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

The list of participants is attached to this report.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur
In the case of this Extraordinary PECMAC meeting, which took place during the Annual Meeting, the Secretariat was tasked with drafting the documentation for presentation to the Commission and therefore the PECMAC Chair drafted this report.

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda
This PECMAC extraordinary meeting was convened in the margins of the AM to finalise the relevant documents necessary for the implementation of NEAFC’s ERS.

4. Implications for the Scheme of the use of ERS
With regard to ERS the Chair noted that the objective should be to agree on articles (documents AM 2018-37 and AM 2018-38) and Annex IV (AM 2018-58) and on the establishment of an ERS Implementation group. However, the Chair noted that PECMAC first needed to decide between the following approaches:

- Single Scheme full alignment (including technical)
- Single Scheme alignment limited to technical adjustments
- Two parallel Schemes alignment limited to technical adjustments

Furthermore, the Chair noted that all of these approaches are possible. However, there are very different implications and consequences to the different approaches.
It was identified that the decisive element on this matter was to secure a level playing field during the transition period. PECMAC agreed that this could be achieved by filtering the data available for inspectors in a way that the same data shall be made available for inspection purposes as is available in the current NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement.

On this basis PECMAC agreed to follow the two parallel Schemes approach with alignments limited to technical adjustments. The texts of both Schemes would be included in one NEAFC Recommendation. PECMAC agreed that, when amendments are made to either of the Schemes, the same amendments would be introduced into the other Scheme *mutatis mutandis* (as appropriate).

Thereafter, PECMAC considered the remaining outstanding issues identified at the September PECMAC meeting, and in particular issues listed in document AM 2018-40. PECMAC identified a number of issues that need further consideration at a later stage.

PECMAC discussed the transmission procedures provided in the proposed New NEAFC Scheme under Article 14(4). PECMAC will discuss and define procedures that the Master of the vessel should follow in case they do not receive a positive acknowledgment from the Secretariat.

With regard to the obligations on recording fishing information, PECMAC discussed whether to propose to maintain in the NEAFC Scheme the indication that the obligation refers to catches exceeding 50 kg on board. There is a common understanding among Contracting Parties that the removal of the *de minimis* reference of 50kg in catch shall not change how control and enforcement provisions are applied in respect of such catches.

It was noted by one Contracting Party that a donor vessel involved in a transshipment operation do not, like in other prior notifications, have the possibility to correct the prior notification transshipment message to correct for fish caught between the time of prior notification of transshipment to the time the transshipment takes place. The quantity on board the donor vessel after the transshipment has taken place can therefore only be calculated using the transshipment message from the receiving vessel. If any discrepancies are found during inspection of the donor vessel after the transshipment has taken place it is unclear who is legally responsible for the discrepancy. A receiving vessel involved in a transshipment operation shall report the quantities received no later than 1 hour after the transshipment has ended. If the quantities transshipped are fresh fish pumped on board for processing in the receiving vessel the estimate 1 hour after the transshipment has ended will be relatively inaccurate. The quantity received will be much more precise once the processing of the fish has taken place, but there are, like in other activity reports, no possibility to correct the quantities.

There was thorough discussion regarding Article 12.1 and 13.1 in particular whether all species should be reported or only species defined as fisheries resources in terms of NEAFC. It was
agreed that all species should be reported and the NEAFC Secretariat shall inform other RFMOs of possible by catches of species managed by them.

There were discussions on whether the list of serious infringements should apply to fisheries resources, or whether some of them should be limited to regulated resources. It was identified that the scope of the Scheme is fisheries resources. However, the reporting in the past has been limited to regulated resources only, but the Port State Control Scheme requires reporting of fisheries resources. Therefore, some Contracting Parties considered it wrong to ignore possible mis-recording of unregulated resources during at sea inspections but file such possible mis-recording as serious infringement during Port Inspections.

After discussions it was agreed to include text in the chapeau of Article 29 expressing that the list of infringements applied to fisheries resources, but to limit the application of Article 29 d) regarding serious mis-recording of catches and Article 29 f) regarding repeated failure to comply with the provisions of Articles 12 and, as appropriate 13, to regulated resources. As some Contracting Parties were of the opinion that Article 29 d. and f. should not be limited to regulated resources, it was agreed to come back to this issue in PECMAC.

PECMAC agreed that the new reporting requirements will not change today's practice with regard to enforcing serious infringements as outlined in article 29.

There were divergent views on specific data elements (fishing and bottom depth) with regard to when this information should be provided. It was pointed out that a reference to specific management measures is not in line with the request from PECMAS nor what PECMAC proposed to the Commission in 2016. Furthermore, the current logbook requires fishing depth when recording haul by haul operations. To clarify the matter PECMAC will ask PECMAS for further guidance on these specific data elements.

However, PECMAC agreed to consider these issues at a later stage and that they would not stand in the way of a final agreement on ERS.

PECMAC agreed on amendments to the current NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement (AM 2018-98 Annex 3), articles in a new NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement (AM 2018-98 Annex 1) describing requirements for ERS when introducing the FLUX UN/CEFACT standard and Annexes (AM 2018-98 Annex 2) to this new Scheme.

Annex IX of the new Scheme was not finalised. Therefore, PECMAC agreed to recommend the establishment of a new ERS Implementation Group under PECMAC to finalise technical documentation. In particular it was agreed that this group shall give advice on issues outstanding in Annex IX of the New NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement and the NEAFC Master Data Register during the development phase and transition period of the ERS in NEAFC.

PECMAC also considered procedures for implementing ERS in NEAFC and in particular procedures to adopt the implementation date of the ERS and consequently the date that the
new Scheme and amended current Scheme enters into force and the start date of the two year transition period.

PECMAC agreed on procedures to this which were presented to the AM as document AM 2018-98 with annexes.

5. **Report to the 2018 Annual Meeting**
The Chair reported to the AM the conclusions of this PECMAC meeting presented in document AM 2018-98 with annexes.

6. **Closure of the meeting**
The Chair thanked and congratulated participants and the Secretariat for their work and the progress made in the meeting.