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1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair Gylfi Geirsson (Iceland) opened the meeting welcoming the participants. The Russian Federation was not represented at the meeting. The detailed list of the 17 of Participants is annexed to this report as document 2016-02-02.

2. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was discussed and a new point under any other business added. The agenda was approved as amended as document 2016-02-01.

3. Appointment of the rapporteur

The Secretariat was appointed as the rapporteur.

4. Advice from the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)

The Chair summarised the issues forwarded to JAGDM for advice. The Secretariat introduced document 2016-02-04 which included advice from JAGDM on the possible adoption of UN/CEFACT P1000 in NEAFC ERS.

It was noted by some CPs that the work at this meeting should continue to focus on the work done in the January meeting and not start additional discussions.

CPs discussed at length the possible use of the new standard noting that for some of them most of the internal and bilateral work is done and systems that are in operation are using...
other formats, but having very similar data elements. The change of format is from CP FMC to and from NEAFC.
The Chair noted that NEAFC usually does the pioneer work. He also noted that P1000 standards will be formally approved by UN/CEFACT still during April.

It was noted that mapping of real reports between NAF slash reports, XML reports with two-letter codes from NAF used in ERS bilaterally and UN/CEFACT P1000 is need and it should be done by EU as the one CP having all these formats in there systems. This shall be done as soon as possible ahead of the next meeting NEAFC Secretariat also volunteered to take part in this mapping exercise.

EU made a presentation on the recent work on UN/CEEFACT P1000 the CPs considered to have a much clear understanding of the complete system now.
The Chair summarised discussion considering the advice from JAGDM to be reasonable.

5. Continuation of work according to the mandate from the NEAFC 2012 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 documents 2016-02-05 on “possible data-elements : message format” and 2016-02-08 on “possible data-elements : list format”.

Secretariat presented document 2016-02-05 as a new version of the document presented at the January meeting. The participants reviewed the document thoroughly and discussed each point in detail.

There was a discussion on the need for additional advice from JAGDM.
The result of discussion is document 2016-02-05 rev2 that includes amended tables but also a summary of main discussion points for future reference.

It was also agreed that the request for advice to be sent to JAGDM will be circulated to participants for comment prior to be sent to JAGDM.

According to the discussion of making the IMO number the unique identifier for vessels in the new ERS system for NEAFC JAGDM is asked to look at the technical part of this question. Contracting Parties were invited to make a document showing any other pros and cons that could be if this change is done when adopting a new system.

Document 2016-02-08 will be updated in accordance with the conclusions of the discussions on document 2016-02-05.

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

The Chair reviewed the conclusions of document 2016-01-08 and asked for any additional comments.
It was mentioned from one CP that the group should take into consideration the results from the AHWG ERS June meeting 2013, also listed as AHWG ERS 2016-01-04 and not start for the beginning again.

There was agreement noting that NEAFC will have to consider the need for consistency between the new ERS architecture and the need for transmission of data under the Chapter II data, the VMS and Chapter IV data.

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

An additional set of questions to be addressed to PECMAS will be prepared by the Chair and will be circulated to participants for comment.

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

The Secretariat presented document 2016-02-06 on the “application of the ISMS to ERS”. Participants discussed the need to condition the access to classified data and also discussed the need to establish business continuity guidelines.

It was agreed that the Chair and the Secretariat will prepare a data flow chart for next meeting.

5.5. Develop a timeframe for the implementation of the system

The Secretariat introduced document 2016-02-07 on the “steps towards building ERS: tendering vs preferred partner”. As the decision to tender or not will have a significant impact on the timeline for ERS.

The general view is that the Secretariat should do an initial contact with the existing service provider in order to have some information on the amounts to be budgeted to establish ERS and all other additional work required to integrate order databases and web services.

It was noted that tendering or not may be affected by the fact that CPs contribution need to be additional to the annual budget.

The Chair considered discussing within PECMAC the possibility of requesting advice from the Finance and Administration WG on this matter.

It was noted that if a final decision is taken at the November 2016 Annual Meeting then the ERS will most likely be operational on the first quarter of 2018, if NEAFC can continue to work with their current service provider as a preferred partner. Tendering will require significantly more time.

It was agreed that EU and Norway should produce a document as soon as possible on the pros and cons of having one or two systems in the Secretariat.
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**

Chair summarised development so far since 2013 noting a Norwegian document that started the task of identifying the articles and annexes of the Scheme requiring amendment to implement ERS.

It was greed that the Chair and Secretariat will take task of identifying the Scheme articles and annexes requiring amendment and produce a document for the next meeting.

7. **Any other business**

   **7.1 Interoperability of ERS with legacy systems:** Norway asked for this to be added under this agenda point.

Norway stressed the importance of starting now in addressing the issue of the integration of the new ERS with other existing reporting requirements now in place namely the Chapter II data, the VMS and the Chapter IV data. The existence of these data demand either that the scope of the ERS system cover these data in a new system, or that ERS systems and existing systems are interoperable so there is no loss of data to control and inspection personnel. This has significant practical implications for tendering and resources.

It was noted that full integration of all types of messages and/or reports to be exchanged is a goal and that if UN/CEFACT P1000 becomes the standard then all other reporting requirements need amending. There is already a UN/CEFACT standard for exchange of licensing information (corresponding to Annex II information in NEAFC), which is somewhat behind the UN/CEFACT P1000, but will become an international standard and that work is being done in EU on exchange of inspection reports in the same format which is scheduled to become a standard in 2017.

It was noted the implications of the existence of two systems within the Secretariat and the consequences not only on the tendering and acquisition but also on the cost of future maintenance. Reference is made to item 5.5 where EU and Norway are askew to develop a document covering pros and cons of having one or two systems in the NEAFC Secretariat.

8. **Report to the April 2016 meeting of PECMAC**

The Chair will present the reports from both the January and April meetings to PECMAC meeting.

9. **Date and place of next meeting**

The Chair will consult with the CPs to ascertain on the need to an additional meeting. A tentative date for the meeting could be 14/15 June in London.
10. Closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked the participants and the Secretariat for the good work and wished all a safe return home.
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