

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Organisation des
Nations Unies pour
l'alimentation et
l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Agricultura y la
Alimentación

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

Rome, Italy, 21 – 23 March 2016

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS (DRAFT)

This document aims to give participants of the second meeting¹ of the Global Record Working Group some background into the state of affairs and challenges of the Global Record programme, and consolidate some of the discussions carried out to date, in order to be able to cover the agenda items for the meeting and put together some recommendations for future actions.

State of Affairs of the Global Record Programme

COFI 31

During its consideration of the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels (Global Record), the Thirty-first Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), held from 9 to 13 June 2014, while recognizing the role of the Global Record in the concerted fight against IUU fishing: (a) reiterated its support for the Global Record's continued development by FAO and commended FAO on the preparation of the strategy document and the demonstration of the prototype; (b) welcomed FAO's efforts in coordinating the Global Record with other existing systems to keep it cost-effective, whilst working towards standardization at a global level; (c) appreciated the collaboration with IMO in extending the IMO ship identification number scheme to fishing vessels and agreed that the IMO number should be used as the Global Record's unique vessel identifier for Phase 1; (d) noted that several RFMOs have made provisions for the IMO number to be compulsory in their convention areas; (e) agreed that States are responsible for the data and its provision to the Global Record, possibly through RFMOs; (f) appreciated FAO's continued assistance to developing States.² In addition, some Members recognized the need for an advisory committee to clarify outstanding issues and to find a solution for the long-term financing.³

¹ See meeting website: <http://www.fao.org/fishery/nems/40812/en>

² See paragraph 40 of the COFI 31 report: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4634e.pdf>.

³ See paragraph 41 of the COFI 31 report.

DRAFT

Global Record Working Group

In order to take up the role of the above-mentioned advisory committee, FAO established the Global Record Informal Open-Ended Technical and Advisory Working Group (GRWG), the first meeting⁴ of which was held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, from 23 to 25 February 2015. In this first meeting of the GRWG, experts from FAO Members and Observers 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 terms of reference for the Working Group, scope of the Global Record and data requirements, system development, operational rules and data exchange mechanisms, the governance framework and the way forward. Among other issues, the meeting agreed upon the following: 1) the Global Record fulfils a crucial role as a tool to fight IUU fishing in support of a variety of existing binding and voluntary fisheries instruments; 2) the function of the Global Record is not restricted to that of an authorized list of vessels; 3) the Global Record should also include authorization, compliance and historical data most of which should be in the public domain; 4) States are responsible for providing information to the Global Record; 5) Core Specialized Working Groups should be established to deal with particular matters mainly at technical level; and 6) a pilot version of the Global Record including participation of key partners should be developed and if possible, presented at the Thirty-second session of COFI in 2016 for review.⁵

Global Record Core Groups

At the recommendation of GRWG 1, three Global Record Specialized Core Working Groups were set up to address technical issues in further detail. These groups have mainly been working through virtual workspaces. In addition, a physical meeting⁶ of these groups was held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, from 30 September to 2 October 2015. Information on the outcome of this meeting and other technical recommendations from the Core Groups is provided later in this discussion paper, for assessment by the GRWG2.

Pilot Project

The project team has started a round of contacts with potential Pilot Project Partners. Initial support missions have taken place to evaluate the work needed.

Actual work on the Pilot Project has been delayed due to lack of resources during 2015 and the need for the technical advice from the Core Groups to decide on the way forward. Work will resume after GRWG2, to take its decisions into account for the design of the system. Partners willing to be part of the Pilot Project are encouraged to come forward and contact the Secretariat. However, given the current status of participation and other matters pointed out, at the moment it is unlikely that the Pilot Version would be ready for demonstration at COFI 32. The Secretariat is seeking additional funds to set up a support programme for developing countries, beyond the Pilot Project Partners, wishing to participate in the Global Record.

⁴ See meeting webpage: <http://www.fao.org/fishery/nems/40698/en>

⁵ See the report of GRWG1: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5025e.pdf>

⁶ See the report of the GRCG1: ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/DOCUMENT/global_record/2016/inf5e.pdf

DRAFT

Further information on the Pilot Project is dealt with in a dedicated section of this document.

Financing

Transfer of part of the funds committed to the Global Record for 2015 was delayed for several reasons within the administrations of the donor countries and FAO. Hence, a restructuring of the project plan had to be accomplished reducing the amount of activities and work done, which will be taken into consideration during 2016. Reallocation of resources is underway together with a new proposal for 2016.

