

IEMRS Implementation Advisory Group – Meeting Minutes

30 August 2017

Members	Simon Watt (Chair), Bryan Wilson, Josh Barclay, Lesley Campbell, Amanda Leathers, Storm Stanley (for Jeremy Cooper), Rob Domanski, Jeremy Helson, Laws Lawson, Mark Edwards, Ian Angus, Keith Ingram, Geoff Keey, Michael Looker
MPI Officials in attendance	Idil Kaplan, Matthew Perkins, Elizabeth Cossar, Jo Hartigan
Apologies	Stuart Anderson, Jeremy Cooper, Daryl Sykes, Rosemary Hurst, George Clement, Karen Baird

Item	Discussion and agreed points	Actions
1. Welcome and approve minutes of 28 July meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair welcomed the members. • One of the members had suggested amendments for the minutes; that MPI undertook to develop flowcharts to accompany the circulars and to provide a plan to inform and assist in the event of gear malfunction, rather than a hard-line compliance approach. • One member had an amendment to the FDWG minutes to ensure the protected species by-catch data was captured. • It was agreed to add an item to the agenda for FishServe to give an update on their progress, and move the report back from MPI from item 4 to item 3. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MPI to amend minutes from IAG meeting #3.

<p>2. Update on FishServe's progress with rolling out Cedric</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The update to the CEDRIC reporting system has been going well and is working well in trials. • The first report has been received into FishServe, the data aggregated and then sent to MPI. • The system will be ready to go for deepwater trawlers 28m and over by 1 October. 	
<p>3. Report backs from MPI: a. Meeting with the IEMRS Technical Working Group b. Fisheries Data Working Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI gave an update on the main discussion points at the last Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting (29 August). • The main concerns were around privacy issues and the sharing of aggregated data, specifically around GPR information. • MPI undertook to provide an update on its work on Privacy and Intellectual Property issues in the next couple of weeks • The TWG also discussed the need for guidance from MPI in the case of malfunction of reporting equipment, particularly the process for determining whether a vessel can continue fishing or not. • MPI explained that they will provide guidance to fishers on who to contact and how in the event of a breakdown or failure. • A member of the group suggested that the issue of what to do in the event of a breakdown or failure needed to be addressed in the regulations or circulars rather than in peripheral guidance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. MPI to provide an update on its work on Privacy and Intellectual Property data. 3. MPI to provide minutes of the FDWG 4. MPI to update the website information regarding equipment failures 5. MPI to follow up on treatment of failures in terms of BCP. 6. MPI to contact Dragonfly regarding data capture

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was also suggested that the current instructions on the MPI website for breakdowns or failures needed to be tidied up.• There was also concern expressed around what back up reporting requirements there would be for e-logs as it was not feasible for most fishers to have 2 electronic systems• MPI explained that there was an expectation that providers would have business continuity plans for storing and subsequently transmitting data in the event of a failure. MPI also has no intention to prosecute fishers for not providing data through no fault of their own.• FishServe also explained that there was an easy business continuity plan whereby fishers could download and print event reports to fill in manually and then enter later.• There was concern around who was liable for failure at each potential point of failure. MPI explained that there would be robust service specifications in the contracts with providers.• Concern was also expressed about the likely limited number of technology providers in the market.• A discussion was had around the options of shared liability and costs for failures.• Some members stated that they would support some form of registration or endorsement of systems through MPI. MPI explained that	
--	--	--

	<p>the standards the providers had to work to were outlined in the circulars, however they are still thinking this through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was also concern that the penalty regime is out of proportion in the regulations now that the rates of detection are likely to be much higher than previously.• The other item that was discussed at the TWG was the submissions that were made on the circulars (which was presented by MPI to the IAG, see item 4).• MPI explained that it is considering very carefully what will be in place for 1 October so that fishers can comply and are looking at workable solutions across all fisheries.• A meeting would be taking place with industry representatives from deepwater trawl to consider what is workable, what the current reporting requirements mean and what may need to be considered in a future circular.• A discussion was held around ensuring that reporting equipment needs to be rugged enough for marine conditions. It was suggested that MPI could tender for a preferred provider to ensure that devices are fit for purpose.• MPI explained that they had considered a tender but that this process was unlikely to provide solutions across all types of fisheries. However the information was placed on the Government Electronic tendering	
--	---	--

	<p>Service (GETS), and MPI had connected directly with technology providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI gave an update on the main discussion points at the last Fisheries Data Working Group (FDWG) meeting (23 August). This meeting was convened at the suggestion of the IAG • The FDWG discussed Electronic reporting focusing on the circulars and 7 key themes were developed. • MPI will distribute the minutes of the FDWG to the IAG • It was suggested that there needed to be a focus on protected species by-catch data for the purposes of data analysis and that MPI should commission research on the circulars. 	
<p>4. Circulars Consultation: Key preliminary themes from submissions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI thanked the group for all their robust and well thought out submissions. MPI acknowledged that they need to talk more with industry and different fisheries representatives and committed to keep talking with industry. • MPI explained that the focus was on what can be done now versus what can be done later. It was recognised that e-logs are valuable but the speed was too fast to implement properly. • MPI presented the key themes from the submissions. • Members of the group welcomed the message that MPI was prepared to keep working with industry to make Digital Monitoring work. • A discussion was held on the reasons for slowing down the implementation to ensure there was good quality data. • The group recommended that MPI get it right the first time by slowing down the implementation. 	<p>7. MPI to confirm whether the themes document was able to be circulated.</p> <p>8. MPI to liaise with WWF regarding engagement with fishers around protected species.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was also concern that MPI were not focusing enough on the people aspects of the changes and that MPI should talk publicly about its willingness to work with industry around timeframes to assuage anxiety. • Discussion was also had around timings and the roadmap forward to get it right and ensure that the intents of the changes were met. • A member suggested that exemptions were not the right tool and that it would be better to get it right in the first place. • MPI outlined the process for getting the circulars finalised. • Timings were discussed and MPI undertook to come back to the group with clearer timeframes around implementation. • WWF stated that they would be keen to help engage with fishers around protected species by-catch. • FishServe stated that if there needed to be changes to the data structure of the e-logs that would create both timing and cost implications. • MPI would confirm whether the circulars consultation themes document could be circulated by the group. 	
<p>5. Draft Implementation Approach – Advisory Group Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI presented their proposed implementation approach. • It was agreed that proposed collateral needed to be diagrammatic and not text heavy. • A member of the group suggested that MPI should set up an information hotline for fishers. • Members suggested that the best way to approach implementation was fishing method specific at various locations across the country. • It was also suggested that a glossary of terms be provided. • A suggestion was also made that local conservation groups should be involved in each meeting with fishers. 	<p>9. MPI to come back to the IAG with clearer process timings.</p> <p>10. MPI to consider an information hotline and adding a glossary of terms to the guidance collateral.</p>

		11. IAG to feedback to MPI locations for engagement with fishers.
6. Any other business and wrap up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a question raised around the landings and discards policy. • MPI explained that options around this will be presented for consultation in October and there would be a discussion at IAG before then. 	

Next meeting is scheduled for the first week of October, date to be confirmed.