the International MCS Network, due in Bangkok, Thailand from 18-22 February 2019. The meeting would focus on global cooperation between flag, coastal and market States. [http://imcsnet.org/6th-global-fisheries-enforcement-training-workshop-gfetw/](http://imcsnet.org/6th-global-fisheries-enforcement-training-workshop-gfetw/)

**11. Report to the 2018 Annual Meeting**

**11.1** The draft report of the meeting was circulated to Contracting Parties for comments and the final report was adopted on xx October 2018.
11.2 The Chair noted that he would present an executive summary of the two PECMAC meetings at the Annual Meeting 2018. On the substance of the ERS, documents PE 2018-02-23, PE 2018-02-27 and PE 2018-02-36 would be provided along with the European Union document PE 2018-02-55.

All Contracting Parties were invited to reflect on the documents before the annual meeting.

12. Closure of the meeting
12.1 The Chair thanked participants for their work and the progress made in the meeting. He also thanked the Secretariat for their help.