Second Meeting of the Permanent Committee on Control and Enforcement 7-8 October 2008
NEAFC headquarters - 22 Berners Street, London W1T 3DY

Report

1 Opening
The Chair, Mr Martin Newman, EU, opened the meeting welcoming everybody. All Contracting Parties were present, except the Russian Federation.

2 Appointment of the rapporteur
The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur

3 Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
The agenda, document PECCOE2008/02/01 was tabled and adopted.

4 Scheme of Control and Enforcement

4.1 General implementation
The Chair asked the Secretariat to introduce doc. PECCOE 2008/02/34, which lists the performance of Contracting and Reporting Parties. As an overall observation, the system is improving with respect to the number of automatic reports sent to the system, but with respect to catch reporting in particular there are problems with discipline in the use of the codes. This makes it difficult to query the database and the Secretariat has to work on data for each vessel and each day by hand. Some FMCs have good quality data, others are more variable.

The Chair said that these observations had implications for the discussion of the performance of individual FMCs and controls in the pelagic redfish fisheries.

The EU representative appreciated the detailed information. He described the responsibilities of the flag states and DG Mare and wanted to discuss the detailed information in his delegation. The Secretariat explained how the information had been prepared and the bearing on different parts of the Scheme, especially the responsibility of inspection platforms.

The Chair observed that this was an internal EU problem, but the document was a good basis for discussion. He invited the Icelandic representative to introduce doc. PECCOE 2008/02/04.
The Icelandic proposal is in short to make information that has been available to Parties with an active inspection presence in an area available on the web. Text to cover this in the Scheme was proposed. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had a lot of sympathy for the proposal, but he felt it was necessary to take a close look at the implications. The Norwegian representative echoed this. The Secretariat informed that an upgrade of the NEAFC database system is underway. The basic system is at present almost unchanged since it was established 8-9 years ago. The upgrade opens up for the use of new applications and technical improvements access to data.

The Chair suggested that this was an obvious matter for the AGDC to look into. He noted general support for the Icelandic proposal, which simplifies procedures with respect to Article 14, 4 the proposal. The Secretariat saw the proposal as giving a choice to Contracting Parties to pull data in addition to data pushed by the Secretariat already in place. The Icelandic representative agreed and pointed out that the measure in place for the Irminger Sea redfish this year was a major step forward in assisting inspection. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted changes in technology now allow inspection platforms to go online. The EU representative noted the problem of security of the links and felt that the management of security should be stricter if it was decided to go ahead. The Icelandic representative agreed and thought that this was covered in their proposal, which he felt really improved security.

The Chair summed up that there was a need for access to information in the database to plan inspections well in advance. Tighter security should be put in place. The Icelandic representative suggested that this could also be investigated in detail by the AGDC. He found that increased use of the data would be the best way to secure its quality. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed. The Icelandic representative informed that the Icelandic Coast Guard had over the years assisted a number of other Parties in locating fishing activities, as the information in the database had not always been available to their inspection platforms.

The Chair asked if the suggested changes should go into the Scheme. The Secretariat noted that many inspection services still had problems in receiving information from the NEAFC database. The Norwegian representative felt that it was the right time to push these matters forward. The information from the Secretariat about upgrading the system required that necessary funds were made available at the Annual Meeting in November. The Chair summed up that we should try to solve the problems identified head on. He left the issue for further consideration. He noted that there may be other proposals that affected the Scheme which should be included in any discussion on changes in the Scheme.

