



**Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations**

FIAO/ R1161 (En)

**FAO  
Fisheries and  
Aquaculture Report**

ISSN 2070-6987

Report of the

---

**SECOND MEETING OF THE GLOBAL RECORD INFORMAL OPEN-  
ENDED TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY WORKING GROUP**

Rome, 21–23 March 2016



Report of the  
Second Meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group  
Rome, 21–23 March 2016

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 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. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

ISBN 978-92-5-109302-3

© FAO, 2016

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org).

## PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This is the report of the Second Meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group held in Rome from 21 to 23 March 2016. The conclusions of the meeting, as agreed by participants, are an integral part of the report.

The material in the appendixes is reproduced as submitted.

**FAO. 2016.**

*Report of the Second Meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group, Rome, 21–23 March 2016.*

FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No.1161. Rome, Italy.

### ABSTRACT

The second Meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group (GRWG) was held in Rome, Italy, from 21 to 23 March 2016.

At this second meeting of the GRWG, experts from member States of and observers to the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) provided their view on the next steps towards the development of the Global Record as a tool to fight illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Several important issues were discussed including: the progress and state of affairs of the Global Record Programme; the development of technical specifications particularly with regards to data requirements, data exchange and third party data; the preparation of a pilot system; and a funding mechanism to support the long-term sustainability of the Global Record.

Among other issues, the meeting agreed upon the following: (i) substantial progress was made, particularly through the work of three specialized core working groups, on the design and specifications of the information system; (ii) the development of the system should continue on Phase 1; (iii) five essential data fields are absolutely necessary for the information to be included in the Global Record; (iv) the importance of data quality and cross-checking of information; (v) it may be strategic to populate the Global Record Vessel information module with data from reputable third parties; (vi) retaining a range of options for data formats and transmission mechanisms would facilitate data submission to the Global Record both from developed and developing Members; (vii) detailed guidelines to consolidate the technical specifications for the implementation of the Global Record would be useful to Members in aligning their data, systems and processes to the Global Record; (viii) development should continue on a publicly-available, operational pilot system that includes records across the various information modules; (ix) the need to promote the long-term development, implementation and maintenance of the Global Record; (x) the importance of dedicated funds for capacity development in order to facilitate the alignment of national, and possibly regional, systems and processes to the technical specifications of the Global Record.

The next meeting of the GRWG will be held in the first quarter of 2017 to review advances made by the specialized core working groups and the Global Record project team.

## Contents

Preparation of this Document .....	iii
Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	v
Opening of the Meeting .....	1
Meeting Arrangements.....	1
Election of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.....	1
Adoption of the Agenda.....	2
Progress Report and State of Affairs of the Global Record Programme .....	2
Development of the Global Record .....	4
Data Requirements.....	4
Outputs of the GRCG-DR.....	4
Ongoing GRCG-DR discussions .....	6
Third Party Data.....	8
Outputs of the GRCG-TP.....	8
Ongoing GRCG-TP discussions .....	8
Data Exchange .....	11
Pilot Project .....	13
Funding Mechanism to Support the Long-Term Sustainability of the Global Record .....	15
Any Other Matters .....	16
Recommendations to the Thirty-Second Session of COFI .....	17
Adoption of Conclusions of the Meeting.....	18
Date and Place of the Next Meeting of the GRWG.....	20
Closure of the Meeting.....	20
Appendix 1 Agenda and Timetable.....	21
Appendix 2 Terms of Reference for the Working Group .....	23
Appendix 3 List of Documents .....	24
Appendix 4 List of Participants.....	25
Appendix 5 Opening Statement by Mr Lahsen Ababouch.....	29

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

COFI	FAO Committee on Fisheries
CSV	Comma-Separated Values
CWP	Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics
DG-MARE	Directorate-General of the European Commission for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries Commission
EC	European Commission
EFCA	European Fisheries Control Agency
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FIAO	Fishing Operations and Technology Branch
FIAS	Statistics and Information Branch
FLUX	Fisheries Language for Universal eXchange
GFCM	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean
GISIS	Global Integrated Shipping Information System
GRCG	Global Record Specialized Core Working Group
GRCG-DE	Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Data Exchange
GRCG-DR	Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Data Requirements
GRCG-TP	Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Third Party Data
GRWG	Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group
GT	Gross Tonnage
IHSM	Information Handling Services Maritime and Trade
IMO	International Maritime Organization
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IT	Information Technology
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated
JWG-IUU	Joint FAO/IMO Ad Hoc Working Group on IUU Fishing and Related Matters
LOA	Length Overall
NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
NEAFC	North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the United States of America
PSC	Port State Control
PSMA	Port State Measures Agreement
ReCAAP	Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organization
UN	United Nations
UN/CEFACT	United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UN/LOCODE	United Nations Code for Trade and Transport Locations
USCG	United States Coast Guard
UVI	Unique Vessel Identifier
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
XML	eXtensible Markup Language

## **OPENING OF THE MEETING**

1. Mr Ari Gudmundsson, Officer in Charge of FAO's Fishing Operations and Technology Branch (FIAO), called the meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group (GRWG) to order and welcomed the participants to FAO Headquarters.

2. The meeting was attended by 32 participants from 19 Members, in addition to five participants from intergovernmental organizations, three from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), one resource person and eight participants from FAO as support staff. A list of participants and support staff is attached as Appendix 4.

3. Mr Lahsen Ababouch, Director of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Resources Division, made an opening statement on behalf of the Assistant Director-General of FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Mr Árni M. Mathiesen, reminding participants that illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing continues to pose a global threat to the long-term sustainability of fisheries and the maintenance of healthy and productive ecosystems. He noted that a number of international binding agreements as well as soft law instruments had been adopted to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing and to promote the sustainable management of fisheries resources, one of which is the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels (Global Record). Mr Ababouch highlighted that the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) had repeatedly expressed its support for the Global Record's continued development by FAO and that COFI, at its Thirty-first Session in June 2014, had recognized the role of the Global Record in the concerted fight against IUU fishing. He explained that some Members had recognized the need for an advisory committee for the Global Record, and that the GRWG was established to serve this purpose. He outlined the outcomes of the first meeting of the GRWG, held in February 2015, and described how, following the GRWG's recommendations, Global Record specialized core working groups (GRCGs) had been established to deal with technical matters, and that the current focus was on the implementation of a pilot project. Mr Ababouch clarified that the recommendations made by the GRWG would not be binding, but would serve to guide the Secretariat and to make recommendations to the Thirty-second Session of COFI. He expressed thanks to a number of donors such as Australia, the European Union (Member Organization), Iceland, the Republic of Korea, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America that have provided financial contributions to the Global Record Programme. The opening statement is attached as Appendix 5.

## **MEETING ARRANGEMENTS**

4. Mr Gudmundsson briefed the participants on the arrangements of the GRWG. He mentioned that an administrative report of the GRWG would be prepared and circulated among the participants. The GRWG would approve the conclusions of the meeting once it was over, and would also be given the opportunity to draft recommendations to the Thirty-second Session of COFI.

## **ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON**

5. Mr Hector Villa, Deputy Director of Control and Inspection, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment of Spain, was elected as Chairperson for this second meeting of the GRWG. Ms Cheri McCarty, Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection, National Marine Fisheries Service of the United States, was elected as Vice Chairperson. Both Mr Villa and Ms McCarty expressed their gratitude to the participants for entrusting them as the Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. Ms McCarty chaired the meeting on 23 March owing to the unavoidable absence of the Chairperson.



## **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

6. The Indonesian delegation requested time for a presentation of fisheries management in Indonesia and its fight against IUU fishing. The GRWG agreed to include the presentation after Agenda Item 4.

7. The GRWG then adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix 1.

## **PROGRESS REPORT AND STATE OF AFFAIRS OF THE GLOBAL RECORD PROGRAMME**

8. Mr Ari Gudmundsson, in his role as the Global Record coordinator, gave the group a full update on the Global Record. He started with a summary of the main concepts of the Global Record, reminding participants of its role as an information tool to support instruments that fight IUU fishing, in particular the implementation of the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), by providing a single point of access to information related to fishing vessels and vessels supporting fishing operations. Its main strength, in putting together certified information from official State authorities responsible for it, and its uses and benefits were also highlighted. The fact that Phase 1 (vessels of 100 GT and above, or 24 meters in length and over) will be dealt with first was repeated, and the importance of the use of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) number as the Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI), as a key component for the Global Record, for identification of vessels and traceability in general, was emphasized.

9. The group revisited the Strategy Document<sup>1</sup> and prototype that were presented to the Thirty-first Session of COFI, and the recommendations arising from that session of the Committee. Mr Gudmundsson explained how the GRWG fulfils the requested function of an advisory body to deal with outstanding issues and the long-term financing of the Global Record, and reminded participants of the outcomes of its first meeting, that was convened in February 2015. He informed the group of the three GRCGs, that were set up to address technical issues related to data requirements (GRCG-DR), data exchange (GRCG-DE) and third party data (GRCG-TP), and whose recommendations, resulting from work through a virtual workspace and at a meeting held in September-October 2015, would be analyzed by the GRWG during the current meeting.

10. Mr Gudmundsson also introduced the Global Record Pilot Project, which was discussed in depth during the meeting, and explained the work that had been done to date and how the implementation of the pilot project was planned. He also summarized the financial situation of the Global Record Programme, thanking the current and past donors, whilst explaining the difficulties that had been encountered in setting up the project operations following the Thirty-first Session of COFI, and the resulting delays affecting the Programme.