This situation has impacted greatly the implementation of some activities such as development of the pilot version and support missions to pilot partners.

Further information can be found in a dedicated section of this document.

International events

Some relevant international events in relation to the Global Record have taken place since COFI 31:

JWG 3

The Global Record was one of the subjects considered at the Third Session of the Joint FAO/IMO Ad Hoc Working Group on Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing and Related Matters (JWG) that was held at IMO Headquarters, London, United Kingdom, from 16 to 18 November 2015.

In noting that the benefits of IMO numbers for fishing vessels go beyond the context of the Global Record, the JWG expressed concern regarding the prematurity of the proposal to extend the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme to fishing vessels of less than 100 gross tonnage (GT), but also expressed interest in examining the feasibility and financial implications of such an extension. The JWG indicated its preference not to limit consideration only to those vessels fishing in waters beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, but rather to analyze an expansion to smaller vessels in general and, then, to enforce restrictions based on the outcomes of the study. The JWG also expressed its adversity to the development of an alternative scheme for the Global Record's Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI) for vessels outside of Phase 1, that is vessels of less than 100GT.

With regards to the application of the IMO Unique Company and Registered Owner Identification Number Scheme to fishing vessels, the JWG noted the potential difficulties with such a requirement.

On the exchange of information, the JWG, noted the apprehension of some FAO Members towards the exchange of information between fisheries flag State administrations or RFMOs and Information Handling Services Maritime and Trade (IHSM). The JWG acknowledged the way in which such information exchange has been handled with regards to the merchant fleet.

The JWG recommended that: (a) the IMO and FAO Secretariats, and, the ILO Secretariat, as appropriate, cooperate on the establishment of a system for the collection of records from States and other data providers, as appropriate, for the development of the Global Record

DRAFT

for Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels (Global Record); (b) FAO and IMO progress the implementation of Phase 1 of the Global Record, including the consideration of its application to decked motorized inboard fishing vessels of any hull-type construction of 100 GT and above, and the potential need to expand the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme, as appropriate. Any further expansion beyond Phase 1 of the Global Record should depend on the successful implementation of that phase; (c) FAO and IMO explore the further possibility to expand the application of the IMO Number Scheme to fishing vessels of less than 100 GT; and (d) IMO, in cooperation with FAO, discuss mechanisms, to the extent practicable, for regular fleet data exchanges on fishing vessels particulars between flag Administrations and IHSM in order to support the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme in the context of the Global Record and other regulatory and non-regulatory frameworks.

G7 High-level Meeting on Maritime Security

A G7 High-level Meeting on Maritime Security (entitled “Enhancing Maritime Security – Connecting Regions – Governing the Commons”) with over 100 participants representing G7 states, outreach states, international organisations and civil society was held in Berlin, Germany, on 14 December 2015. By way of dedicated roundtables, the meeting covered four major and interrelated dimensions of maritime security. With regard to the Global Record, the recommendations of Roundtable 3, which dealt with “Preventing illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing”, were as follows:

Undertake joint G7 diplomatic outreach to IMO member states, seeking their support for the Global Record and for extending, to all fishing vessels, the mandatory requirements for IMO numbers and tracking already in place for merchant vessels. Making the future Global Record mandatory should also be considered.

Invite their respective line ministry colleagues to consider national contributions to set up a 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.

DRAFT

Development of the Global Record

The Specialized Core Working Groups

Three Global Record Core Groups (GRCGs) were set up in mid-2015, to discuss technical issues related to:

- Data Requirements (GRCG-DR)
- Data Exchange (GRCG-DE)
- Third Party Data (GRCG-TP)

Since their establishment, participation in the Core Groups has been increasing, and there are currently around 55 experts involved, from 25 organizations, covering all regions.

The first round of discussions began through the virtual workspaces set up purposely, and culminated in a meeting for each of the Core Groups (GRCGs¹), held 30 September – 2 October 2015 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Various topics were considered, the majority of which were concluded, with a few issues being pushed forward to the next round of discussions. Kindly refer to the report for full details (GRWG/2/2016/Inf.5), in particular Appendix B for a summary of the confirmations, conclusions and pending items (from the Secretariat's initial proposal) at the end of the GRCGs¹.