4.2 Annual reports from Contracting Parties under Articles 32 & 33 of the Scheme

The relevant documents were listed. Documents PE2008/02/09 Iceland, 17 the Faroe Islands, 19 Greenland, 07 Norway and 27 the EU. No report has been received from the Russian Federation. The Chair invited Contracting Parties to report briefly.
The Norwegian representative reported one infringement. The Iceland representative reported 50 incidents of serious infringements, most related to missing reports in the redfish fishery in the Irminger Sea. He noted that very often vessels report correctly, but these reports are not forwarded to the NEAFC database by the FMCs. He noted that pressure exerted under Icelandic domestic law - closing harbours to vessels not complying - had led to improvement in compliance. Iceland had not reported all serious infringements, before having made additional investigations. Iceland had, as a follow up, sought to inspect landings in other Contracting Parties’ harbours. This had been accepted by one Party, but not by another.

The EU agreed that vessels generally are complying, because they suffer if they do not. Unfortunately the EU had discovered systemic failures further down the line, but these had to some extent been resolved. He stressed that to pursue infringements original inspection and surveillance papers should be submitted to the flag states. The Icelandic representative thanked the EU for the information. He noted that a report on an infringement of an Icelandic vessel did not match other parts of the report. The EU representative accepted that this was an error. The vessel in question was Faroese. There was also a Norwegian infringement. He noted that Norway and Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had not responded to that.

The Norwegian representative informed that he was not aware of this alleged infringement. This was a rather recent event and that probably was the reason that there had not been a follow up. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed that they had not received any information from the EU about an infringement. The EU representative said that there should have been information directly from the inspection vessel, but he would check.

The Chair noted that Article 24 of the Scheme allows the Port State to invite inspectors from other Contracting Parties to inspect landings. NAFO had a similar procedure. However, an invitation was needed. He also drew attention to Article 30.8, where an inspector can remain on a boarded vessel until the landing port has been reached. These procedures are triggered by infringements.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had not carried out any inspections or any surveillance. The Icelandic representative asked for action on reported infringements of a Greenland vessel and a vessel from the Faroe Islands. Greenland informed that there had been confusion about the identification of the vessel. With respect to the Faroese vessel, there had been a muddle when the vessel was notified and eventually withdrawn. The Icelandic representative observed that this should lead to a message from the system.

The Chair questioned the reporting period. If PECCOE was to deal with compliance issues at the April meeting it would make sense to report by calendar year. This would make it possible to pick up consequential amendments to the Scheme stemming from problems with compliance. This would also give more time for compiling and analysing data. He asked for the opinion of Contracting Parties.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) said that originally there was only one autumn meeting of PECCOE. NAFO had also shifted from the calendar reporting period. He would not oppose a move to deal with
the matters in the spring and report by calendar year. The Norwegian representative thought that originally the reporting period has been established to bring forward to the Annual Meeting data that are as up to date as possible. He also pointed out the difference in time scale in reporting infringements and reporting on the follow up process. The EU representative felt it would be more logical to report by the calendar year. He proposed that reports on port state control should be included in the annual report. He felt that the deadline for reporting should be as early as possible to allow analysis before the spring PECCOE meeting. The Chair concluded that these matters could also be discussed at the PECCOE autumn meeting. The Annual Meeting generally does not discuss these matters in detail.

The Chair summed up that there was general consensus that as much information as possible should be available for inspecting parties on the website. Annual reports under Article 32 and 33 should be by calendar year and PECCOE should discuss these matters at its spring meeting. The deadline for Contracting Parties to report to NEAFC should be 1 March. The Secretariat will compile the data by 15 March. The Scheme will be changed accordingly. This also goes for reports on port state control measures under Article 33. The reports on port state control can be compiled from the website by the Secretariat.

**4.3 Possible amendments**

**4.3.1 Infringements**

At the April meeting it was agreed that certain amendments to Article 28 should be recommended for adoption (Document PE 2008-02-25 Rev 01).

The EU representative proposed that the heading of Article 32 should reflect that it also dealt with the follow up on infringements - “Reporting and follow up on infringements”. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) supported this proposal. He proposed that it should be stated that reports should be given in English. The Chair did not want to go into the issue of language at this stage. This was accepted, but delegations were urged to consider the matter.