11. A review of the international events at which the Global Record was on the agenda followed, with the group being provided with details on the outcomes of the Third Session of the Joint FAO/IMO Ad Hoc Working Group on IUU Fishing and Related Matters (November 2015), the G7 High-level Meeting on Maritime Security (December 2015), the Chatham House Forum on IUU Fishing (February 2016) and the Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics (CWP) (February 2016).

12. Mr Marc Taconet, Branch Chief of FAO's Statistics and Information Branch (FIAS), gave some further background of the CWP. Whereas it was initially dealing only with statistical classifications, concepts and definitions, with IT progress, and the emerging need to streamline data exchange, it is now also moving into the domain of standards for data exchange. At its intersessional meeting in February 2015, there was a call for groups to work on global meta-data standards, and the Global Record data sets were mentioned in this context. The last session of the CWP was informed of the GRWG, and it welcomed the work being done under the auspices of the GRWG and recommended that it should not

<sup>1</sup> COFI/2014/SBD.2: <http://www.fao.org/cofi/33133-01d7de5488a77180759efacea7c39dbb7.pdf>

be duplicated. Thus, once the results of the GRWG and GRCGs are complete and mature, the CWP is open to examining the Global Record standards for possible promotion to the global community. Mr Taconet also informed the group that there might also be transversal topics, such as master data management, that fall under the CWP's area of work that would be relevant to the Global Record.

13. The group noted that there had been substantial advancements since its last meeting, particularly in relation to the establishment and ongoing work of the GRCG-DR, GRCG-DE and GRCG-TP. The Chairperson noted that the benefits of the Global Record in fighting IUU and increasing transparency were very clear, as was its potential use in supporting flag, port, coastal and market States. The Global Record team was commended for its efforts and encouraged to continue its work in the same direction.

14. A representative of the European Union (Member Organization) made an enquiry as to whether the scope of the Global Record covers aquaculture vessels, as the new European Union (EU) fleet register is considering the exclusion of such vessels. The Indonesian delegation considered the issue interesting and requested that a forum to discuss aquaculture vessels be made available in the future, given the possibility that they may travel across borders. The IMO representative also encouraged keeping options open, as some aspects related to vessels that might include aquaculture vessels, may be relevant to IUU fishing. The group agreed that, for the time being, the scope of the Global Record should be limited to seagoing vessels used, or intended to be used, in capture fishing, as well as other vessels supporting fishing operations, such as refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels. In discussing the scope of the Global Record, participants were also reminded that vessels involved in inland fisheries were also not being considered at this time.

15. For those who were not present at the meeting of the GRCGs in late 2015, an explanation by the European Union (Member Organization) delegation was given of the new EU regulation<sup>2</sup>, in effect from 1 January 2016, that makes the IMO number mandatory for all third country fishing vessels authorized to carry out fishing activities in EU waters, all EU vessels of 15m length overall or above fishing outside the EU, as well as EU vessels of 100 GT or 24m and above, wherever they fish.

16. The Chairperson highlighted the importance of national vessel registers including the IMO number, to compile full history for the vessel and thus curb IUU practices, and of the enhancement of national legislation to establish such procedures. Whilst emphasizing the importance of the implementation of the IMO number, as the Global Record UVI, at global level, the European Union (Member Organization) delegation enquired as to the situation of allocating IMO numbers to vessels below 100 GT. The IMO representative explained that, although the EU is going beyond the traditionally-understood range for the IMO number, the resolution A.1078(28) on the IMO ship identification number scheme provides only the minimum requirements for its application, and national administrations are encouraged to apply IMO numbers even beyond these minimum requirements, within reason (non-propelled ships and leisure vessels should be excluded). Therefore, there is no legal limitation to assigning IMO numbers to vessels below 100 GT, but possibly technical limitations of the managers of the IMO number.

17. The resource person from Information Handling Services Maritime and Trade (IHSM) explained how fishing vessels were incorporated into the IMO ship identification number scheme only recently and, for consistency and considering the volume of vessels in question, resources have been dedicated to the allocation of IMO numbers to vessels of 100 GT and above. Although the IHSM is

---

<sup>2</sup> Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1962 of 28 October 2015 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 404/2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 establishing a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2015.287.01.0006.01.ENG](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2015.287.01.0006.01.ENG)

trying to accommodate requests for IMO numbers for vessels below 100 GT, this would be reliant on electronic data exchange with other organizations and flag States. The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) observer explained that papers regarding such data exchange had been submitted to the Third Session of the Joint FAO/IMO Ad Hoc Working Group on IUU Fishing and Related Matters (JWG-IUU), but there was still an urgent need to discuss and promote this idea. The IMO representative, in reiterating the need for the managers of the IMO number to have resources and good quality information, agreed with IHSM and WWF on the need for electronic data exchange and also explained how IHSM's work could be facilitated by considering practical aspects such as the use of batch requests. IHSM also informed the group of the possibility of blocks of numbers to be reserved for allocation to regional fisheries management organization (RFMO) vessel lists. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation stressed the fact that it was not only the EU but also RFMOs that have mandated the use of the IMO number to vessels of less than 100 GT, and that it was important that the needs of RFMOs and flag States, including the European Union (Member Organization), be covered where recommendations already exist.

18. In concluding this discussion, it was reiterated that the development of the Global Record should go on as planned with Phase 1, and, as also agreed during the JWG-IUU, any further expansion beyond Phase 1 would depend on the successful implementation of Phase 1.

19. Mr Suseno Sukoyono, Adviser to the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia, presented Indonesia's fisheries resources and vast bio-diversity, and the work of the Ministry revolving around three main pillars: sovereignty, sustainability and prosperity. He also emphasized the need for strong leadership in order to foster commitment and voluntary participation. Ms Grace Gabriella Binowo outlined the efforts of the newly established Presidential Task Force to Combat Illegal Fishing in Indonesia, and showcased the positive results that this cross-sector team has achieved to date. She also mentioned the in-depth analysis of the vessels constructed outside Indonesia that were given a license to operate in Indonesia but were subsequently banned (ex-foreign vessels), which produced information that would be useful in the context of the Global Record and beyond.

20. The IMO representative added that Indonesia had played an important role in the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP), the first regional government-to-government agreement to promote and enhance cooperation against piracy and armed robbery in Asia. He also stressed the importance of the global fight not only against IUU fishing, but also against piracy, human trafficking and abandonment of seafarers, and other related problems.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF THE GLOBAL RECORD**

### **DATA REQUIREMENTS**

#### **Outputs of the GRCG-DR**

21. Ms Alicia Mosteiro, Global Record Technical Manager, introduced the topic of data requirements, focusing on the outputs of the work of the GRCG-DR. She reminded the group that the GRCG-DR had been set up around mid-2015, following the recommendation of the first meeting of the GRWG. The first round of discussions focused on the definition of the data sets for the Global Record, and had been largely finalized.

22. The group was given an explanation of the different priority levels for information in the Global Record, along with the list of the five data fields that are a prerequisite for including a vessel record in the system (UVI, vessel name, flag, LOA and GT). Ms Mosteiro also summarized the information modules decided on by the GRCG-DR, namely Vessel Details, Historical Details, Authorization Details (for fishing and support activities too, such as transshipment), Inspection and Surveillance, Port Entry

Denials and IUU Lists, and indicated the changes to the initial proposal, as put forward in the Strategy Document, that were recommended by the GRCG-DR. She highlighted the handful of pending issues related to data fields and types, priority levels and references, and welcomed any comments from the group in the conclusion of this work.

23. Various delegations spoke in favor of the inclusion of details on the vessel fish hold capacity and type, indicating the importance of such information for inspections, and particularly in support of the PSMA, for cross-checking of catch and landing, and catch documentation, and in the context of transshipment. Such details were deemed to be of high priority. The representative of Iceland highlighted the fact that RFMOs such as the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) and North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) require blueprints of the fish hold. The IMO representative suggested that, just as the IMO number is required on such blueprints, it should also be obligatory on all vessel documentation.

24. In relation to the ownership details, numerous participants recommended that the removal of the Nationality fields for Owners and Operators be reversed, and such information be retained as part of the Vessel Details as it assists in taking action against those involved in IUU fishing. The issue of sensitivity of ownership information, in particular beneficial ownership, was also raised, and the Icelandic representative emphasized the need for caution in considering the legal requirements. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation informed the group of their legal constraint that does not allow the dissemination of personal information. Indonesian law also restricts the disclosure of personal information of owners, managers of companies, etc., although it is possible to share company names. The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) also keeps owner information private, and provides it only upon official request and approval by the Commission. It was agreed that, if provided to the Global Record, such sensitive information would need to be kept private and, thus, it would become inevitable to have a restricted area, even if management of the system would become more complex and transparency might be hindered. The IMO delegation offered technical support, if necessary, based on how their Global Integrated Shipping Information System (GISIS) handles different access rights for different groups of users.