As a summary, the GRCG-DR has elaborated a comprehensive list of data fields and references and organized them in six information modules: vessel details, historical details, authorization details, inspection and surveillance, port entry denials and IUU lists. These information modules include definitions for the data fields, inclusion level and data type. Only five data fields have been recommended to be absolutely necessary to include a vessel record into the Global Record: UVI, name, flag, LOA and GT. These constitute the minimum requirements for the Global Record. The rest have been classified as high priority, which includes information that is thought to be crucial for the utility of the Global Record to fight IUU fishing, and low priority, if the information is useful but can be provided only if available.

This approach allows for sufficient flexibility for countries to start submitting the data that they judge possible in an initial stage, and increase the information whenever it becomes available.

The GRCG-TP reviewed a few options on third party data providers and concluded that some would be useful for the Global Record such as Interpol Purple Notices, IHSM information and RFMO IUU lists (including history). It was also concluded that flag State endorsement is necessary should any third party vessel data be included in the Global Record.

However there are a few pending items that might be decided upon by the GRWG2, such as the use of IHSM vessel information, IHSM historical data, or for cross-checking in the interim, or not, and incorporation of the data or through an external link.

The GRCG-DE concluded that both CSV and XML formats would be applicable with manual and automated transmission available, to cover for different capacities whilst keeping the system simple. Capacity development is needed in some countries to upgrade their systems. Further work is needed to define the procedural details of transmitting the data. FLUX may be recommended over web services, once details related to open source licensing and use are defined.

DRAFT

The GRWG2 is invited to express an opinion (endorse or amend) on the technical advice provided by the GRCGs.

The work of the GRCGs is on-going, with the following currently under discussion, through online documents open to comments on the virtual workspaces:

- Data Requirements:
 - Data Providers for the Global Record (GRCG-DR/2016/01)
 - Data Conflicts within the Global Record (GRCG-DR/2016/02)
- Third Party Data:
 - Options for use of IHS-M Data within the Global Record (GRCG-TP/2016/01)

These three issues are closely related and it was requested, at the GRCGs-1, that the matter of IHS-M data be discussed by the GRWG. Therefore, these documents have been provided as Annexes, and any comments received prior to the meeting will be presented by the Secretariat for discussion during Agenda Item 5.

Global Record Pilot Project

Coverage and Expected Outputs

The Global Record Pilot Project is an initial, yet functioning, version of the Global Record, which comprises information from a few key Members, and possibly RFMOs, as the Pilot Project Partners. The aim is to have at least one data provider to represent each region and integrate data in all information modules as proof of concept.

The Pilot Project will require Pilot Project Partners to regularly submit information related to Phase 1 vessels, and to have as complete a data set as possible for those vessels. This will include the collation of information related to:

- the identification, physical characteristics and registration of the vessel itself;
- historical information on the vessel flags, names, owners and operators;
- licensing and authorization information;
- MCS information, specifically inspection results and port entry denials.

The output will be a fully operational system, which covers both the data submission and data dissemination aspects, whilst fulfilling the requirements drawn up by the GRCGs. At the end of the Pilot Project phase, coverage will be extended beyond the initial Partners to a wider set of data providers, to move towards the first version of the Global Record.

Members are encouraged to express their interest in becoming partners at the GRWG2.

Roles and responsibilities

In the implementation of the Pilot Project, the following roles and responsibilities have been identified, at various levels:

- Pilot Project Partners (States):
 - Participation in the GRCGs and GRWG
 - Alignment of processes and systems to Global Record requirements, including ensuring that relevant vessels have been allocated IMO numbers
 - Regular submission of information to the Global Record
 - Testing and review of Global Record system
 - Advocacy with any other States involved in fisheries business together as to the benefits of participating in the Global Record
- Other States:
 - Participation in the GRCGs and GRWG
 - Advocacy with any other States involved in fisheries business together as to the benefits of participating in the Global Record
- Pilot Project Partners (RFMOs):
 - Participation in the GRCGs and GRWG
 - Alignment of processes and systems to Global Record requirements
 - Regular submission of information to the Global Record
 - Testing and review of Global Record system
 - Advocacy with Members as to the benefits of participating in the Global Record

DRAFT

- Other RFMOs:
 - Participation in the GRCGs and GRWG
 - Regular submission of information on listing/delisting of vessels on IUU lists to the Global Record
 - Advocacy with Members as to the benefits of participating in the Global Record
- FAO:
 - Development of Global Record information system, including web portal and data exchange mechanisms
 - Identification of States and RFMOs to become Pilot Project Partners
 - Capacity development for Partners in the context of implementation of the Pilot Project
 - Fund-raising
 - Advocacy with Members as to the benefits of participating in the Global Record
 - Ensuring sectoral synergy (e.g.: analysis of how the Pilot Project may be of use in the implementation of the Port State Measures Agreement)
- Other:
 - IHS-M: allocation of IMO numbers to vessels
 - Testing and review of Global Record system (if public access available)

Accessibility

In the context of the Global Record, the issue of accessibility has come up on various occasions.