The proposals in document PECCOE2008/02/25 Rev 2 were adopted. The proposal will be forwarded as a recommendation to the Commission.

**4.3.2 Measures concerning Non-Contracting Party vessels**

At the April meeting it was agreed that certain amendments should be recommended for adoption (Document PE 2008-02-24). The amendments concern Articles 44 and 45 of the Scheme. The Chair informed that this slightly enlarges the scope to differentiate cooperative non-Contracting Party status. Four categories had been identified. He did not find it necessary to spell this out in the Scheme, but this could be decided at the Commission level in each case. Other text amendments allow a more flexible way to deal with vessels on the IUU lists, allowing for example scrapped vessels to be removed from the IUU list without confirmation from the flag state.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) supported the amendments. He asked if there was a need to have a confirmation that all fishing gear had been removed from the vessels before scrapping. The Chair
pointed out the important thing was not detail in the Scheme text. PECCOE will investigate detail on a case by case basis. It is then up to PECCOE to assess the information and risks. The only thing that has changed is that parties other than the flag state can provide evidence. Satisfactory evidence is the key. The present IUU list shows that there are new challenges all the time.

The EU representative suggested that in 34, a, b and c reference should be made to Regulatory Area, rather than just the NEAFC Area, “and update them” in 44.7. And Article 43 should be renamed “Reports on non-Contracting Party activity” not IUU activity. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thought reference should be to the Convention Area, not the Regulatory Area.

Document PECCOE2008/02/24 rev 1. The Chair commented that the revisions reflected the concerns expressed in discussions yesterday. Reference was to the Regulatory Area not to the Convention Area. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) accepted this.

PECCOE2008/02/24 rev 2 was adopted. The proposal will be forwarded as a recommendation to the Commission.

4.3.3 Port State Control measures
At the April meeting it was agreed that certain amendments should be recommended for adoption (Document PECCOE2008-02-23). In particular these concern Article 22 of the Scheme and the PSC 1 and PSC 2 forms and means to cancel PSCs. The Chair drew attention to the fact that NAFO has amended the PSC and NEAFC could adopt that also. It allows the splitting of catches between three areas in general, but only two when it comes to certification of the catches by the flag state. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) mentioned that STACTIC had also included conversion factors in the PSC. This should also be introduced in NEAFC. The STACTIC document will be circulated for information.

PECCOE2008/02/23 rev 1 mostly affected annexes, reflecting that the forms are now RFMO neutral, adding clarity to some procedures and the Secretary is tasked with compiling the information on port state control for PECCOE. The Icelandic representative suggested that “as soon as possible” should be used instead of giving an exact deadline for cancellations in Article 22 3. In NAFO it had been realised that more experience was needed and that it would be better to wait for NEAFC before deciding on any specific deadline. The Chair outlined the difference between NAFO and NEAFC. He invited the Norwegian representative to comment. The Norwegian representative noted that the other Party interested in this cancellation procedure was not present. He would like to discuss the matter with the Russian Federation. There was always a need for enough time, for example 24 hours or 6 hours as it stands now, to plan monitoring, but he did not know Russia’s wishes. He would prefer 6 hours to “as soon as possible” in Article 22 4. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) regretted that the Russian delegation was not present. He explained how he saw the situation and would prefer to keep the text as suggested in rev 1. The EU representative pointed out that there was a possibility for a Contracting Party to allow other reporting times. He suggested using the term “masters of vessels” throughout the document.
The Secretariat informed that they proposed using the document number for the original document for the cancellation as well. The Norwegian representative observed that the way cancellations were undertaken meant that it would be the same document with the word cancelled written across it. That may become different when electronic reporting became possible. The Icelandic representative asked if it would be possible to correct the area of catch and how that should be handled and verified. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thought this would lead to new reports. The Norwegian representative noted that if limitations on what could be corrected were adequately described in the Scheme, there should not be a problem. It was agreed to spell out the need to verify. This means that the procedure for the corrected forms will be exactly the same as for the original form. The pressure for acquiring verification from the flag state will be on the vessel not on the port state.