25. A discussion about the IMO Unique Company and Registered Owner Identification Number Scheme (IMO company number) also ensued, in which it was clarified that the IMO company number applies to a company, as a means of unique identification, regardless of its role in the ownership or management of a vessel. Although IMO company numbers exist for many companies involved with fishing vessels, the sharing of these numbers with flag States, and possibly directly with the Global Record, would need to be discussed in order to determine whether existing exchange channels could be used. The IMO representative explained that the IMO company number is mandatory under the International Safety Management Code, and future IMO instruments on fishing safety may entail the extension of the IMO Company and Registered Owner Number Scheme to in the context of fishing vessels. He also informed the group that the IMO company number is publicly available to national administrations through GISIS, irrespective of national laws. The European Union (Member Organization) representative questioned whether submission of addresses and nationalities could be avoided by sending only the IMO company number. The representative of the United States of America added that those investigating IUU fishing could access any ownership information not provided to the Global Record through the IMO company number, and also suggested linking to such information or absorbing it within the Global Record in order to facilitate analytical work.

26. Concerning the Ports reference list, the IMO representative suggested that the decision not to use the United Nations Code for Trade and Transport Locations (UN/LOCODE) be reconsidered. He reminded the group that this list is used by IMO's port State control (PSC) regimes, and many others,

and explained how IMO is currently cooperating with United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) to ensure frequent updating of the list of ports. Currently, anyone can propose new locations, including ports, and a network of national focal points exists to validate the proposals. He requested that a proposal be put to COFI to encourage members to check their national lists, and recommended that the Global Record Secretariat work closely with UNECE for effective use of UN/LOCODE. Conversely, the European Union (Member Organization) delegation reported that many problems had been encountered in the past and thus the Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG-MARE) of the European Commission was no longer using UN/LOCODE. It now maintains its own list and only some entries have a UN/LOCODE value. Thus, there is an accepted risk of misalignment. Nonetheless, the representative suggested retaining the option of States providing lists of ports with specific codes, which may also be UN/LOCODE values. The GFCM informed participants that it has a public list of ports that is updated manually, and that could become more consistent if it were also shared with the Global Record. The Icelandic delegation also noted that lists of designated ports were notified to RFMOs, such as NEAFC and NAFO, and thus could easily be submitted to FAO as well. In recognizing that the port lists available at the RFMOs could be of great use to the Global Record, the group agreed to stick with the decision that States should report their lists of ports, at least for the time being.

27. The IMO representative informed the group of the UN/LOCODE Conference, being held as a side event of the 28th United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) Forum at the end of April 2016, and encouraged the Global Record Secretariat and other interested parties to attend.

#### **Ongoing GRCG-DR discussions**

28. Ms Mosteiro facilitated the second part of the discussion on Data Requirements, which focused on the ongoing discussions of the GRCG-DR on the issues related to data providers and potential data inconsistencies. She introduced these topics, referring to the technical documents GRCG-DR/2016/01 and GRCG-DR/2016/02 that had been made available to the group.

29. In reminding participants that States, and possibly RFMOs on their behalf, are responsible for the information and its submission to the Global Record, as stated by the Thirty-first session of COFI and reiterated at both the first meeting of the GRWG and the first meeting of the GRCGs, Ms Mosteiro presented the following summary table explaining the role of States and RFMOs in providing data for the different information modules:

<b>Information Modules</b>	Flag State	Coastal State	Port State	Market State	RFMO
Vessel Details	P				O
Historical Details	P				O
Authorization Details	P	P			P
Inspection & Surveillance	P	P	P	P	P
Port Entry Denial			P		
IUU Listing	P?	O	O	O	P

(P: Principal; O: Optional)

30. She also explained that there might be the need to consider interim measures in the context of the Global Record Pilot Project or the initial population of the database in general, as there may be delays in obtaining data from its owners (or principal providers as marked with a 'P' above). This is particularly true for the Vessel Details, which are critically important as they contain the five essential fields for the Global Record and the UVI acts as a pre-requisite for linking all information modules.

Two proposals were put forward for discussion: the five essential data fields being provided not only by flag States, but also by coastal, port or market States when submitting other information modules such as Inspection and Surveillance information; or obtaining the five essential data fields for all vessels with an IMO number from IHSM (as also being considered by the GRCG-TP).

31. In either case, Ms Mosteiro reminded participants that the focus was on having certified, accurate and timely information, and she assured the group that the source of data would be clearly marked, for proper consideration by users.

32. Regarding data conflicts, the proposals for identifying inconsistencies were described, with particular focus on conflicting vessels details that may come to light through the comparison of flag State data with other sources, specifically IHSM data. Ms Mosteiro also mentioned the more straightforward issues of multiple flag States reporting the same vessel, and thus determining potential double flagging situations, or reporting time-overlapping historical records. The potential actions to be taken in the case of data conflicts were also explained, with participants given the opportunity to voice their opinion on the most effective way to deal with such issues that may be indicative of IUU fishing.

33. The IMO representative informed the group that IMO purchases the core module of GISIS from IHSM whose raw data cannot be altered. Discrepancies can be reported to IHSM, directly or through IMO, in order for its data to be updated. IMO Member States also have a GISIS Country Maritime Profile where they can provide statistical data of their fishing fleet. He also stated that one of the objectives in extending the IMO number to fishing vessels was to take advantage of support FAO's ongoing Global Record-related developments. In addition, since data is passed on from flag States to IHSM, it may not need to be considered third party data. The WWF observer further stated that a two-way dialogue between flag States and IHSM is currently in place, and should continue in the context of the Global Record.

34. The United States of America delegation spoke in favor of obtaining the five essential fields from IHSM, as long as they are clearly marked as such, and time-stamped, and added that it would be a pity not to gather information for modules such as Inspection and Surveillance due to missing vessel details from flag States, when IHSM makes such details available. The Icelandic representative, in reaffirming that States should be responsible for submission of information, agreed that a centralized source may be necessary at this point in time, and recommended bringing the issue to the attention of COFI to get commitment from Members. He further stated that Iceland issues vessel notifications annually and it would not be a problem to inform FAO as well. A representative from the European Union (Member Organization) emphasized that vessel data from the flag States, and possibly RFMOs, should remain the priority and, although IHSM data could be useful to populate the Global Record initially, it would be better to focus on motivating flag States and RFMOs to participate.

35. In considering the option of obtaining vessel information from port, coastal or market States, the Icelandic representative was not in favor, except as a last resort. He explained that such an approach would take much time, as landings are sparse, so obtaining data from IHSM, and giving flag States some time to verify and confirm the information, would be more effective. The observer from WWF added that IHSM already exchanges information with flag States, so sending data from IHSM back to flag States for validation before including it in the Global Record would just be an extension of the existing process. The group agreed to come back to the topic of IHSM, and review the technical issues in more detail, under agenda item 5c.

36. There was general agreement that receiving vessel data from port, coastal or market States would be better than having no information at all. The issue of falsified documents presented during inspections was also brought up, but the United States of America delegation noted that this could be cross-checked against flag State information and would still be useful for identifying discrepancies and

potential IUU activity too. He also highlighted the value of including all possible data from States, and IHSM, in order to give prominence to conflicting information. The Chairperson noted that some rules would need to be established to deal with any data discrepancies, and it was agreed that any conflicting information should be flagged, rather than hidden or replaced, and that all parties that submitted this information should be contacted in order to be able to check the issue.

37. In addition, the WWF observer reiterated the benefits of having user feedback to improve the quality of data.

### **THIRD PARTY DATA**

38. Ms Mosteiro introduced the topic of third party data, as being analyzed and discussed by the GRCG-TP. She reminded the group that the GRCG-TP was working to identify third parties with data or systems relevant to the Global Record, and deciding on the best way for these to be integrated with the Global Record system.

#### **Outputs of the GRCG-TP**

39. IHSM, as the manager of the IMO number, was introduced as one of the main third parties around which much of the GRCG-TP discussions centered. This private company was considered:

- as a potential third party data provider, for Vessel Details and possibly Historical Details;
- as a provider of this data for cross-checking only; or
- as a complementary source to which the Global Record could link for additional information.

40. The GRCG-TP, at its last meeting, stated its preference for linking to the information through IHSM's Sea-web system, rather than including it directly within the Global Record, which would require clear flag State endorsement. The usefulness of IHSM's data in cross-checking information received from flag States was also highlighted. However, the group requested further details on the financial implications of obtaining IHSM data, which are currently under discussion (refer to the next section).

41. With regards to the other third parties that were put forward to the GRCG-TP, Ms Mosteiro explained how the experts agreed that a deep hyperlink into the Equasis system, as demonstrated through the Global Record prototype, would be useful to obtain information on vessels supporting fishing operations, although transshipment details, inspections and similar information are not available through Equasis. A link into IMO's GISIS, on the other hand, was not defined as a priority for the Global Record at this point. The GRCG-TP encouraged collaboration with INTERPOL in order to create a link from the Global Record system to INTERPOL's Purple Notices. As also demonstrated through the prototype, links into RFMO IUU lists, on a vessel-by-vessel basis for those vessels that were listed, were also supported by the GRCG-TP.

#### **Ongoing GRCG-TP discussions**

42. In order to forge ahead with discussions on the use of IHSM data, Mr Gudmundsson informed participants that the Global Record team had entered into dialogue with IHSM on the different options available and the annual costs of each, which are reported in the table below.

	Price per number of users (restricted access)	
	1-5 (Pilot/verification)	200 (1 per Member)
External link to Sea-web	€ 794	€7 940
Integration of minimum vessel details	€14 796	€8 785
Integration of full details and historical details	-	€3 416
Data for verification purposes	€34 299	-

43. Mr Gudmundsson highlighted the fact that, although requested, IHSM had provided no quotes for public access, for any of the options above, although the Global Record team was open to holding further negotiations. He requested the group to weigh the pros and cons of each option, whilst considering whether restricted use could be beneficial in the short to medium term, and, if so, how to move on to public access from there. Participants were also requested to contemplate the need for a process for the data to be forwarded to the appropriate State authorities for verification.