From its inception, the Global Record was designed and requested to be publicly available, in order to increase the transparency and traceability needed to fight IUU fishing. This was also a characteristic that distinguished the Global Record from other similar initiatives. The public nature of the Global Record was also requested by COFI on several occasions and recommended by the GRWG1.

In line with this, the GRCG-DR has defined a restricted set of data that needs to be provided to the Global Record, taking in consideration that the information would be publicly available. In this regard, only a few data fields are totally essential for a record to be included. The rest of information is voluntary but recommended to be provided in order to achieve the objectives of the Global Record, leaving some flexibility for each data provider in deciding what information to provide to the Global Record for dissemination. The contribution with information from a few champion countries (the Pilot Project Partners) should encourage others to see the advantages of transparency, particularly on market accessibility of their products. Participation in the Global Record, first through its Pilot Version and then in the full system, would be an indication of a country's willingness to counteract IUU fishing. It will be taken by the international community as yet other sign of increased transparency.

The Global Record programme will seek and aim at providing financial support for those developing partners willing to fully participate as Pilot Project Partners to support increased transparency.

On the other hand, some Pilot Project Partners have highlighted the need to safeguard their interests, as States coming forward to submit information to the Global Record. If the Global Record, in an initial stage, will include information from only a few data providers, and that information will

DRAFT

be made publicly available, then those data providers may feel that they would be exposing themselves and this may also act as an initial deterrent for other partners to participate. Thus, a suggestion was received, to restrict pilot information to the Pilot Project Partners.

Conversely, it is understood that the Pilot Project is necessary to show demonstrative value and make the uses and benefits of the Global Record clearly visible. It should also be made available for use and review, and aims to increase support for and commitment to the Global Record, which would be limited in the case that access is restricted. At the GRWG1, it was indicated that it would be preferable to include fewer information, but this be public, than to include many data fields that have to be managed by access rights. With only five data fields being required to include records in the Global Record, those submitting information already have a high degree of flexibility and can decide which information to provide and, thus, make publicly available.

Therefore, the Working Group should consider solutions that strike a balance between the concerns of the Pilot Project Partners, and the need to make information widely available in order to push Global Record development forward. One option could be to keep the majority of the information restricted but make a subset of the information available publicly, as decided by each data provider. Another could be to request submission of only a few test records during the Pilot Project phase, as a proof of concept of data exchange and data dissemination.

In considering these possibilities, the Working Group should keep in mind the fact that, at some point in time, the Global Record will move from the Pilot Project phase to the first operational version and, given its voluntary status, data will not be submitted by all States immediately. Thus, the concern of some regarding the risk for those submitting information should be further discussed.

Benefits and beneficiaries

Once the Global Record includes varied, timely and accurate information, State administrations will benefit from the availability of such information in carrying out internal processes such as background checks on foreign vessels and risk assessment. In the context of the Pilot Project, these advantages are undoubtedly limited, as information will come from few Partners, but remain valid and valuable to show demonstrative value and to attract more partners.

In offering targeted support to facilitate participation, by assisting in the alignment of internal State processes and systems to the Global Record requirements, the Global Record intends to provide immediate and concrete aid to those coming forward as Pilot Project Partners, willing to support increased transparency. The information systems that will be set up, or upgraded, as well as the supporting policy and legislative aspects that may be improved, will offer benefits that reach well beyond the implementation of the Global Record, but will allow for improved fisheries management, in particular in relation to information sharing. This in turn will enable increased transparency and traceability of vessels and fish products.

Pilot Project Partners will also ensure that their needs and preferences are given priority in the design of the Global Record, as any recommendations of the GRCGs which prove problematic in the implementation of the Pilot Project will need to be revisited and possibly revised according to the realities at hand.

DRAFT

Participation in the Global Record will also give Pilot Project Partners visibility as key stakeholders in the fight against IUU fishing, and will serve as proof of commitment to this important global objective that in the final analysis aims at sustainability of the fisheries sector.