The Icelandic representative pointed out the potential for confusion with two certified forms, the original and the corrected both certified by the flag state. The Chair suggested that it should be stated that the corrected form should replace the original. After some discussion it was agreed that it would be better to only have a cancellation procedure and not a correction procedure. Cancellation will demand a new PSC form. The correction procedure was then taken out of the proposal.

The Chair pointed out that the PSC forms had been brought in line with what had been agreed in NAFO. They are now the same across the Atlantic.

The text as amended in PECCOE2008/02/23 rev 2 as then adopted. The proposal will be forwarded as a recommendation to the Commission.

4.3.4 Redfish landing controls

Further to the discussions at the April meeting the Chair had circulated a discussion paper, PECCOE 2008/02/11.

The Chair opened by asking if it was appropriate to introduce elements in the Scheme allowing redfish control measures, without specifically naming redfish. It was felt that the Scheme should not be too specific with respect to individual conservation measures. He gave the example of catch reporting. The Scheme could be neutral on reporting frequency, but allow flexibility in specific cases as needed. The same approach could be used for landing control. There should be tools in the Scheme that could be switched on and off as needed. He drew attention to discussions with respect to the binding instrument on Port State Control developed by FAO. The requirement is that rules are the same for own and foreign vessels. He had understood from the discussions in April that Parties wanted to go in this direction.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed with these statements. He noted the mixed nature of the fisheries across species or fishing zones. The same vessels are involved. There should not be too many specific measures in the Scheme. With respect to catch reporting, it should be the same for all fisheries. Logbook and VMS requirements should also be uniform. He described the experience in NAFO. He accepted that the same rules should be applied to own and foreign vessels, but this should not lead to the lowest common denominator. He
pointed out that scientists called for better reporting on catches and positions to improve stock assessments.

The Icelandic representative agreed with the Chair’s observations and this was precisely the aim of the Icelandic proposal, PECCOE 2008/02/03. The EU representative agreed. He stressed the need for a balance between measures for own vessels and foreign vessels as required by NAFO. The Norwegian representative could support the general approach suggested by the Chair. The Scheme should have the necessary tools to be applied in different situations.

The Chair started the discussion based on the Icelandic proposal and his own discussion paper. He suggested that the code for reporting under specific management measures should be indicated in the management measure, whereas the technical steps should be in the Scheme. The Norwegian representative asked for clarification of how this would work. The Icelandic representative noted that the text had never been really made clear on the reporting period. He would like to make it absolutely clear now. There was extensive discussion on technical details and experience from NAFO. The Norwegian representative found the Icelandic proposal quite complicated. We should try to find the simplest solutions possible to monitor the redfish fishery.

The Chair agreed that experience with reporting in NEAFC did suggest that complicated reporting procedures should be avoided. The Icelandic representative maintained that controlling a designated (conservation) area was not complicated and referred to the evidence presented in April 2008. The Chair found that the point was transparency and therefore all data, also from the parts of the conservation area which are inside EEZs, should be included. The Icelandic representative did not see a problem in reporting for the EEZs as these reports are distinctly marked by zone. The Norwegian representative thought that daily catches reports and VMS data would be enough to allow monitoring. The Secretariat pointed out that the proposal requires splitting up areas, which has not been supported before. This also required the reporting of all messages in real time, a thing not achieved by all FMCs at present.

The Icelandic representative pointed out that they did not propose a specific area, but to make it possible to define any area or box for conservation purposes. Other delegations asked for clarification of reporting of catches in different situations, especially when changing from an EEZ to the Regulatory Area and to the conservation (designated) area. The Icelandic representative clarified the situation and referred to systems set up in NAFO and for reporting from individual EEZs. The Chair pointed out that this was not provided for at present in the Scheme. The Icelandic representative thought that this was provided for in the 2008 measure for redfish in the Irminger Sea. The important point was to take out the reference in the Scheme to weekly catches.