44. Mr Alex Gray, the resource person from IHSM, elaborated on this topic and explained that the pricing options put forward were based on the standard annual subscription prices. Whereas IHSM could enter into negotiations to provide public access to the five essential Global Record fields, or even an extended dataset, public access to Sea-web would be more difficult. The reason for this is that Sea-web cannot be restricted to fishing vessels, and would need further development that would, in turn, require one to two years to implement. He clarified that IHSM had 60-70 people currently working in eight departments on the different facets of the data, to build up vessel records over time. The cost of the resources employed to gather and validate data should not be underestimated, and IHSM, as a commercial company, needs to offset its overheads whilst offering value for money to its customers. He reiterated that IHSM data is tried and tested, it has been provided for more than 30 years, and is currently being used by IMO for its GISIS system, Equasis and European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA), amongst others. IHSM has a unique opportunity to check the vessel information before assigning the IMO number, and before any attempt of identity fraud takes place, and, as an independent company, it also performs continuous checks and data validation.

45. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation put focus on the role of the Global Record in the fight against criminal activity and further detailed that, for this purpose, the flag States must be responsible and should be encouraged to submit data. In the case that they are not technically ready to participate in the Global Record, the RFMOs should act as intermediaries, as flag States are already obliged to provide certain information to RFMOs. Although this arrangement would not cover the entire world, it would be a good start, and the European Union (Member Organization) representative stressed his preference for this option rather than going through a private company, which also has financial implications. He also highlighted the fact that the currently available programme funds are just sufficient to cover system development for the basic, high priority, functionality that would allow submission and dissemination of data. Although he concurred that there would be added value in using third party data, especially for cross-checking, any solution that comes with an extra cost should be reconsidered. In this regard, it would be preferable for this message to reach COFI.

46. The representative from the Philippines agreed that the flag State is the main provider for the Vessel details and stated that, in the case of the Philippines, the authorities could also provide vessel information and transshipment authorizations for foreign-flagged vessels involved in transshipment with vessels within the national registry.

47. The Icelandic representative spoke in favor of collaboration between the Global Record and IHSM in order to immediately populate the system. Whilst agreeing that the principal responsibility lies with the flag State, he expressed his preference for obtaining the five essential fields for all vessels from IHSM, to ensure proper start-up of the Global Record, especially considering the urgency related to the PSMA's likely entry into force before long. The representative also mentioned that obtaining information through RFMOs would be acceptable in some regions, but different RFMOs have different data quality levels and this might create problems in the long run. In highlighting that Iceland had already offered data to the Global Record, and would continue to do so, he suggested bringing the discussion up at the Thirty-second Session of COFI, to ensure that all flag States recognize the critical



need to live up to expectations and to contribute their data, and to understand that other options are available but costly.

48. The United States of America representative tendered the idea that a one-time purchase of the essential information would suffice, and would come with a one-time fee that might be considered more acceptable. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation countered that argument, stating that this solution would not be satisfactory, as the information would quickly become out-of-date.

49. The WWF observer emphasized the need to find a solution that allows for public access to IHSM data, in the context of the Global Record. In understanding that flag States should participate and submit data, and that missing data could be a means to put pressure on flag States to participate, he reiterated the need to find a balance and make enough information available in the Global Record for it to be interesting to users.

50. The WWF observer also pointed out that, apart from completeness, third party data would also increase transparency and be useful for due diligence. Having third party data sources linked externally for additional information would overcome issues such as submission of data with confidentiality restrictions, and the need for State endorsement of such data. He further explained that if the core Vessel details were made available by flag States, then data conflicts could be flagged and this would be of great utility, especially considering that IHSM and flag States are not always in agreement. He also suggested consideration of the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) proactive database on tuna vessels as another source of third party data.

51. The European Union (Member Organization) representative agreed that, in principle, verification of information in the context of the Global Record would be very sound, although it was not a priority at this first stage. However, he raised concern about the cost of obtaining IHSM data for cross-checking, which he believed to be very expensive, when considering only five elements.

52. The Uruguayan representative described how flag State data received by the Global Record could be cross-checked with IHSM data to facilitate the work of the company, once the Global Record becomes operational. This would reduce the time and resources that IHSM would need to invest in updating their vessel data, which could, in turn, translate into a marked down subscription fee for the Global Record.

53. The representative from the United States of America was also of the opinion that being able to visualize multiple sources of data would be instrumental in detecting data inconsistencies, which would be of great value to national administrations. He and his colleagues currently use Sea-web for IHSM data, and Equasis as a fallback, so he expressed his belief that linking to both those systems would be ideal. He also put forward the possibility for the Global Record to include a link to the Sea-web login page and for States to make arrangements for access directly with IHSM.

54. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation, in welcoming any external links to third party data, agreed with this proposal and added that many State administrations and other organizations already have access to Sea-web, and that any other interested users should request access directly to IHSM. In this manner, the Global Record would be free from fees and subscriptions, and interested parties would bear the final cost.

55. The representative of the IMO reminded the group that IMO Members have access to GISIS free of charge, to view basic ship identification, which comes from IHSM, and other information that might not be available to the general public. This ensures that State's administrations have no impediment to viewing the data on their fleets, and thus sharing it with other administrations or the Global Record. He also described the current situation of the fishing world, where flag States may also suffer from a lack of transparency. With a change in flag potentially taking as little as 15 minutes to

complete, many flag States have difficulties in maintaining data on their register. Information tools such as GISIS and Equasis have a role in helping registers keep their data timely and accurate.

56. The Indonesian delegation expressed its view that one of the most practical ways to boost transparency would be to encourage Members to submit information and to find incentives for that. The Global Record team was encouraged to formalize the commitment of the various Members to provide data, provide updates on the progress being made towards such submission, and make this information available to COFI and to a wider audience on the Global Record website. This would act as a means of social motivation for those Members that have not expressed willingness to join the initiative yet.

57. In summary, it was agreed that the potential use of IHSM information should be put forward to COFI to indicate the preferred way to deal with this particular third party data, due to the legal and financial implications of its use, noting that it could speed up the operationalization of the system.

## **DATA EXCHANGE**

58. Ms Dawn Borg Costanzi, Global Record Systems Analyst/Developer, introduced the topic of data exchange, focusing on the outputs of the work of the GRCG-DE. She reminded participants that the first meeting of the GRWG had recognized the need to define standards for data and data exchange for the Global Record, whilst considering existing international standards for the exchange of fisheries data.

59. Ms Borg Costanzi explained that the GRCG-DE had discussed different data formats and agreed on the importance of allowing for a basic format, in particular CSV, as well as a more advanced format, having chosen XML and, more specifically, UN/CEFACT standardized XML schemas where available. She also informed participants of the consensus to allow transmission of information using both manual and automated mechanisms, but clarified that the decision between email attachments and upload on a website, as a manual method, had not yet been decided, and that the use of the Fisheries Language for Universal eXchange (FLUX) transportation layer as an automated system was still pending some technical clearances.

60. The critical issue of capacity development was also mentioned, with Ms Borg Costanzi describing how the GRCG-DE highlighted the important work that will need to be done in order to align Member information systems with the Global Record requirements for data requirements and, particularly, data exchange.

61. The group agreed that the GRCG-DE had come up with a good set of options that cover the vast range of internal procedures, needs and capacities of the various Members and also allows for the use of international standards, specifically UN/CEFACT standards. In understanding that the manual options are necessary, especially at the start of the Global Record implementation, it was recommended to retain all the proposed options, at least for the time being, in order to maximize data submission by Members.

62. The GRWG was reminded that the Global Record, given its voluntary status and therefore flexible arrangements, provides the perfect context for harmonization at global level, and that this was an opportunity that should not be missed. In this regard, the IMO representative further stated the need to work on taxonomies and the relationships between data fields. The European Union (Member Organization) representative informed the group that EFCA and DG-MARE are currently working on a UN/CEFACT standard for Inspections, which would be useful for the Global Record, apart from the Vessel and Fishing Licenses, Authorizations and Permits domains that have already been standardized. He acknowledged the investment that is required to produce such international standards, but also ensured participants that the real benefits were now being reaped. He also notified the group of the

upcoming UN/CEFACT forum that will be held in Geneva from 25 to 29 April 2016. Standards for fisheries data exchange will be discussed, and all interested parties were encouraged to participate.

63. The Icelandic representative reiterated the need for technical documentation, as a compilation of the technical specifications of the Global Record, to be made available for IT personnel. The resource person from IHSM also emphasized the importance of having clear field definitions and descriptions, and good guidelines. He also suggested that the mechanism to handle data discrepancies and a feedback loop, as previously discussed, be included, highlighting the possible need for named contact points for correspondence with each administration submitting information. In addition, the Chairperson highlighted the need for Member administrations to make internal preparations to adhere to these technical specifications, even prior to the functioning of the Global Record. It was also suggested that COFI be informed of such requirements, in order to ensure that the appropriate budget and resources be made available at national level.