Evaluating the success of the Pilot Project

The success of the Pilot Project may be assessed according to the following:

- Number of Partners and regions covered
- Number of vessels incorporated
- Coverage of all information modules
- Use of the Global Record by flag State administrations, port State administrations (particularly by signatories of the PSMA), coastal State administrations and the general public
- Increased support for and commitment to the Global Record

DRAFT

Funding requirements for the long-term sustainability of the Global Record

Global Record Staffing

Currently, the Global Record works with the following **staff**:

- Programme coordinator
- Technical manager (consultant)
- Analyst/developer (consultant)
- Programme operations (consultant)
- Administrative support

All members of this team work **part-time** on the Global Record given the scarcity of dedicated financial resources so far and responsibility over other tasks.

The Global Record Budget as forecast in the five-year proposal on the Strategy Document

The below forecast is based on a team of dedicated staff working full time on the Global Record programme. It would be the minimum required to operationalize the Global Record in the medium-term.

Yearly Forecast	USD
Technical manager	200 000
IT analyst developer	165 000
Admin/secretarial support (part-time) ⁷	40 000
Ad-hoc experts/consultants	50 000
Travel	60 000
Other (visibility, servicing costs, technical support services...)	50 000
TOTAL (annually)	565 000
GRAND TOTAL (over 5 years)	<u>2 825 000</u>

Global Record Umbrella Project Funding Situation

FAO, like all UN agencies, depends on contributions, which are often based on commitments.

Generally, there are obstacles of varying nature either:

- hindering the realization of the pledge,
- reducing its magnitude, or
- delaying it.

So far, some USD 975,000 have been committed to the Global Record for approximately a two-year period (26 months), i.e. over USD 116,000 short every year.

For a 12-month period, this translates into USD 448 681 (NB: FAO only recently received the second half of the 2015 commitments).

⁷ This line is no longer required and is merged with the budget line, 'Consultants'.

DRAFT

The Strategy Document foresaw an annual USD 565 000.

Thus funding has been short by an annual USD 116 319.

The shortfall over two years is US 232 638.

Contributor	2015	2016	2017	USD	EUR
EC Year 1	GCP/GLO/595/EC			285,536	225,000
FAO				53,869	49,236
Iceland		GCP/GLO/595/MUL		5,000	3,940
Spain		GCP/GLO/595/MUL		273,523	250,000
NOAA				30,000	27,450
EC Year 2			GCP/GLO/675/EC	245,902	225,000
FAO				28,312	25,877
NOAA				50,000	45,750
Total				972,142	852,253

NB: * The exchange rate is variable depending on the date of receipt of funds at FAO.

The Global Record **funding modality** has been dictated by constraints, rules and regulations of contributors. Recently, it has taken the following shape:

1. Annual EC funds
2. This is conditional on co-funding by other donors (so far: FAO, Iceland, NOAA and Spain)
 - This co-funding has to date also only been possible on an annual basis.
 - It becomes part of a multi-donor project (MUL), which allows for consolidated reporting.

Constraints incurred by such a funding approach:

- Annual funding hinders medium-term planning and work
- This in turn affects efficiency in achieving planned results, because
- Annual funding is costly in terms of bureaucratic necessities (e.g. annual financial and programme reporting, yearly drafting of proposals)
- This means it is also costly with regard to staffing, because it deviates staff time from programmatic work (as they spend considerable effort raising funds and attending to annual bureaucracy).

Recommended funding strategy

- **A multi-donor medium-term strategy** – 5 years.
- Six-monthly monitoring and reporting to the donors, allowing for overview of progress and for timely corrective action, if required.
- 1 Mid-term and 1 final evaluation (FAO contribution).

Advantages:

- Staff can concentrate on programme work and on achieving desired results.
- Results are achieved in a more efficient fashion, i.e. the reduction in IUU fishing is speedier.
- Human and eco-system well-being are centre stage!

DRAFT

Recommendations to the thirty-second session of COFI

The Thirty-second Session of COFI, which is scheduled to be held from 11 to 15 July 2016, will be invited to consider a paper, summarizing the significant developments to combat IUU fishing and related activities, including those pertaining to the Global Record, which have occurred since the Thirty-first Session and have been undertaken by FAO.

The paper will provide information on the state of affairs of the Global Record programme, as well as recommendations agreed at the meetings of the GRWG and JWG.