The Chair summed up that the issue was a particular catch report when entering a designated area (if that can be clearly specified). This should be elaborated based on the Icelandic proposal. Various catch reports will use the same message template, but frequency can vary. He pointed out that “days fished” was already in the Scheme and should correspond to the reporting period. This should be in the text itself not in a footnote. He pointed out that the definition of the area would be discussed by HODs, but PECCOE should stress the need for having a full set of coordinates and clear
definition of the measure in space and time. There will only be a need to have a
general description of a designated area in the Scheme.

The Chair then addressed the question of landing controls. Again the approach should
be general in the Scheme and not specific. The Secretariat drew attention to the port of
landing control report (Article 13 and Annex VIII, 6).

The Chair then listed outstanding issues: Weighing, landing declarations and various
reports. The templates will be in the Scheme and individual measures will trigger the
use. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
expressed puzzlement about the number of new reports. Is it not possible to use
reports we already have? There was general support to attempt to use the same
inspection report vis-à-vis all users.

The Chair pointed out that his discussion paper was a maximum approach. The PSC
forms were perhaps not necessary. Contracting Parties could use their own
procedures. The important thing was a level playing field and transparency for all
parties. A landing declaration would ensure transparency with respect to landings as
we have for the report of catches at sea. He summed up that the main thing to look
into now was the landing declaration and the inspection procedures. An interim
conclusion was that there seemed to be general support to have only general
descriptions in the Scheme. Of course it was possible to have a chapter in the Scheme
that dealt with specific fisheries, or a mixture of both. The representative of Denmark
(in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed that he needed more time to
reflect. His general feeling was not to clutter the Scheme with special measures. We
may have an electronic logbook in a couple of years.

Document PECCOE2008/02/37 was circulated. The Chair said that this puts in place
simplified procedures for the fishery for pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea as
requested by HODs. The scope is specific and deals only with directed fishery as in
NAFO. The definition of the designated area is the original presented last year. He
then suggested going through the document paragraph by paragraph.

Scope
The Norwegian representative noted that, although he could accept a specific
arrangement for the Irminger Sea, he was interested in the implications for similar
arrangements for the fishery for pelagic redfish in the Norwegian Sea. The proposed
area code for the designated area was discussed. It was observed that it was possible
to use more than three letters in the code.

Definition
The Icelandic representative noted that the proposed definition of the area was an
attempt to open up for a general approach to designated areas.

Recording of catches
The point was made that there had for some time been a need to break down the XRR
area into smaller units. The EU representative suggested that this should be discussed
in AGDC.
Communication of catches
The Icelandic representative called for a clear definition of which periods the reported catch covered. The CA message should be defined unambiguously. The important point was “since the last communication”. The Chair concluded that the text should be amended to reflect this. The coding of the area will trigger when reporting takes place. This should also be discussed by AGDC. The Icelandic representative's proposal makes the area code mandatory only when the designated area is entered.

The Chair suggested that specific codes should not necessarily be specified in the paper going to HODs. That could be looked into afterwards. The Norwegian representative suggested text in 4 b. This would be in line with what we already have, the only change being that catch reporting will be daily not weekly.

Labelling of frozen fish
No specific code (like RCA) should be mentioned, but only the concept of a specific code.

Weighing
No comment

Landing or tranship declaration
The area of catch has to be identified by a specific code. For a start any format can be used and presented on the NEAFC website. If this does not work it can be changed.

Cross checks
The Icelandic representative pointed out that the VMS data are available to the flag state, not to the port state. It was agreed to change competent authority to “flag state”.

Inspections
The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) wanted to go back to the handlers taking care of the landings to follow this procedure. They already have efficient systems in place. The Chair suggested using “may” instead of “shall”.

