



Report of the Second Meeting of the Vessel Monitoring System Working Group

Held by video-conference, 17 September 2021

DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Meeting
IOTC CPCs
Chairperson IOTC
Chairperson IOTC Compliance Committee
Chairperson IOTC Scientific Committee

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IOTC-VMSWG02 2021. Report of the Second Meeting of the Vessel Monitoring System Working Group. Held by video-conference, 2021.

IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-R[E]: 10 pp.





The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication and its lists do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) or the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This work is copyright. Fair dealing for study, research, news reporting, criticism or review is permitted. Selected passages, tables or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgment of the source is included. Major extracts or the entire document may not be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the Executive Secretary, IOTC.

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission has exercised due care and skill in the preparation and compilation of the information and data set out in this publication. Notwithstanding, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, employees and advisers disclaim all liability, including liability for negligence, for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon any of the information or data set out in this publication to the maximum extent permitted by law.

Contact details:

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission Le Chantier Mall PO Box 1011 Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles

Ph: +248 422 5494

Email: IOTC-secretariat@fao.org
Website: http://www.iotc.org

HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

The VMSWG01 Report has been written using the following terms and associated definitions so as to remove ambiguity surrounding how particular paragraphs should be interpreted.

Level 1: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to the next level in the structure of the Commission:

RECOMMENDED, RECOMMENDATION: Any conclusion or request for an action to be undertaken, from a subsidiary body of the Commission (Committee or Working Party), which is to be formally provided to the next level in the structure of the Commission for its consideration/endorsement (e.g. from a Working Party to the Scientific Committee; from a Committee to the Commission). The intention is that the higher body will consider the recommended action for endorsement under its own mandate, if the subsidiary body does not already have the required mandate. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for completion.

Level 2: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to a Contracting Party or Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (CPC), the IOTC Secretariat, or other body (not the Commission) to carry out a specified task:

REQUESTED: This term should only be used by a subsidiary body of the Commission if it does not wish to have the request formally adopted/endorsed by the next level in the structure of the Commission. For example, if a Committee wishes to seek additional input from a CPC on a particular topic, but does not wish to formalize the request beyond the mandate of the Committee, it may request that a set action be undertaken. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for the completion.

Level 3: General terms to be used for consistency:

AGREED: Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be an agreed course of action covered by its mandate, which has not already been dealt with under Level 1 or level 2 above; a general point of agreement among delegations/participants of a meeting which does not need to be considered/adopted by the next level in the Commission's structure.

NOTED/NOTING: Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be important enough to record in a meeting report for future reference.

Any other term: Any other term may be used in addition to the Level 3 terms to highlight to the reader of the IOTC report, the importance of the relevant paragraph. However, other terms used are considered for explanatory/informational purposes only and shall have no higher rating within the reporting terminology hierarchy than Level 3, described above (e.g. **CONSIDERED**; **URGED**; **ACKNOWLEDGED**).

Table of Contents

OPENING OF THE MEETING	.5
INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS	. 5
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	. 5
REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND WORK PLAN	. 5
SCOPE AND APPLICATION OF VMS	. 5
5.1 Feedback of participants on the consultant's report	. 5
5.2 Finalise scope and application of the VMS	. 5
METHOD FOR ENSURING REAL TIME OR NEAR REAL TIME POSITION REPORTING	6
6.1 Report from the European Union and Seychelles on how the transmission of VMS data wor in practice	
DEVELOP POSSIBLE FUNDING MODELS AND OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THE IOTC VM	1S
CONSIDER IMPROVEMENTS THAT CAN BE MADE TO RESOLUTION 15/03	.7
ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRPERSON OF THE VMS WORKING GROUP	.7
OTHER BUSINESS	.7
opendix 1 List of Participants	.8
5 5 6 iii	.2 Finalise scope and application of the VMS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

- 1. The meeting was held online, via Zoom, on 17 September 2021.
- 2. The List of Participants is provided in <u>Appendix 1</u>. A total of 23 participants (6 Member States and 4 Invited Experts) attended the meeting. The second meeting of the Vessel Monitoring System Working Group (VMSWG02) was chaired by Mr Stephen Ndegwa (KEN).

2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

3. VMSWG02 **NOTED** each participant presented him or herself.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. VMSWG02 **ADOPTED** the Agenda, <u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-01</u>, without amendment.

4. REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND WORK PLAN

- 5. VMSWG02 **NOTED** the paper, <u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-02</u>, on the Status of Progress and the Work Plan, which presented the expected calendar for addressing different agenda items.
- 6. VMSWG02 **RECALLED** that a hybrid system would cater for those CPCs who preferred a shared decentralised or a partially centralised system.
- 7. VMSWG02 **APPRECIATED** that the IOTC-2021-VMWG02-02 provides a running sheet of the items that need to be addressed in VMSWG02 and in VMSWG03 scheduled for 13 December 2021.

5. SCOPE AND APPLICATION OF VMS

5.1 Feedback of participants on the consultant's report

- VMSWG02 NOTED that the consultant's report (<u>IOTC-2019-WPICMM02-VMS_Study</u>) clearly indicates that it is important to consider why a VMS is needed and also indicates that a clear objective has not been established, and FURTHER NOTED that the consultant's report had provided four objectives.
- 9. VMSWG02 **AGREED** that the scope and application of the VMS should be in line with the objectives.
- 10. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that there are cases where VMS would serve to monitor vessels which repeatedly enter the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of coastal States illegally.

5.2 Finalise scope and application of the VMS

- 11. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that a clear objective had not been presented by the Commission and **RECALLED** that VMSWG01 had agreed to use the scope defined in paragraph 1 of Resolution 15/03 in the first instance (<u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG01-R</u>, para 12).
- 12. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that the scope in Resolution 15/03 is narrower than the scope indicated in the consultant's report.
- 13. VMSWG02 **RECALLED** that VMSWG in point 1 of its ToR is tasked with providing advice on the consultant's report that does include a proposal for objectives.
- 14. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) may provide a good starting point for formulating the objectives.

- 15. VMSWG02 **RECALLED** the report of the VMS Steering Group (<u>IOTC-2019-CoC16-05a</u>) that considered both the objective and scope of a VMS and highlighted the need for the Commission to agree the objective.
- 16. VMSWG02 **AGREED** to accept the offer by the EU, with the assistance of Seychelles, to draft a document with proposed objectives and to make it available to other participants by mid-October, and **FURTHER AGREED** that Members be given one month to provide comments on the proposal.
- 17. VMSWG02 **AGREED** that the scope be discussed during VMSWG03 once the objectives have been agreed in that meeting.
- 18. VMSWG02 **NOTED** the importance and usefulness of having buffer zones (EEZ/EEZ and/or EEZ/High Seas) for monitoring vessels' activities in the IOTC area of competence.

6. METHOD FOR ENSURING REAL TIME OR NEAR REAL TIME POSITION REPORTING

- 6.1 Report from the European Union and Seychelles on how the transmission of VMS data works in practice
- 19. VMSWG02 **NOTED** paper <u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-03</u>, prepared by Seychelles, assessing delays between vessels' VMS reports and the receipt of same by the fisheries monitoring centre, but **FURTHER NOTED** it did not assess the risks associated with the data flow, given that this is largely covered by the consultant's report.
- 20. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that paper <u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-03</u> showed on average, 96.3% of the data reports were received by the Seychelles FMC within ten minutes of the position being fixed by the vessel location device (VLD).
- 21. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that paper <u>IOTC-2021-VMSWG02-03</u> deduced that the risk of delays of more than 10 minutes from the time the position is fixed by the VLD, to the time the coastal State receives the data, via the vessel's flag State FMC, is minimal.
- 22. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that tampering with VMS data by the flag State of a vessel is possible but it involves considerable effort and **FURTHER NOTED** that there are systems that distinguish between automatic and manual inputs.
- 23. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that even if the internet system goes down, data is still stored and hence there is no data gap.
- 24. VMSWG02 NOTED a presentation prepared by the EU that showed the model in use in the EU.
- 25. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that information goes first to the EU Commission's central node for communication to third parties and **FURTHER NOTED** that the average time from the vessel to the final destination is between three and four minutes.
- 26. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that the delays presented by EU (which has a very high volume of messages) and Seychelles (that has VMS on vessels smaller than 24m) are comparable and not significant.
- 27. VMSWG02 **AGREED** that risk of tampering in the case of Option 2 Shared Decentralised is negligible.

7. DEVELOP POSSIBLE FUNDING MODELS AND OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THE IOTC VMS

28. VMSWG02 **NOTED** there remains a number of uncertainties regarding objectives and scope, which make it difficult to consider different funding models.

