

IEMRS Implementation Advisory Group – Meeting 3 Minutes

28 July 2017

Members	Simon Watt (Chair), Bryan Wilson, Stuart Anderson, Josh Barclay, Lesley Campbell, Amanda Leathers, Storm Stanley (for Jeremy Cooper), Rob Domanski, Jeremy Helson, Laws Lawson, Karen Baird, Rosemary Hurst, Mark Edwards, George Clement, Kris Ramm (for Ian Angus), Keith Ingram
MPI Officials in attendance	Idil Kaplan, Matthew Perkins, Sylvie Ots
Apologies	Ian Angus

Item	Discussion and agreed points	Actions
1. Welcome and approve minutes of 27 June meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair welcomed the members and introduced Lesley Campbell. One of the members had two suggested amendments for the minutes, i.e. there should be an action point added, that MPI will provide a briefing on where the IEMRS data goes, who owns it and who controls it and that ‘several members’, rather than ‘one member’ had requested this briefing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> MPI to amend minutes from IAG meeting #2.
2. IEMRS ER and GPR circulars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPI talked about what the main talking points had been at the last Technical Working Group meeting (27 July), particularly in relation to the draft ER and GPR circulars. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> MPI to email TWG meeting minutes to IAG members.

<p>Discussion on key points raised at the Technical Working Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that, once finalised, MPI would circulate the minutes from the TWG meeting of 27 July, to the IAG members (and would generally circulate TWG meeting minutes to IAG members). • MPI explained that the circulars contain the detail on what will need to be reported. At this stage they are in draft form and MPI is meeting with industry (range of companies, SREs, Federation of Commercial Fishers) to get feedback on them. • Some non-industry members asked that they also be consulted with. It was reiterated to the members that MPI is keen to get their feedback in order for IEMRS to work properly. • MPI is currently working towards specifications for what is needed for cameras on boats. This circular has not yet been released. • There was concern from some of the members around the issue of disposals, in the circulars. • It was suggested that the circulars are missing some things such as whether line-weights will be used and the mitigation of sea-beds, the impact of sea-birds landing on vessels during storms. • It was suggested that in the future, if a change is warranted, amendment to circulars may be a decision that MPI would take. • A document was circulated, by MPI, showing a summary of the details in the circulars. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. MPI to consult with non-industry IAG members. 4. MPI to share 'day in the life of a fisher' documents with IAG members, once complete. 5. MPI to consider and decide what its policy/ approach will be to amending circulars over time.
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a general feeling that the circulars in their current draft form are too complicated. MPI explained that documents are currently being created to show a high level depiction of the steps a fisher will need to take each day once digital monitoring has been implemented. Once these documents have been created, they can be shared with the IAG members. These documents will be tailored to the different types of fishing methods/scenarios. • Several members of the group suggested that the first point of contact for fishers should be their local fisheries officer. MPI agreed that the local fisheries officers are crucial as they are out in the regions, fielding queries from fishers and it will be important for them to be familiar with the rules of digital monitoring. 	
<p>3. Report backs from MPI: a. Transmission of data and frequency of that transmission b. Information needs analysis c. Data Working Group d. Process from here onwards (legislative and implementation) e. MLS and Deemed Value (discards policy)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI explained that GPR will be required 'real time' i.e. real time at 10 minute intervals. • GPR costs to MPI will be cost-recovered from quota owners. • There was a general feeling that there needs to be a more targeted approach to the costs involved. • Some members expressed concern that transmitting data on a continuous basis will prove costly. It was suggested that the 'short burst data approach' could be preferable and that it is currently operating successfully. 	<p>6. MPI to get clarification on the risks of signals being intercepted during transmission and report back to the group at the next meeting.</p> <p>7. MPI to reconvene Data Working Group, and to circulate its membership to the IAG members</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPI explained that a device will need to stay on, unless it has been approved to switch off at prescribed intervals between pings. • MPI reiterated that vessel owners will choose the device (available in the market) that they feel best suits them. • There was a concern raised that outside parties could intercept signals as they are being transmitted. • MPI circulated a high level A3 (Digital Monitoring of Commercial Fishing) needs analysis on the following components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ER ○ GPR ○ Cameras • Some members felt that more granularity is needed in order for them to understand how MPI intends to achieve the goals of digital monitoring. • MPI explained that essentially, paper-based reporting will make way for electronic reporting, cameras will enhance transparency and GPR will allow location to be available. • Several members queried the need for daily rather than monthly reporting. • It was suggested that the penalties are severe. There was a query about the consequences of a fisher's technology breaking down or being corrupted. MPI explained that the onus would be on the fisher to prove 	<p>(MPI is open to additional members of the DWG).</p> <p>8. MPI to create a clear issue/needs analysis for next meeting, including addressing what further explanation is warranted regarding digital monitoring information needs.</p> <p>9. MPI to create a detailed analysis on how they intend to achieve the goals of digital monitoring and bring this to the next IAG meeting.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>what had taken place on the trip, but the Regulations do specify considerations around equipment malfunction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was noted that MPI will be reconvening the Data Working Group as part of the process around finalising the circulars.• The current membership of the Data Working Group will be circulated.• There was a suggestion that the group that manages the protected species data-base i.e. Dragonfly should be represented alongside the Data Working Group.• A document was circulated by MPI, detailing a high level overview timeline of digital monitoring of commercial fishing.• MPI reiterated that a lot of effort is being made to speak with a broad representation across the industry and get their feedback.• The timeframe is a concern everybody shares.• There was some discussion around what will happen if equipment malfunctions. MPI felt that there is some allowance for this within the regulations.• There was some discussion around the quality of the hard drive required. These specifications have not yet been set. There was a suggestion that the quality of the recorded data will hinge on the quality of the hard drive.	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPI explained that they have had some engagement with experts on monitoring protected species. 	
<p>4. Discussion of issues/views sought:</p> <p>a. Data ownership and Privacy</p> <p>b. Cost effective implementation</p>	<p>Data Ownership and Privacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was some concern around the privacy of fishers, once cameras are on boats. Where will fishers get changed if they are on a small fishing boat? There will be no privacy for them. It was suggested that MPI will need to develop a policy on how privacy can be dealt with. There was some concern over fishers’ rights. Some members felt that there is a lot of information which should be accessible to the public and information which would be valuable to scientists. Having to get this information via OIA could make things difficult. Information on protected catch needs to be readily available. Some members made the point that the data needs to be owned by the government and not industry. There was agreement that the data transmission and storage needs to be tamper-proof. Some members raised concern that commercially sensitive information could be released with the advent of cameras on boats. 	<p>10. MPI will consider policies around the privacy of fishers well in advance of cameras being required on boats.</p> <p>11. MPI to give further consideration to the issues surrounding data ownership and privacy, and to how MPI will address these issues in the IAG’s work.</p> <p>12. MPI to address cost-effective implementation as well in its further needs analysis (see action 8 above).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members stated that they do not believe that cameras will prove any more effective than the observers that are already on some boats. • There was a query over the amount of footage which will need to be looked at. Are there technical experts who can signal what will be most important to watch? • Cost effective implementation was discussed earlier in the meeting, during item 3, when discussing the high level A3 needs analysis circulated by MPI. 	
<p>5. Any other business and wrap up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair summarised the main actions from the meeting. 	<p>13. MPI to circulate each handout from this meeting, electronically.</p>

Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 30 August, 9.30-12.15. This date is after the draft circulars consultation has closed and will give the IAG members the opportunity to discuss the circulars again before they are finalised and issued.