

Meeting Minutes

IEMRS Technical Working Group, 2 June 2017, Meeting 1

Attending members	Stuart Anderson (Chair), Richard Wells, Colin Williams (first 2 hrs only) , Nathan Reid, Dion Iorns, John Radford, Andrew Rodley, Rimu Boddy, John Tucker, Iain Henderson, Mark Janor (first hour only) , Geoffrey Clark, Daryl Sykes, Johanna Pierre, Matthew Perkins, Via Skype: Simon Dick, Derek Munneke
In attendance (MPI officials)	David Foster, Idil Kaplan, , Geoff Backhouse, Simon MacDonald, Julie Hills, Stephen Pepper, Rory Kyle, Sylvie Ots
Apologies	--

Item #	Discussion and agreed points	Action
Welcome and introductions	<p>The Chair opened the meeting and invited the members to introduce themselves.</p> <p>The Chair reiterated that the purpose of this group is for MPI, industry and technology providers to work at a technical level, to be alerted to design/development/implementation issues and for the group to collectively find solutions.</p>	
Draft Electronic Reporting requirements: events and data fields	<p>The group looked at the Attribute Definition Document. This document serves as a data dictionary for events data, which will be submitted by e-Logbooks.</p> <p>Key discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimation of catch • Whether it is technically simpler to reconcile location fields with GPR based equipment, but MPI's view is that this would compromise accuracy. • MPI clarified that fishers will only need to complete non-fish/protected species reports if they catch something. • Query over what the difference is between the current requirements and what Electronic Reporting will be requiring. • With respect to ER requirements – some members noted that it would be useful to provide explanatory notes for the fields and to highlight the changes relative to current catch, effort and landings data. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MPI to provide a list detailing the current reporting requirements in comparison with the requirements of Electronic Reporting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was some discussion about the frequency of reporting (i.e. daily) and cost and practicality implications resulting from this. There was a suggestion that it may be more cost-effective for data to be reported less frequently, as long as fishers ensure that it is recorded on a daily basis. E-loggers can be used to collect information on a daily basis, but whether submission daily is necessary for any current stock assessment or management process was discussed. • The group discussed the utility of a modular approach to catch and effort reporting requirements, with some of the group suggesting that reporting should reflect the different information needs of different fisheries and fishing methods. 	
<p>Draft Position Reporting Specs</p>	<p>The group looked at the Minimum Standards and Requirements for IEMRS Geospatial Position Reporting document.</p> <p>Some members were concerned that monitoring position being required on a 24/7/365 basis could place a drain on some vessels, particularly those that fish seasonally and may be in storage for months at a time. It was suggested that an alternative solution could be to ensure that the GPR would switch on automatically whenever a vessel is switched on.</p> <p>It was explained that the hardware used for position reporting could either be a GPR device or an AIS device. There was concern that information from an AIS device can be accessed by the public.</p> <p>At present, Schedule 1 gives the attributes of position reports including both heading and course. There was some discussion over whether heading should be treated as optional.</p> <p>It was suggested that there are other means to collect reliable information on position, and that the current requirements may create difficulty for some reporting platforms.</p>	
<p>Draft E-logbook Specs</p>	<p>The group looked at the Minimum Specification for IEMRS E-logbook. E-Logbooks will be mandatory for all permit holders and will be an important component of the Catch Reporting System which aims to provide verifiable, accurate and timely data around commercial fishing activity.</p> <p>E-logbooks will submit all reports to MPI via FishServe and the data will be entered at the start and end of a fishing event. There was a suggestion that there could be a separate feed to FishServe for non-statutory data that companies may want.</p> <p>There was some discussion on depredated fish and a suggestion that a separate destination code could prove helpful in covering this scenario.</p> <p>The value of existing time series data was discussed.</p>	
<p>Terms of Reference</p>	<p>It was agreed that the Conflict of Interest clause be removed, due to the fact that this group by nature is a collection of different interest groups. There will, instead, be a Register of Interest.</p>	<p>2. Members to email to MPI their interests to</p>

	<p>It was agreed that sub clauses 7.5 and 7.6, would be removed.</p> <p>Pertaining to 8.3, the members will be kept in the loop for information, should information about the group or its business be released in response to an OIA.</p> <p>With regards to Finance and Budget, it was agreed that members will book their own travel. MPI will then reimburse costs (a claims form was distributed to each member at the meeting).</p>	<p>be compiled in a Register of Interests</p> <p>3. MPI to amend Terms of Reference as per discussion and bring back to next meeting for agreement</p>
Forward Agenda	<p>The revised Terms of Reference will be discussed and agreed.</p> <p>There was general agreement that the group should aim to retain its current size. The membership will be discussed at the next meeting.</p>	
Next Meeting date	<p>Monday 26 June. 12.30pm – 3.00pm.</p>	<p>4. MPI to set next meeting date - completed</p>