Inspection reports
The Chair summed up that a landing declaration would be inserted as Annex 2. With respect to weighing, reference would be made to an Annex I. The conversion factor part will not be optional, but should be in the section on weighing (paragraph 5 Annex I). The factor for fillets is still in square brackets. The factor suggested is an average. PECCOE has been asked to find factor for all types of presentations.

The Icelandic representative had some concerns. The methodology proposed for sampling does not make sense in the Icelandic system. Would what other Parties did be transparent? The Chair pointed out that the sampling method was optional. He acknowledged that there were problems, but much depended on the flag state taking responsibility for these cross-checks. The EU representative pointed out that another party would have access to VMS data if they carried out inspections. The Icelandic representative noted that such data had to be deleted after 24 hours. The Chair asked if the paragraph on cross-checks made sense. It was an attempt to force some discipline into the process, where it was lacking.
The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) could accept the paper as it stands as an interim measure. Having looked more closely into the matter they had become more in favour of the Icelandic proposal, which was consistent. The Chair pointed out that the discussion paper was a first attempt to deal with the issues related to the specific measures for redfish in the Irminger Sea, without going into a major Scheme exercise at this juncture. The Icelandic representative said that he was not going to oppose the proposal, as that was what could be put in place now. However, transparency had to be at the centre.

The Norwegian representative could also support the proposal, but had hoped that the VMS frequency would have been discussed in more general terms also. The Icelandic representative agreed. There seemed to be agreement on the need to increase the VMS position report frequency to once an hour and catch reporting from weekly to daily. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed and thought this should be put in place now, even if we expect electronic logbooks in a couple of years.

The Chair did not think there was the time to do this now. He suggested that Document PECCOE2008/02/37 be revised to reflect the discussions and points made. After considerable discussion on the whole approach and specific details of the proposal it was agreed to prepare a revision 1 reflecting the discussions and points made.

Document PECCOE2008/02/37 rev 1 was introduced. The Icelandic representative suggested replacing “weekly catches” with “catches” and introducing the area data elements as described in the Icelandic proposal. The Chair summed up that PECCOE accepts the new template for reporting catches subject to the acceptance of the AGDC. He then went through the rest of the document and some small amendments were made.

The Committee then adopted the proposal in Document PECCOE2008/02/37 rev 1 as amended. The proposal will be forwarded as a recommendation to the Commission.

4.4 Other matters carried on from the meeting 9-10 April 2008

4.4.1 Analysis of reporting of FMCs
At the request of the Committee, the Secretariat had analysed reporting by FMCs in 2007, i.e. position, catch, and entry and exit messages. It was agreed that this type of analysis of reporting on fishing activity should be made on a monthly basis to assist the planning of inspections. The Secretariat introduced documents PECCOE 2008/02/29 and 32. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) asked about the reporting period in PECCOE 2008/02/29. The Secretariat informed that it was the usual reporting period starting 1 July. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted that there seemed not to be any catch information in the VMS database. The EU representative suggested that “N/A” was used, where appropriate, instead of “none”. The Secretariat explained but accepted the point. The Icelandic representative asked about improvements in reporting. The Secretariat stated again that more automatic reports are coming into the
system, but in some cases the discipline in reporting, particularly with respect to catches had gone backward.

4.4.2 Cancellation and correction of transmitted data
With respect to correcting errors, it was agreed in April 2008 that the FMC that has sent a message should stay in control with the authority to cancel and amend. A clear procedure for cancellation and sending a new message should be developed. To support this, the Secretariat had been asked to be more active in reporting errors. Document PECCOE 2008/02/33 proposes a procedure to allow FMCs to cancel erroneous messages. After cancellation a new message is sent with the correct data. Erroneous messages will be files. The Icelandic representative felt this was needed and would fully support this amendment. The proposal will be discussed in AGDC tomorrow. The Norwegian representative recalled concerns some years ago and was not ready to commit himself. The Icelandic representative suggested that inspectors should also have access to the original message.