64. The representative from Ghana enquired about ways to link their database to the Global Record, for which they would like to receive assistance. The Indonesian delegation requested assistance from the Global Record team to extract necessary information from their administration's data sharing system, which now also provides public access to information, and submit it to the Global Record. It was confirmed that, as a pilot project partner, Indonesia would receive targeted support to participate in the Global Record, and such support would include technical assistance. The Global Record team also reiterated its conviction of the need for dedicated funds for capacity development, as mentioned at the first meeting of the GRWG and also stressed by the GRCGs at their first meeting, and reassured participants that efforts were being made in this regard.

65. The representative from the Philippines enquired as to whether the possibility to input data directly into the Global Record system had been analyzed and expressed interest in providing this option to cover for situations where information systems are not yet available, in particular for the Inspections and Surveillance and Port Entry Denials information modules in the context of the PSMA. The Global Record team clarified that, although the PSMA mentions a platform for data management, the GRWG should proceed cautiously on this topic, as the links between the PSMA information system, once set up, and the Global Record have yet to be studied in depth. To date, the need for direct data entry into the Global Record had not been put forward by the GRWG or the GRCGs, and therefore had not been considered. However, the GRCG-DE would still be able to discuss this suggestion, as its work is still ongoing. The IMO representative also pointed out that such a system might prove to be an effective way to give something back to Members who are willing to participate in the Global Record, in the form of a database, which currently may not be present within their administrations.

66. Various participants emphasized the need to avoid overlaps and duplicated work, with the financial implications and inefficient resource utilization for providing the same information to different destinations in different formats being highlighted. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation, in its belief that the Global Record is well placed to act as a central point for the storage and management of information and a platform for data exchange, put forward a suggestion to request that COFI identify opportunities for growth of the Global Record. In expanding beyond the gathering and dissemination of information, the delegation expressed its view that the Global Record could provide a single communication channel between Members, RFMOs and other organizations, greatly reducing the need for redundant work on many levels.

67. Mr Taconet reminded participants of the work being undertaken by the CWP, which includes meta-data standards as a new area of work that is necessary to streamline information flow. In reminding the group that the CWP recognized the important role that the GRWG plays in such efforts, he suggested that any data set descriptions also include ownership and copyright information, and the terms of use

of the information, under the overarching term of legal interoperability. This was discussed in further detail later on during the meeting, for which he put forward the proposal that legal interoperability be considered at part of the GRWG's future areas of work.

#### **PILOT PROJECT**

68. Ms Borg Costanzi gave participants some details about the Global Record Pilot Project, which had been mentioned at the first meeting of the GRWG as an ideal way to show demonstrative value and increase commitment to and participation in the Global Record. She explained how the pilot system would be an operational one that follows the design set out by the GRCGs. It would include information from a handful of key partners, which represent the various regions and also the needs and requirements of both developed and developing States. The idea is to include data that covers all of the information modules, even if the number of records is limited initially, and then extend coverage to move into the first version of the Global Record.

69. The roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders in the pilot project were outlined, with Ms Borg Costanzi explaining how FAO is developing the pilot system and will facilitate the partners' participation by offering targeted support that will help the partners align their systems and processes with the Global Record requirements. She explained that the partners, and also other States and RFMOs, should take on the important role as experts in the GRCGs, in order to shape the Global Record even prior to committing to the regular submission of data, and the testing of the system, as pilot project partners. The importance of promoting the use of IMO numbers was also mentioned, as was the importance of advocacy for the Global Record, by all parties.

70. Upon certain concerns raised by one Member, Ms Borg Costanzi brought up the issue of accessibility of the pilot system, weighing the pros and cons of public access versus restricted access, which will allow only partners with specific access rights to view the information. The critical value of closing the existing information gap and increasing transparency and traceability was reiterated, as was the flexibility being provided to partners in specifying only five fields as pre-requisites to insert records into the Global Record. It was recalled that the Global Record is a voluntary initiative, and that partners have the prerogative of deciding which information to include into the Global Record system for its public dissemination, the only strict requisite being the five essential data fields. It was also emphasized that the rest of the data fields are classified as high or low priority depending on its usefulness to fight IUU fishing, but partners are still free to decide which data to share with the global community through the Global Record. The advantage of having external stakeholders try and test the system, and explore the uses and benefits of the Global Record, was also mentioned.

71. The benefits the partners could expect when participating in the pilot project was outlined, and, apart from the targeted assistance detailed above, these include the reassurance that their needs and preferences are given priority, and also the guarantee of visibility as States taking an active role in the fight against IUU fishing.

72. Ms Borg Costanzi put forward a number of proposals of how to evaluate the pilot project, and asked participants for their opinion on the most important factors to be considered when measuring its success. She closed the introduction by giving the group a detailed explanation of the current status of the pilot project, explaining that, although work was underway and the first fact-finding mission to a pilot project partner had been carried out, the pilot system development had suffered delays and the team was conscious of the increasingly difficult task of preparing something for demonstration at the Thirty-second Session of COFI in July 2016. The difficulty is due to not only the status of development but also the preparedness of partners to participate and submit data.

73. There was unanimous agreement amongst participants of the need to take advantage of the great and timely opportunity that COFI presents to show positive results, in order to build on existing momentum. Emphasis on the criticality of demonstrating the pilot project was made, particularly with the possible important milestone of the PSMA agreement entering into force. The Indonesian delegation, representing the first pilot project partner with which work has begun, expressed its desire to showcase progress at COFI, and to inform FAO Members of the partners' support and commitment to fight IUU fishing.

74. Various representatives came forward and communicated their States' willingness to participate in the pilot project. The delegations of Spain and Iceland, which had acted as data providers for the prototype, gave their commitment to continue providing information for the pilot project and encouraged others to come on board. The Indonesian delegation confirmed its pledge as the first pilot project partner, and expressed satisfaction with the fact-finding mission that had recently taken place. The delegations of Colombia, the Philippines, Ghana and Uruguay all asserted their interest in acting as partners and seeking approval from their administrations for submitting information before the Thirty-second Session of COFI, as they agree that the current momentum should be exploited to show that the partners are serious about fighting IUU fishing. The resource person from IHSM also offered to make a link into Sea-web available for the demonstration of the pilot project at COFI. The Brazilian representative explained how the political and financial difficulties in his country currently do not allow for Brazilian participation in the pilot project, but that Brazil is already committed to fighting IUU fishing and would strive to join in the near future. The United States of America representative informed the group of the work that is being undertaken by the United States Coast Guard (USCG) in order to prepare data for submission to the Global Record, but noted they did not have a definitive timeline and could not commit to this being complete in time for the Thirty-second Session of COFI. The European Union (Member Organization) delegation described a similar situation at DG-MARE, where more time would be necessary to submit the information, with IMO numbers, to the Global Record, but reassured the group that preparations were underway and Global Record requirements were being taken into account. EU Member States were encouraged to submit data independently to the Global Record for the time being. The delegation of Argentina also indicated that their administration intends to contribute with data shortly. The potential to channel information through regional systems, such as the central integrated system being developed in Central America, which already strengthen collaboration between States, was also mentioned.

75. The necessity to have rules for participation in the pilot project was stressed, and the Global Record team promised to put the technical specifications together as soon as possible. Emphasis was also put on the need for these requirements to be studied and background work to be undertaken at national level to ensure that data may be sent in the correct format and high coverage of the various information modules may be established. The Chairperson also highlighted that the pilot system, apart from proving that the Global Record could work effectively, would also allow for the detection of issues that were missed during the technical specification and planning phases.

76. The issue of accessibility was discussed at length, with various delegations making interventions in support of public access, both as an incentive to participate as well as to promote transparency and strengthen collaboration. In understanding that partners will immediately have the flexibility to avoid submitting any non-essential data that invokes sensitivity concerns, the group agreed that, although public access should be the recommended approach, the problem of confidentiality remains, and, in time, there may be need to assess the need for restricted access to some of the pilot system information. Some representatives also conveyed their belief that public access should be monitored, and the success of the pilot project evaluated through the number of public users obtaining information from the Global Record.

77. Several delegations updated the group on the efforts being made to ensure that vessels are assigned an IMO number. In light of the information put forward by some representatives on the national situation that requires multiple ministries to work together on the IMO numbering matter, the IMO representative encouraged collaboration between Member administrations in the same spirit of cooperation that FAO and IMO have been manifesting. He also offered assistance in obtaining IMO numbers for vessels, and informed the group that progress was being made on a new circular for requesting an IMO number, which aims at facilitating the process.

78. The paramount importance of capacity development and, additionally, financial support for developing countries that require significant preparatory work to be able to participate in the Global Record was underlined. It was suggested that this be brought to the attention of the Thirty-second Session of COFI.

79. The Global Record Secretariat, in reiterating the potential risk of not being able to produce a high-level product by the Thirty-second Session of COFI, given the tight deadlines and amount of work to be done in collaboration with each pilot project partner, agreed that best efforts would be made to this end. The group acknowledged the need to balance high expectations and show advancement to Members, thus spurring all potential participants of the Global Record to take up the challenge ahead.

#### **FUNDING MECHANISM TO SUPPORT THE LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GLOBAL RECORD**

80. Ms Marina Raïs, Global Record Operations Specialist, presented the subject of the funding requirements for the long-term sustainability of the Global Record Programme. With regard to staffing, she noted that all current staff work part-time because of the scarcity of financial resources and competing staff duties in other areas of work. She noted that the Strategy Document<sup>3</sup> had put forward an annual budget of USD 565 000, totaling USD 2 825 000 for a five-year period. This forecast was based on a team of dedicated staff working full-time, which was considered the minimum that would allow the implementation of the Global Record in the medium-term.