- 29. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that the FFA applies fees to distant water fishing nations payable to coastal States as a part of access agreement but the model would not be transferable to the IOTC context where significant part of fishing operations occur in the high seas.
- 30. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that the simplest way is to fund through IOTC's regular budget, as is the case in other RFMOs.
- 31. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that when and if costs for VMS are included in the IOTC budget, there will be the service costs that will have to be made to the FAO for related expenses.
- 32. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that consideration should be given to the user pays principle, as some CPCs do not have vessels in the record of authorised vessels or in the list of active vessels.
- 33. VMSWG02 **REQUESTED** the Secretariat to provide a size breakdown of active vessels over the last few years, and **FURTHER REQUESTED**, if possible, to provide the number of vessels operating within the EEZ and in the high seas.

8. CONSIDER IMPROVEMENTS THAT CAN BE MADE TO RESOLUTION 15/03

- 34. VMSWG02 **NOTED** Attachment 2 of the consultant's report (<u>IOTC-2019-WPICMM02-VMS_Study</u>) with proposals for amendments that might be made to Resolution 15/03 and **FURTHER NOTED** that at present there are too many uncertainties to consider the proposals in detail.
- 35. VMSWG02 AGREED that it would be premature to consider the proposals in this meeting.
 - 9. ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRPERSON OF THE VMS WORKING GROUP
- 36. VMSWG02 RECALLED the position of Vice Chair was still vacant.
- 37. VMSWG02 **AGREED** to nominate Mr Johnny Louys (Seychelles) for the position of Vice Chair of the VMSWG.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

38. VMSWG02 **NOTED** that there was no other business.

APPENDIX 1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Members

CHAIR

Mr Stephen NDEGWA (Kenya) ndegwafish@yahoo.com

AUSTRALIA

Mr Paul RICKARD

Australian Fisheries
Management Authority
Paul.RICKARD@afma.gov.au

Mr Patrick SACHS

Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment patrick.sachs@awe.gov.au DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries Laura.marot@ec.europa.eu

Mr Thierry REMY

European Commission
DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
Thierry.Remy@ec.europa.eu

Mr Eckehard REUSSNER

European Commission DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries <u>Eckehard.REUSSNER@ec.europa.</u> <u>eu</u>

Mr Marco VALLETTA

European Commission
DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
Marco.VALLETTA@ec.europa.eu

Ms Maiko NAKASU

Fisheries Agency of Japan maiko nakasu100@maff.go.jp

MADAGASCAR

Absent

MALDIVES

Absent

OMAN

Absent

EUROPEAN UNION

Mr Jérôme LAFON

European Commission DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

jerome.lafon@developpementdurable.gouv.fr

Ms Fanny LOISEL

European Commission DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

fanny.loisel@agriculture.gouv.fr

Mr Benoit MARCOUX

European Commission DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Benoit.MARCOUX@ext.ec.europa

<u>.eu</u>

Ms Laura MAROT

European Commission

FRANCE

Ms Alice BOIFFIN ép. PIERRAT

Bureau des affaires européennes et internationales Direction des pêches maritimes et de l'aquaculture Ministère de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation alice.boiffin@agriculture.gouv.fr

Mr Nicolas VUILLAUME nvuillaume@groupcls.com

JAPAN

Mr Hiroyuki MORITA

Fisheries Agency of Japan hiroyuki morita970@maff.go.jp

Mr Takeshi MIWA

Fisheries Agency of Japan takeshi miwa090@maff.go.jp

SEYCHELLES

Mr Freddy LESPERANCE

Seychelles Fishing Authority flesperance@sfa.sc

Mr Johnny LOUYS

Seychelles Fishing Authority <u>jlouys@sfa.sc</u>

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr John PEARCE

MRAG Ltd

j.pearce@mrag.co.uk

YEMEN

Absent

OBSERVER

The PEW Trust

Absent

INVITED EXPERT

Mr. Ken Chien-Nan LIN

chiennan@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Mr. Tsung-Yueh TANG

tangty@ofdc.org.tw

Mr. Ching-Ying TSENG

cyt0630@ofdc.org.tw

Mr. Chia-Chun WU

jiachun@ms1.fa.gov.tw

INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

Mr Gerard Domingue Compliance Manager Gerard.Domingue@fao.org

Mr Florian Giroux Compliance Coordinator Florian.giroux@fao.org Ms Mirose Govinden
Bilingual Secretary
mirose.govinden@fao.org

Mr Carlos Palin
Technical Assistant – MCS
Expert
SWIOFish2 Project (IOTC
Component)
compliance.expert@iotc.org