Draft international guidelines for the implementation of the Global Record could also be prepared according to the outcomes of GRWG1 and GRWG2, including technical advice from the GRCGs, and incorporating feedback from the Global Record Pilot Project. Should this be considered useful, this document would be presented as a Session Background Document in support of the main paper.

In this regard, the Committee will be invited to provide guidance, as appropriate, on FAO's future work on the Global Record.

Draft Proposal for Consideration of the Working Group

1. Note progress made in the design of the Global Record system through specialized technical guidance from GRWG1, GRCGs and GRWG2.
2. Recognize the usefulness of putting forward draft international guidelines for the implementation of the Global Record.
3. Encourage active participation into the Pilot Version.
4. Call for a financial mechanism in the medium-term that would guarantee sustainability of the project design, development and implementation.
5. Call for coordination and synergies among several instruments and tools to fight IUU fishing.

GRCG-DR/2016/01
Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Data Requirements
Data Providers

This document aims to open a detailed discussion on the data providers of information to be included in the Global Record. It has been stated at FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI), and reiterated at the first meeting of the Global Record Working Group (GRWG1) and the first meeting of the Global Record Core Groups (GRCG1), that the States are responsible for the information and its submission to the Global Record. This group should now consider each information module separately and discuss who the data providers should be. The group should also keep in mind that it may be necessary to put in place interim measures for the Global Record Pilot Project and for the medium-term, until information is being submitted by all Members.

Vessel Details

In understanding that the Vessel Details make up the core of the Global Record, and that the only essential fields for inclusion of a record are 5 data fields from the Vessel Details information module⁸, particular attention should be paid to the provision of this information.

Previous discussions have always identified the flag State as the owners of this information, and therefore those responsible for submitting it, with the possibility of channelling information through RFMOs or the EU, where applicable.

It is important to note that, without a Vessel Details record for a particular vessel, data on secondary information modules (i.e.: all other information modules) for that vessel would not be able to be accepted. This would cause issues in the short and medium term, until all States have come on board as data providers for the Global Record. It may be the case that a State, in its role as a Global Record Pilot Partner, would like to submit information about Inspections carried out on foreign vessels, for example, and the flag States of those vessels are not yet submitting information to the Global Record. Two proposals are being put forward here:

- The possibility for the data provider of the secondary information module to provide also the 5 essential fields of the Vessel Details, even in the case that the vessel is flying the flag of another State. This would be an interim measure and the information would be replaced by flag State data as soon as it becomes available.
- The use of third party data, in particular that owned by IHS-M in its role as manager of the IMO number, for the Vessel Details information module. This would ensure that core information would be available for all vessels that have been assigned an IMO number, and could be considered an interim solution, with such information being replaced by flag State data once it is made available⁹.

⁸ UVI (IMO number), Vessel Name, Flag State, LOA and GT (or GRT in its absence).

⁹ This issue is also under discussion by the GRCG-TP, as there are further matters to be discussed including: the fact that this data would come at a cost; the fact that this information might not be available to the general public; the possible requirement for the IHS-M information to be forwarded to the flag State for verification before being included in the Global Record. Please refer to GRCG-TP/2016/01 for further information.

DRAFT

In either case, the source of the data would be clearly marked in the Global Record so that there would be no risk of misinterpretation of information.

Historical Details

Historical information, related to flags, vessel names, owners and operators, is also the responsibility of flag States. Therefore, the current flag State of a vessel should submit information on any changes to these fields, and any previous flag States should submit information on changes that took place during the period of time that the vessel was registered in its State. All historical information includes a date, which makes it possible to order the information in time and combine it to compile full vessel history. This information would be very useful for other States to cross check with their records and better detect instances of flag hopping, double flagging and possibly flagless vessels.

One issue to consider is potential timeframe overlaps reported by different Members, and whether anything should be done in such a case (e.g. correction of mistakes? double flagging detected?). This will be discussed under the topic of data conflicts, and the discussion document GRCG-DR/2016/02 will include further details.

IHS-M also records historical information and is able to provide it to the Global Record. The group may wish to consider the use of such information, once again referring to the document GRCG-TP/2016/01 for further information.

Authorization Details

An authorisation to fish or to carry out fishing-related activity, whether a licence, special authorisation or permit, is usually issued by the flag State, but is not limited to that. Coastal States may also issue authorisations to foreign vessels for operation in waters under its jurisdiction, and RFMOs might also issue authorisations for vessels to operate in their regulatory areas. In each case, the Global Record expects the issuer of the authorisation, as the owner of the information, to submit the relevant information. Information overlapping in time should be possible.