The Chair summed up that there was consensus to go in this direction, but the proposal still needed some consideration.

4.4.3 Warnings by email from Secretariat to FMCs
This could be done by a system generating automatic e-mails with a warning from the database to the FMC. A proposal was presented by the Secretariat in PECCOE 2008/02/35. E-mails will only be sent to FMCs which wants this information. The EU representative admitted that there had been problems. He asked for some clarification and the Secretariat explained. The Secretariat doubted that FMCs that does not react to return messages would be helped by the proposal. The proposal will also be discussed by AGDC. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) felt that the proposed messages may help, but warned against setting up a system that would create hundreds of e-mails.

The Secretariat introduced documents Document PECCOE2008/02/31 and 32 which give detailed reviews of the performance of FMCs reporting on pelagic redfish fisheries in ICES SA I-II this year. It was noted that reporting has improved considerably compared with last year.

4.5 New system for monthly catch reporting (Art. 10)
Experience monitoring the redfish fisheries in the Irminger Sea and ICES Sub-area I and II suggests that monthly reporting does not allow the close monitoring of quota uptake. It was noted that PECMAS has been asked to look into the problem. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) was worried about sending catch data to the scientists. He admitted, however, that catch reporting under Article 10 was a disgrace. The Secretariat said that the important thing was to monitor quota uptake not to meet scientific concerns. There are still big problems and the 2006 Article 10 catch data have still not been finalised.
5 Port State Control

5.1 Overall evaluation
The Secretariat will report on volume and problems encountered running the system. No major problems have been encountered and the volume has not changed much.

5.2 Possible digitalisation forms (PSC1 and PSC2)
The possibility of digitalising PSC forms was considered, documents PECCOE2008/02/12 and 13. These will also be discussed by the AGDC. The Chair of AGDC informed about the two documents and suggested that discussion concentrated on the joint EU-Norwegian paper. It would hopefully give material for the Secretariat to work with. The key words were web applications and automatic procedures, as far as possible. The proposal is based fully on known technology. It should be seen as a great step forward and the Icelandic representative will support it strongly. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed. The EU representative agreed that this was a good basis for moving forward. The management of passwords was important and this could be quite a workload for the Secretariat. The Norwegian representative supported that NEAFC move in this direction as soon as possible.

The Chair concluded that there seemed to be consensus to move forward on the basis of option one. AGDC would sort out the technical details and attention would be paid to security. It was full steam ahead.

6 Cooperative non-Contracting Party status

6.1 Diversified categories of cooperative status
Document PE 2008-01-14 listed the categories involved. There was consensus to recommend the categories to the Commission. Necessary amendments to the Scheme broadening the scope to allow these categories have been worked out. There is no need to go deeper into the Scheme.

6.2 Review of cooperative status

6.2.1 Renewal of existing cooperative status
Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Belize and Cook Islands have had this status this year. Belize and Canada have indicated that they want a renewal and PECCOE recommends that they are given cooperative non-CP status next year. With respect to the three others the Commission will be informed about any contacts.

Norway noted that the application from Belize indicated that they were not aware that the obligation to transmit position data by VMS also applies to transport vessels. This is also the experience when vessels from Belize are involved in transshipment in Norwegian waters. The Secretariat was asked to emphasize this when responding to the letter.

6.2.2 New applications for Cooperative Non Contracting Party status
The Bahamas and Panama have applied. There is no new information on the appropriate legislation in the Bahamas. With respect to Panama, the Polestar issue has been solved, but there are still Panama flagged vessels on the B-list and that has to be sorted out before PECCOE can do anything further.
7 IUU Lists A and B

7.1 Review of the lists

The review took into account the possibilities of removing vessels from the B-list that could be introduced if the amendments to the Scheme to be discussed under Agenda item 4.3.2 are accepted by the Commission.