81. With regard to the UN's funding opportunities, Ms Raïs clarified that FAO, like all UN agencies, depends on contributions, usually based on commitments, which frequently face hindrances that either impede the realization of the pledge, or reduce its magnitude, or delay its fulfilment.

82. Ms Raïs further reported on the actual and planned funding by all current donors, which comprise the European Commission (EC), Iceland, Spain and the United States of America. She stated that so far USD 975 000 had been committed for the first two years – as opposed to actually having been donated – which translates into an annual shortfall of USD 116 319 for the first two years. She clarified that the current funding modality was based on the EC's annual funds that are conditional on co-funding by other donors. The main constraints of annual funding concern its hindrance to medium-term planning, which affects efficiency in achieving planned results, because it is costly in terms of bureaucratic necessities involving the yearly drafting of proposals, as well as annual programme and financial reporting. Such an arrangement is also costly in terms of staffing, since staff spend considerable effort raising funds and attending to annual bureaucracy. Therefore, and in line with the principles of results-based management, medium-term financing is the most effective.

83. Ms Raïs indicated that the recommended funding strategy was a multi-donor medium-term strategy, ideally of five years. This was to be monitored through six-monthly reports to the donors, allowing for overview of progress and for timely corrective action, if required. It should also foresee one mid-term and a final evaluation, as part of an FAO and/or donor contribution.

<sup>3</sup> COFI/2014/SBD.2: <http://www.fao.org/cofi/33133-01d7de5488a77180759efacea7c39dbb7.pdf>

84. The direct advantage of such a funding strategy would be that staff could concentrate on the programme work and on achieving desired results in a more efficient fashion. In the long run, this would also result in the reduction in IUU fishing being speedier and, consequently, human and ecosystem well-being are center stage.

85. The Chairperson stressed that any resources dedicated to the Global Record would represent an investment for the future, and that the critical issues of the need for planning and sustainability would need to be tackled at political level.

86. The representative from the European Union (Member Organization) remarked that he would raise the financial problems faced by the Global Record with his supervisors, with the aim of finding a balance between the constraints being faced and DG-MARE's internal procedures. He further stressed that two messages had to be transmitted to COFI: on the one hand that currently all staff work part-time on the project and therefore serious delays in the Programme were to be expected, and on the other that a solution for the financial constraints was paramount through new financial contributors.

87. The representative from Spain clarified that his ministry also contributes on an annual basis, although he expressed the hope of being able to provide further contributions and promised to seek an administrative solution as a basis for timely disbursement of funds.

88. Ms Raïs thanked both representatives for their proactive stance.

89. The representative from the United States of America said that her agency also disbursed funds on an annual basis of up to USD 80 000, and explained that the United States could only provide annual funds due to their domestic budget process. She further mentioned that the United States of America funding had been available for two years but due to FAO bureaucracy the Global Record had only received the contribution a few months prior to the current meeting, and expressed willingness to enter into discussions in order to facilitate future contributions.

90. The negative effect of the funding delays on the preparation of the Global Record Pilot Project was discussed, with some representatives expressing concern about the upcoming COFI meeting.

91. The group agreed on the importance of having an increased number of donors, with contributions of any magnitude, in order to garner as much support as possible for a strong and concerted stance against IUU fishing.

#### **ANY OTHER MATTERS**

92. Mr Taconet introduced the issue of "legal interoperability" in the context of the Global Record to the group, as a possible future area of work. In defining legal interoperability and explaining when it should be employed in order to ensure proper copyright and licensing for sharing and reusing data, he highlighted the fact that this issue is relevant to the Global Record as it involves automated processing of huge amounts of data that will need to be streamlined. There are various layers at which legal interoperability should be considered, and the Global Record team will need to work both on data policy, to specify the terms of use of the data and ensure that the source and copyright are properly indicated, as well as at the meta-data level, to guarantee that the standards in use for data exchange will carry this information through during automated handling of records. Mr Taconet also provided a practical example through the Open Data Creative Commons license elements, and encouraged the group to keep this issue on the agenda due to the importance that policy and legality aspects are given once information sharing is improved.

93. The Indonesian delegation agreed that the ownership of records, and the associated copyright, should be discussed at the policy level, and that data shared with the Global Record should convey details on licensing and terms of use. The European Union (Member Organization) representative added

that the GRCGs should discuss the way in which the Terms of Use are displayed within the Global Record front-end interface, and the way that current standards for data exchange, such as UN/CEFACT, should be extended to include such notions.

94. The representative from IMO clarified that, as a UN body, the ownership of data provided remains that of the Members, and it cannot be made available to commercial entities without permission. Intellectual property rights would also need to be addressed in the case that the information is combined with commercial data, and the alignment of data structures and definitions would need to be ensured, in which case the experience of EQUASIS and GISIS could be useful. Given that the Global Record operates in the context of the fight against IUU fishing, issues related to the compatibility and source of information are especially critical.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE THIRTY-SECOND SESSION OF COFI**

95. The Chairperson opened discussions by indicating that the following matters, which were brought up during the meeting, would need to be presented to COFI: the need for stable financing for the Global Record, expressing concerns that it is a critical issue for the future; the ongoing development of the pilot system; the need for technical guidelines; and the need to discuss the financial and legal implications of using third party data.

96. The representative of the United States of America also highlighted the importance of receiving guidance on the possible solutions to the problem of States not submitting information to the Global Record, due to its repercussions leading to IUU fishing allegations. The representative from the Philippines agreed that States should be encouraged to participate and submit information, and it would be up to COFI to decide on the approach to be taken to counter the issue of missing data. The Indonesian representative mentioned the possible effectiveness of social sanctions, where those countries that are willing to contribute in any way should be commended so that positive pressure would be put on the remaining States.

97. The IMO representative also requested that COFI be advised to encourage FAO and IMO, as well as Member administrations, to continue cooperating on the further development of a regulatory framework for fishing, including the entry into force of the Cape Town Agreement of 2012 on the Implementation of the Provisions of the 1993 Protocol relating to the Torremolinos International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels, 1977; and the implementation of the IMO ship identification number scheme.

98. The GRWG agreed on the following recommendations to the Thirty-second Session of COFI:

##### **The Committee is invited to:**

1. Note the continued progress concerning the development of the Global Record as a major tool in implementing the PSMA and supporting other international instruments to fight IUU fishing, in particular through the formation and work of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group and three specialized core working groups in the provision of specific technical guidance and recognize the importance of formulating guidelines for the implementation of the Global Record.
2. Acknowledge the efforts of several Members advancing the implementation of the Global Record and urge further commitment and participation from all Members.
3. Reaffirm the responsibility of States for the data and its provision to the Global Record, possibly through RFMOs, and to provide guidance that data from independent, reputable and well researched sources be utilized to support the data from flag States.



4. Emphasize the critical importance of the long-term sustainability of the Global Record and encourage Members to support its progress through provision of extra-budgetary contributions.
5. Encourage the relevant Member administrations to support the implementation of the IMO ship identification number scheme at the national level in the context of the Global Record, and to commend the ongoing cooperation between FAO and IMO in the implementation of the scheme.

99. It was understood that these recommendations would be accompanied by explanatory text, and that the Secretariat might be required to make editorial changes to the agreed recommendations.

#### **ADOPTION OF CONCLUSIONS OF THE MEETING**

100. The GRWG adopted the conclusions of the meeting on Wednesday 23 March 2016 as follows:

#### **Conclusions of the Second Meeting of the Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group**

The second meeting of the Informal Open-ended Technical and Advisory Working Group of the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels made the following observations and conclusions:

##### **1. Progress and State of Affairs**

The GRWG noted the substantial progress concerning the development of the Global Record, in particular through the formation and work of the specialized core working groups on data requirements, data exchange and third party data, which have advanced on the design and specifications of the information system.

With regard to the scope, the GRWG reiterated that the development of the system should continue on Phase 1, as stated at the first meeting of the GRWG. In this regard, the GRWG agreed that the scope should be limited, at least in the first stage, to seagoing vessels used, or intended to be used, in capture fishing, as well as other vessels supporting fishing operations, such as refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels.

The GRWG agreed with the recommendation from the Third Session of the Joint FAO/IMO Ad Hoc Working Group on IUU Fishing and Related Matters that any further expansion beyond Phase 1 of the Global Record should depend on the successful implementation of that phase.

##### **2. Data Requirements**

The GRWG endorsed the guidance provided by the GRCG-DR, with some amendments in relation to the importance of the fish hold capacity and type, and the nationality of vessel stakeholders. It also recognized the sensitivity of certain ownership information yet noted that, for the time being, these fields are not essential and thus it is the country prerogative to submit them or not.

The GRWG emphasized that the five essential data fields are absolutely necessary for the information to be included in the Global Record and for linking other information modules to vessel details.

The GRWG recognized the importance of data quality, and of having all data providers maintain an optimal level. In addition, the GRWG noted that the use of third party data could enhance due diligence efforts and improve data quality.

With regards to on-going discussions on data conflicts, the GRWG agreed on the value of cross-checking information with the aim of identifying inconsistencies and flagging them within the Global Record. The value of using third party data, in particular that of IHSM in its role as the manager of the IMO number, in carrying out such verification was recognized.

### **3. Third Party Data**

The GRWG endorsed the outcomes of the GRWG-TP.