Any other possibilities should be put forward for discussion by the group¹⁰.

Inspection and Surveillance & Port Entry Denials

In the case of these two information modules, the data provider should be the State¹¹ carrying out the inspection or sighting, or the RFMO in the case that the RFMO also carries out its own MCS activities, or the State denying entry into port. These situations may give rise to the issue of missing Vessel Details, as described above.

The group should consider whether the flag State is also responsible for providing information on inspections and surveillance carried out by another State on its vessels, or port entry denial reports for its vessels, in the case that it is notified by the responsible State. If so, it should be confirmed that

¹⁰ Such as details of authorizations issued by States other than flag States also being submitted in the interim by the flag State, together with the vessel details.

¹¹ This could be a coastal, port or market State or even a flag State.

DRAFT

the State issuing the report will take priority, in the case of double reporting, as it is the owner of the information.

The group should evaluate the usefulness of the Global Record including information on inspections carried out by flag States on their own vessels, for example, to show its long track of clean records.

IUU Lists

As already agreed in previous discussions, the listing and delisting of vessels in RFMO IUU lists should be notified by the RFMO itself.

It may also be the case that States set up national IUU Lists, and the group should consider whether these should be included in the Global Record. If so, it would be the State, as the owner of the list, reporting any such listing and delisting.

Summary

Table 1. Draft summary table of data providers by information module (P=principal data provider; O=other).

Data Providers/Information modules	Flag State	Coastal State	Port State	Market State	RFMO
Vessel Details	P				O
Historical Details	P				O
Authorisation Details	P	P			P
Inspection & surveillance Details	P	P	P	P	P
Port Entry Denial			P		
IUU listing		O	O	O	P

Other Considerations

The discussion on data providers is a relatively straightforward one, but must identify the data providers that are able to provide timely and accurate information, that is unlikely to be contested by other sources. The decision on which national authorities¹² are responsible for submitting the information to the Global Record is the prerogative of each State, which will have to indicate so.

All information submitted to the Global Record remains the sole responsibility of the data provider, and a disclaimer will be put in place to ensure that users are aware of the fact that the Global Record is simply collating information that otherwise may be difficult to access publicly or from a single access point.

¹² e.g. coast guard, inspections, maritime administration, fisheries administration, etc.

GRCG-DR/2016/02
Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Data Requirements
Data Conflicts

The issue of conflicting data being submitted to the Global Record is one which frequently comes up in discussions and that was considered at length during the first meeting of the Global Record Working Group (GRWG1), which concluded that there is the need to find a way to identify data inconsistencies and draw up a process to handle data conflicts.

Identifying Data Inconsistencies

To date, the most commonly discussed method to identify data inconsistencies within the Global Record is the comparison of data submitted by the State with third party data considered to be verified as accurate, more specifically data obtained from IHS-M. This data could be used to identify conflicts in the Vessel and Historical details, but the use of this data brings with it a number of issues, as mentioned in the document on Data Providers (GRCG-DR/2016/01) and as being considered by the GRCG-TP (please refer to document GRCG-TP/2016/01).

However, data conflicts may occur even without the use of third party data. One example is the submission of data on the same vessel (same UVI) by different flag States, each of which reports that the vessel is flying its flag. There may be several reasons for this, such as one data provider submitting information on a newly-registered vessel before the previous flag State has notified the Global Record of that vessel's deregistration, or in the case of double flagging.

With regards to the comparison of information, there are several details which should be clarified by the group, including:

- Whether only a matching UVI should determine that multiple records refer to the same vessel, or whether other information should be compared (such as the 5 essential data fields) to identify errors in reporting the UVI or attempts to hide a vessel's identity
- Whether all fields should be compared, or only essential/high priority data fields in the Vessel details
- Whether Historical information should be compared and any timeframe overlaps considered to be conflicting information
- Whether any information reported by a State not directly responsible for it (e.g.: a flag State notifying of a port State inspection on its vessel) should also be considered in identifying data conflicts

Handling Data Conflicts

In the case that conflicting information is received, there are a number of possibilities of what could be done procedurally, including:

- Hiding records containing conflicting information in the Global Record, and notifying both data providers of the need to analyse the conflicting information and send the updated/corrected data

DRAFT

- Keeping the original record in the Global Record, flagging it as disputed (indicating the conflicting data), and notifying both data providers of the need to analyse the conflicting information and send the updated/corrected data
- Replacing the record in the Global Record with the newest data received, flagging it as unconfirmed, and requesting the data provider of the original information to confirm the new version of the information received

There are, of course, several other options available, which the group is encouraged to put forward for discussion.