The Chair felt that it was not possible to clean up the list before the beginning of next year. Amendments to Scheme have to be adopted and additional confirmation of the status of the vessels has to be acquired.

The problems of identification of the vessel KABOU was discussed based on an information note from the EU, Document PECCOE2008/02/28. The EU representative described information on the two vessels involved. Photo documentation and other evidence shows that there are two vessels involved, KABOU and RED. The problem is that the information on the B-list is not correct and the vessel on the list has to be taken off, whereas the RED should be on the list. It is in Faro at present and ready for fishery.

The Chair asked if the Norwegian representative agreed with the findings of the EU. He suggested that RED was put on the A-list with the correct information based on the original observation from the Norwegian representative in 2006.

It was agreed to recommend that the KABOU be removed and RED put on the A-list and the usual procedure initiated approaching the flag state. The Chair doubted that it would possible to do anything before the Annual Meeting, but we should proceed as quickly as possible. He mentioned that there may be doubts on the identity of ENXEMBRE. The EU representative explained the situation. The WHITE ENTERPRISE (ex St. Kitts) has taken the name ENXEMBRE. It may still be Panama flagged. The EU representative will try to identify the vessel over the next few days.

7.2 Annual reports from Contracting Parties under Art. 43 of the Scheme

Reports submitted by Contracting Parties have been circulated and are there for information. (Document PECCOE2008/02/05, 06, 10, 16 and 17)

The Secretariat informed that it intended develop one form for all reports from CPs. A proposal will be circulated shortly for consideration.

8 Request to Contracting Parties to evaluate arrangements for the identification of species

There is one Icelandic paper already dealt with under redfish. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) introduced a document on the possibilities of recording some catches as Greenlandic allocations even if they are fished outside the Greenland EEZ. This is especially important as allocations have still not been agreed for this stock. The STATLANT system cannot cope, so the question is whether the NEAFC Secretariat can keep the record. No system is in place at present. There are conditions set in the agreement with the EU and Norway, but
catch reporting is not satisfactory. If a satisfactory solution is not found the flexibility may have to go.

The Secretariat informed that they of course can include any information they receive on allocations. The Chair noted that the Parties involved will have to investigate their internal procedures and how they report the uptake of quotas in different areas.

Two documents from the Icelandic representative, PECCOE2008/02/20 and 21 were discussed. The first one is on access to VMS data for search and rescue. This has already been discussed in STACTIC. Fishing vessels may be the best vehicles to support Search and Rescue in remote areas. Big passenger vessels are the main concern. Fishing vessels are on the spot and know most about the area. There should be an understanding that VMS data can be released under such circumstances. What is needed is a snapshot of the distribution of vessels.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) pointed out that there was no way that it would be possible to withhold such data in an emergency. The Chair asked who would be authorised to release the VMS data. It should probably not be the NEAFC Secretariat. The Icelandic representative pointed out that NAFO had rejected releasing data for an exercise with the US Coast Guard.

The Secretariat pointed out practical implications. The EU representative also saw this as a practical problem. He did not see that any conclusions could be made now and he also needed to coordinate. The Icelandic representative suggested that NEAFC awaited the development of texts in STACTIC. This was agreed.

The other paper was on unrestricted access to information in the database. The Icelandic representative had been given access with respect to the fishery for pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea this year and had experienced some technical problems, which had been solved by introducing a dummy call sign. The exercise had been very helpful supporting surveillance and other aspects of control. He recommended that unrestricted access is made possible. The Chair noted that if this should be made a general feature the Scheme had to be amended. The EU representative saw the potential for other Parties and specifically mentioned the monitoring of the boxes in the waters west of the UK and Ireland. Extending this arrangement should be considered.

The Chair proposed that PECCOE should come back to this based on a document setting out what needed to be changed in the Scheme.

9 Report to the 2008 Annual Meeting
The Report of the meeting based on corrected summary records will be issued on 20 October.

10 Closure of the meeting
The meeting closed at 6:25 pm