Whilst reaffirming the responsibility of States in the provision of information to the Global Record, there was general agreement that there are immediate difficulties with obtaining information from all States and it may be strategic to populate the Global Record Vessel Details information module with data from reputable third parties, specifically IHSM in its role as the manager of the IMO number. However as a first step it would be necessary to assess in-depth the legal and financial implications as well as the sustainability of this option.

### **4. Data Exchange**

The GRWG welcomed the progress made by the GRWG-DE in specifying different data formats and transmission mechanisms, including the use of international standards for data exchange, such as UN/CEFACT standards, and recommended retaining the range of options presented to facilitate data submission to the Global Record both from developed and developing Members.

The need for detailed technical guidelines was reiterated, as a means to consolidate the outputs of the specialized core working groups and provide specifications for the implementation of the Global Record. The GRWG emphasized the importance of preparation by Member administrations, to adapt their national and regional systems and processes to Global Record requirements, even prior to the functioning of the Global Record.

### **5. Pilot Project**

The GRWG agreed on the importance of continued development of a publicly-available, operational pilot system that includes records across the various information modules and may be evaluated by monitoring the rate of user access, whilst assessing the future needs for restricting access to specific information. The requirement for targeted capacity development to put the pilot project in place was acknowledged.

Various Members gave their commitment to the submission of information to the Global Record, and emphasized the importance of aiming to presenting progress on the pilot system to the Thirty-second Session of COFI.

### **6. Financial Requirements**

The GRWG lauded the donors of the Programme for their contributions. Most delegations of the current contributors expressed their intention to continue their commitment, with some indicating that they would refer to their authorities the advantages in terms of programming and efficiency gains of medium-term term funding over current annual contributions.

The GRWG further noted the recommendation by the G7 High-level Meeting on Maritime Security, held on 14 December 2015, which urged that respective line ministry colleagues “consider national contributions in support of the Global Record, both in budgetary terms and by supplying, through their competent national agencies, fishing fleet data with a view to testing a pilot FAO Global Record system in practice”.

In this vein, the GRWG further reiterated the need to promote the long-term development, implementation and maintenance of the Global Record. In so doing, it encourages Members to back the progress of the Global Record through the provision of extra-budgetary contributions, any magnitude of which shows commitment and contributes to advocacy and visibility of the Programme.

The GRWG emphasized the critical need for dedicated funds for capacity development to be made available, in order to facilitate the alignment of national, and possibly regional, systems and processes to the technical specifications of the Global Record.

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE GRWG**

101. The GRWG agreed to reconvene in the first quarter of 2017 in order to assess the progress made by the Global Record Programme following the Thirty-second Session of COFI. In the meantime, work of the GRCGs will continue and meetings might be held on an ad-hoc basis.

#### **CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

102. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr Gudmundsson expressed his gratitude to all the participants, in particular the Chair and Vice Chair.

103. The acting Chairperson thanked the Secretariat and all the participants for the preparatory work and the fruitful discussions during the meeting and declared the meeting closed at 17:00 hours on 23 March 2016.

**AGENDA AND TIMETABLE****Philippines Room, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****Monday 21 March 2016***Morning, 10:00 hours*

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson
3. Adoption of the agenda and arrangements for the meeting

*COFFEE BREAK 11:00 – 11:30 hours*

4. Progress report and state of affairs of the Global Record programme

*LUNCH 12:30 – 13:30 hours*

5. Development of the Global Record
  - a. Review of the outputs of the Specialized Core Working Group on Data Requirements (GRCG-DR)

*COFFEE 15:30 – 16:00 hours*

5. a. Continued

*CLOSING 17:30 hours***Tuesday, 22 March 2016***Morning, 09:30 hours*

5. b. Review of the outputs of the Specialized Core Working Group on Data Exchange (GRCG-DE)

*COFFEE BREAK 10:45 – 11:15 hours*

5. c. Review of the outputs of the Specialized Core Working Group on Third Party Data (GRCG-TP)

*LUNCH 12:30 – 13:30 hours*

6. Implementation of the Global Record Pilot Project

*COFFEE BREAK 15:30 – 16:00 hours*

7. Funding mechanism to support the long-term sustainability of the Global Record

*CLOSING 17:00 hours*

**Wednesday, 23 March 2016**

*Morning, 09:30 hours*

8. Recommendations to the thirty-second session of COFI

*COFFEE 10:45 – 11:15 hours*

8. Continued.

*LUNCH 12:30 – 13:30 hours*

9. Any other matters

10. Adoption of conclusions of the meeting

*COFFEE BREAK 15:30 – 16:00 hours*

11. Date and place of the next meeting of the Global Record Working Group

12. Closure of the meeting

*CLOSING 17:00 hours*

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE WORKING GROUP<sup>1</sup>**

In order for the Global Record Programme (“the Programme”) to obtain guidance on outstanding issues including finding a solution for the long-term financing of the Global Record, the establishment of a Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group is proposed with the following terms of reference:

1. Provide guidance on legal and technical aspects and to guide the development of the application and secure its applicability and utility at global level, particularly in the following critical matters:
  - a) Define the most appropriate approach for the management of the Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI);
  - b) Evaluate the possibilities for expansion to phases 2 and 3, in particular for the UVI (feasibility study);
  - c) Evaluate the need for an Expert Consultation (followed by a Technical Consultation) to start the process for developing an international instrument to govern the rules and procedures for participation in the Programme and provide the framework to define minimum requirements for the Global Record in line with the PSMA;
  - d) Provide advice with regards to the development of standards and mechanisms for data exchange.
2. Provide the opportunity for expression of the views of national and regional administrations, as well as external entities, including international organizations with similar areas of work, which may cooperate with the Global Record, which may act as data providers or system users, and facilitate the exchange of practical information on their working modalities and information systems in place.
3. Put forward suggestions on data and functionality, including data exchange procedures and data formats for the Global Record.
4. Identify key issues and Member States, in particular developing States, and regions for capacity building, including identifying relevant areas for technical assistance.
5. Set up a financial mechanism for the long-term sustainability of the project.
6. Discuss other relevant issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> As adopted at the first meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group, 23-25 February 2015.

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<b>Working Documents</b>	
GRWG/2/2016/1	Provisional Agenda and Timetable
GRWG/2/2016/2	Key Discussion Items
<b>Information Documents</b>	
GRWG/2/2016/Inf.1	Terms of Reference for the Working Group
GRWG/2/2016/Inf.2	Provisional List of Documents
GRWG/2/2016/Inf.3	Provisional List of Participants
GRWG/2/2016/Inf.4	Report of the meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group (Rome, 23-25 February 2015) – FIRO/R1114
GRWG/2/2016/Inf.5	Report of the meeting of the Global Record Specialized Core Working Groups (Rome, 30 September - 2 October 2015) – FINAL DRAFT

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Manrique L. Altavista  
Secretary  
Argentina Alternate Permanent Representative  
to the FAO, IFAD and WFP  
Italy  
Email: emfao@mrecic.gov.ar

Nazareno C. Montani Cazabat  
Secretary  
Argentina Alternate Permanent Representative  
to the FAO, IFAD and WFP  
Italy  
Email: emfao@mrecic.gov.ar

Mauricio Remes Lenicov  
Director Nacional de Coordinación Pesquera  
Ministerio de Agroindustria  
Argentina  
Email: mremes@magyp.gob.ar

Claudio J. Rozencwaig  
Ambassador  
Argentina Permanent Representative to the  
FAO, IFAD and WFP  
Italy  
Email: emfao@mrecic.gov.ar

Josue Bezerra de Freitas Neto  
General Coordinator of Fisheries Artisanal  
Marine - MAPA  
Brazil  
Email: josue.freitas@agricultura.gov.br

Francisco Javier Herrera  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Officer  
Management and Promotion Technical  
Direction  
Governmental Institution: National Authority  
for Fisheries and Aquaculture - AUNAP  
Colombia  
Email: francisco.herrera@aunap.gov.co

Víctor Fernández Rojas  
International Cooperation Officer  
Instituto Costarricense de Pesca y Acuicultura  
- INCOPECA  
Costa Rica  
Email: v.fernandez@incopesca.go.cr

Diana Infante Quiñones  
Counsellor  
Dominican Republic Permanent Mission to the  
FAO, IFAD and WFP  
Italy  
Email: dianainfanteq@gmail.com

Ana Fraile Vasallo  
EU Adviser  
Rome Delegation  
Email: ana.fraile-vasallo@eeas.europa.eu

Thierry Remy  
Project Manager  
Integrated Fisheries Data Management Unit  
EC DG-MARE  
E-mail: thierry.remy@ec.europa.eu

Giuseppe Spera  
Policy Officer  
Fisheries Policy and Aquaculture Unit  
EC DG-MARE  
E-mail: giuseppe.spera@ec.europa.eu

Matilda Quist  
Deputy Director  
Marine Fisheries Management  
Fisheries Commission  
Ghana  
Email: matildaquist@yahoo.co.uk



Kristján Freyr Helgason  
 Counsellor for Industries and Innovation  
 Embassy of Iceland  
 Iceland mission to the EU  
 Brussels  
 Email: kristjanfh@mfa.is

Jón Erlingur Jónasson  
 Permanent Representative of Iceland to the  
 United Nations Agencies in Rome  
 E-mail: jej@mfa.is

Grace Gabriella Binowo  
 Legal Consultant to the Presidential Task  
 Force to Combat Illegal Fishing  
 Indonesia  
 Email: grace.binowo@gmail.com

