

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRONIC MONITORING PROGRAMME STANDARDS PROGRAMME OF WORK (2027–2030)

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, MARCH 2026

The Program of Work consists of the following, noting that a timeline for implementation would be developed by the SC once it has agreed to the priority projects across all of its Working Parties:

Table 1. Priority topics for obtaining the information necessary to deliver the necessary advice to the Commission. Resolution 11/04 and 16/04 elements have been incorporated as required by the Commission.

		Timing				
Topic	Sub-topic and project	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Items considered to be of high priority						
1.	EMS data fields	Review of the fields that are required under the ROS but are logistically difficult to collect for EMS (and /or human observers) and their utilisation for scientific and management purposes.				
2.	Capacity building	Capacity building to develop and implement National EMS Programs.				
3.	EMS Pilot Projects	Facilitation of EMS pilot projects in IOTC fisheries (LL, PS, PL, GN, and others) to ensure that ROP minimum data requirements are collected by EMS Cross validation of EM information with other data sources Identify needs and encourage pilots for new electronic tools and systems. Provide guide for the capabilities of EMS to collect ROS data requirements and how they may be collected in the future				

	(include examples as to how annex II of EM System and Data Standards can be improved).					
Items considered to be of medium to low priority						
<p>4. Develop guidelines on development of EM programmes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the projects conducted in the Indian Ocean and other oceans with some general information (number of vessels, gears, EM provider, duration, context (e.g., FIP), funding, etc.) • A list of EM providers with the main pros and cons (like in document IOTC-2024-WGEMS04-06) • An open repository on EM scientific articles, reports, and conference proceedings (e.g., PEW) • A review of the main outcomes of the pilots to define best practices and guidance to any CPC that would be interested in developing an EM project, including information on costs of equipment, maintenance, and review, and • Collaboration with other t-RFMOs , including other RFBs such as ICES, to compare progress on implementation, commonalities between data minimum requirements, standards and exchange formats between companies, identification of unobtainable information with EM, etc., and possibly work on a global, standard terminology and glossary that could be considered in the context of the Coordinating Working Party on fishery statistics of the FAO. 					
<p>5. Review EM Minimum data Standards</p>	<p>Agree on or revise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions • Minimum technical specifications and equipment • Data collection (including EM capabilities to collect ROP minimum data requirements) and storage • Data transfer and logistical specifications • Data analysis specification and data submission 					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EM maintenance and functioning, • EM data analysis, validation and quality control specifications • Roles of EM users 					
6. Review of EM Programme Standards	<p>Agree on or revise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives and Scope of the Programme • Institutional structure and management • EMS coverage and data review coverage • Roles and responsibilities • Specifications and Procedures • Timeframe for EMS implementation • Accreditation of EMS Systems/vendors • Data confidentiality, access and use • EMS Program cost 					
7. Compatibility and Interoperability	<p>Compatibility of IOTC databases and other collection platforms (e.g. VMS)</p> <p>Interoperability among different vendor’s EMSs</p>					
8. Development of tools and innovative strategies	<p>Innovative collection of data which may include Artificial Intelligence and Machine learning for EMS data analysis as well as other methods that are identified by the WG.</p>					