Suseno Sukoyono  
 Adviser to the Minister of Marine Affairs and  
 Fisheries  
 Indonesia  
 Email: suseno.sukoyono@gmail.com

Royhan N. Wahab  
 First Secretary for Multilateral Affairs  
 Permanent Representation of the  
 Republic of Indonesia to FAO  
 Email: roy.wahab@kemlu.go.id

Francesco Amato  
 Lieutenant Commander  
 Sea Fisheries Department of the Italian Coast  
 Guard  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry  
 Italy  
 Email: f.amato@politicheagricole.it

Salah Al Bazzaz  
 Technical Advisor  
 State of Kuwait Permanent Representation to  
 FAO  
 Italy  
 Email: kuwait\_fao@tiscali.it

Luis Emilio Velasquez Chavarría  
 Nicaragua Institute of Fisheries and  
 Aquaculture Center for Fisheries Research -  
 INPESCA  
 Nicaragua  
 Email: lvelasquez@inpsca.gob.ni  
 lvelasqueznica@gmail.com

Peter Erick Cadapan  
 Fishing Regulations Officer  
 BFAR Central Office  
 Philippines  
 Email: pedangs@yahoo.com

Alexander Okhanov  
 Counsellor  
 Russian Federation Permanent Mission to  
 FAO  
 Italy  
 Email: rusfishfao@mail.ru

Moshibudi Priscilla Rampedi  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 South African Embassy  
 Rome, Italy  
 Email: agriculture@sudafrica.it

Marta López  
 Head of Technical Division  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and  
 Environment - MAGRAMA  
 Spain  
 E-mail: mlopezg@magrama.es

Héctor Villa  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and  
 Environment - MAGRAMA  
 Spain  
 Email: hvillago@magrama.es

Marwa Ghanim Mohamed Dadi Alamiri  
 International Organization Coordinator  
 Ministry of Climate Change and Environment  
 UAE  
 Email: mgalamiri@moew.gov.ae

Mariam Mohammed Saeed Hareb  
 Assistant Undersecretary of Water Resources  
 & Nature Conservation Affairs  
 Ministry of Climate Change and Environment  
 UAE  
 Email: mmhareb@moew.gov.ae

Auhood Hassan Yousef Al Hammadi  
 Biologist, Fisheries Department  
 Ministry of Climate Change and Environment  
 UAE  
 Email: ahalhammadi@moew.gov.ae

Diego Núñez Glutz  
 Fisheries Information Area Manager  
 DINARA  
 Uruguay  
 E-mail: dnunez@dinara.gub.uy  
 dglutz@gmail.com

Cheri McCarty  
 Foreign Affairs Specialist  
 NMFS, Office of International Affairs  
 USA  
 Email: cheri.mccarty@noaa.gov

Robert Mearkle  
 Political/Economic Officer  
 Alternate Permanent Representative  
 U.S. Mission to the UN Agencies  
 Email: mearkler@state.gov

David Pearl  
 Foreign Affairs Specialist  
 NMFS, Office of International Affairs  
 USA  
 E-mail: david.pearl@noaa.gov

Federico De Rossi  
 Data Compliance Officer  
 FAO GFCM  
 Italy  
 Email: federico.derossi@fao.org

Roberto Emma  
 Systems Support  
 FAO GFCM  
 Italy  
 Email: roberto.emma@fao.org

Nicola Ferri  
 Fisheries Officer  
 FAO GFCM  
 Italy  
 Email: nicola.ferri@fao.org

Fabio Fiorellato  
 Fisheries Officer (Data Coordinator)  
 Indian Ocean Tuna Commission  
 Email: fabio.fiorellato@iotc.org

Brice Martin-Castex  
 Head, Implementation of Instruments Support  
 IMO  
 Email: bmcastex@imo.org

Ness Smith  
 Manager, Ending Illegal Fishing Project  
 Pew Charitable Trusts  
 Email: nsmith@pewtrusts.org

Julie Janovsky  
 Manager, Ending Illegal Fishing Project  
 Pew Charitable Trusts  
 Email: jjanovsky@pewtrusts.org

Trevor Downing  
 Consultant  
 World Wide Fund for Nature  
 E-mail: tdowning@tjdconsult.co.uk

Alex Gray  
 Director Product Management  
 IHS Maritime & Trade  
 Email: alex.gray@ihs.com

**FAO**

Lahsen Ababouch  
 Director  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: lahsen.ababouch@fao.org

Blaise Kuemlangan  
 Chief of Development Law Branch  
 Legal and Ethics Office  
 Email: blaise.kuemlangan@fao.org

Marc Taconet  
 Senior Fisheries Officer  
 Fishing Information and Statistics Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: marc.taconet@fao.org

Ari Gudmundsson  
 Senior Fishery Industry Officer  
 (Vessels/Fishing Operations)  
 Fishing Operations and Technology Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: ari.gudmundsson@fao.org

Jiayi Wang  
 Junior Professional Officer  
 Fishing Operations and Technology Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Resources Division  
 Email: jiayi.wang@fao.org

Pio Manoa  
 Legal Consultant  
 Legal and Ethics Office  
 Email: pio.manoa@fao.org

Alicia Mosteiro  
 Technical Manager – Global Record  
 Fishing Operations and Technology Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: alicia.mosteiro@fao.org

Dawn Borg Costanzi  
 Systems Analyst/Developer – Global Record  
 Fishing Operations and Technology Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: dawn.borgcostanzi@fao.org

Marina Rais  
 Operations Specialist – Global Record  
 Fishing Operations and Technology Branch  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
 Resources Division  
 Email: marina.rais@fao.org

**OPENING STATEMENT**  
**by Mr Lahsen Ababouch**  
**Director**  
**Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Resources Division**  
**FAO**  
**Rome, Italy**

Ladies and gentlemen,

On behalf of the Assistant Director-General, Mr Árni M. Mathiesen, I am pleased to welcome you to this second meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group.

As you already know, Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing continues to be a major global threat to the long-term sustainable management of fisheries and the maintenance of productive and healthy ecosystems. IUU fishing mainly targets high value catch often in remote places with ineffective control measures in place and thrives on weak governance, poor traceability and lack of deterrents. Meanwhile, despite ongoing and often successful initiatives by Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) practitioners, IUU fishing continues to have a devastating impact.

The international community has put forward several initiatives, instruments and tools to combat IUU fishing worldwide in a cooperative way. The **International Plan of Action to Fight IUU fishing**, the **Port State Measures Agreement** and the **Voluntary Guidelines for Flag State Performance**, which were recently endorsed by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), are some examples.

The **Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels** that is normally referred to as the “Global Record” is one of the latest tools that is being developed and implemented to combat IUU fishing globally. It is closely related to other MCS initiatives and shows strong synergies with the **Port State Measures Agreement**, which is likely to enter into force in the very near future, and the **Voluntary Guidelines for Flag State Performance** among others.

Dear participants,

COFI has repeatedly reiterated its support for the Global Record’s continued development by FAO. At its thirty-first session, held in June 2014, the Committee recognized the role of the Global Record in the concerted fight against IUU fishing and commended the Organization on the preparation of the strategy document and the demonstration of the system prototype. Some Members recognized the need for the establishment of an advisory committee to clarify outstanding issues and to find a solution for the long-term financing of the Global Record Programme and this is the reason for establishing this Working Group.

The first meeting of the Working Group, which was held from 23 to 25 February 2015, recommended focusing efforts on making a first version of the system – the database, web portal and data exchange mechanisms – operational in order to demonstrate its value and benefits. Furthermore, at the recommendation of the Working Group, three Global Record Specialized Core Working Groups were launched in 2015 to deal with issues related to data requirements, data exchange and third party data.

In addition, the Global Record Programme is collaborating with both developed and developing countries to implement a pilot project with broad regional coverage. I would like to take this opportunity to urge FAO Members and regional fisheries management organizations to participate in this pilot project, as well as in the working groups.

Ladies and gentlemen,

This meeting is informal and open-ended and no binding decisions will be taken at the meeting.

Recommendations arising from the meeting will serve to guide the Secretariat on the continued development of the Global Record. Progress on the Global Record will be presented to the thirty-second session of COFI, which is scheduled to be held from 11 to 15 July 2016, for review.

Your role is to provide guidance on legal and technical aspects, in particular on matters coming from the three Specialized Core Working Groups, and to guide the development of the application that would secure its utility in enhancing transparency and traceability at global level.

Progressing with the Global Record Programme will not be possible without sufficient funding. Therefore, your role is also to guide FAO on the long-term financing of the Programme, as recognized at the last session of COFI. In this regard, FAO is grateful for the financial contributions received in the past from the Governments of Australia, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom and the United States as well as the European Union. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Governments of Iceland, Spain and the United States and the European Union for their recent support in providing funds for the Global Record Programme, through which part of the expenses of this meeting were financed.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

This document contains the report of the second meeting of the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group (GRWG). At this meeting, experts from Member of and observers to the FAO Committee on Fisheries provided their view on the next steps towards the development of the Global Record as a tool to fight illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. Several important issues were discussed, including: the progress and state of affairs of the Global Record Programme, the development of technical specifications regarding data requirements, data exchange and third party data use, the preparation of a pilot system, and a funding mechanism to support the long-term sustainability of the Global Record.

ISBN 978-92-5-109302-3 ISSN 2070-6987



9 7 8 9 2 5 1 0 9 3 0 2 3

I5793E/1/06.16