The group should consider whether all data fields hold the same weight, or whether a conflict in the essential data fields be considered as more important and, thus, a different procedure followed (e.g.: comparison with third party data might reveal inconsistencies related to the construction date and place, but, since such fields are Low Priority for the Global Record, they may simply retain flag State information rather than the entire record be hidden or flagged). The group should also evaluate the pros and cons of displaying information for secondary information modules (anything other than Vessel details), in the case that there are data conflicts within the Vessel details.

It is important to note that all actions, from identifying conflicting information to notifying the relevant authorities, will be taken by an automated system. As discussed during the first meeting of the Global Record Core Groups (GRCG1), it is not foreseen that there will be any Global Record staff analysing the data received and taking decisions on the correctness of the information or otherwise. In this context, the group should discuss the need to set up an editorial board to handle such situations, with Equasis as a potential model, as mentioned during the first meeting of the Global Record Working Group (GRWG1).

GRCG-TP/2016/01
Global Record Specialized Core Working Group on Third Party Data
Options for the Use of IHS-M Data

The use of IHS-M data within the Global Record has been discussed on various occasions, most recently at the first meeting of the Global Record Core Groups (GRCG1). The Secretariat was requested to provide further information as to the details of the data which would be obtained from IHS-M, as the managers of the IMO number which is to be used as the Global Record's UVI, and the cost of such data. The group is requested to consider the options discussed with IHS-M and the potential of any of these options as an interim, or permanent, approach.

External Link to Seaweb

The GRCG-TP, at its last meeting, discussed the possibility of linking to IHS-M's system, to avoid incorporating third party information directly within the Global Record, whilst allowing the user to have access to compare Global Record information with that in Seaweb.

This option would still require that the 5 essential information fields be received from the States, in order to create the link into Seaweb on a vessel by vessel basis, using the UVI as the linking field.

In the context of the Pilot Project, where the Global Record expects to have approximately 5 Partners representing each of the regions, Seaweb access could be given to 5 users for a total of EUR 6,794 per annum. On a wider scale, where each State would be given access to link to Seaweb (estimated at 200 users), the total cost would be EUR 67,940 per annum.

Integration of Minimum Vessel Details

The Vessel Details make up the core of the Global Record, and without the essential fields for a vessel, other information related to different information modules cannot be accepted into the Global Record (for more information, please refer to GRCG-DR/2016/01 – Data Providers).

In understanding that not all States will be able to provide the minimum Vessel Details immediately, it may be worth obtaining this data from IHS-M, which collects them when allocating the IMO number and then updates the data regularly. This will allow the Global Record to include the full set of most basic information as a starting point for implementation, for all fishing vessels, refers and bunker vessels of 100 GT and above.

In order to obtain the five essential fields from IHS-M, and make them available to the projected five Pilot Project Partners, the cost would be that of EUR 14,796 per annum. Giving access to 200 users, and thus all State administrations, would cost EUR 28,785 per annum.

Integration of Full Vessel Details and Historical Details

IHS-M makes a very wide set of data fields available, under subscription, and could provide the majority of the Vessel Details recommended by the GRCG-DR, for all fishing vessels, refers and bunker vessels of 100 GT and above. The company also manages historical information related to vessels, and collects and audits all the data fields in the Global Record's Historical Details information

DRAFT

module. The cost of making all this information available to all State administrations would be EUR 53,416 per annum.

Data for Verification Purposes

Another option for the use of IHS-M data, as also discussed during GRG1, is that of cross-checking information received from official data providers in order to identify inconsistencies, without making the information from IHS-M available through the Global Record. Such a task could be restricted to cross-checking of the five essential Global Record data items, to identify only major issues with the information, and then take action appropriately (for full details, please refer to the document GRG-DR/2016/02 – Data Conflicts). The cost of the internal use of these five fields by the Global Record information system would be of EUR 34,299 per annum.

Other Considerations

Each of the options detailed above is based on the number of users who would have access, with the possibility for public use not being provided by IHS-M for the time being. Given that it has been decided by the Global Record Working Group, and reiterated at the GRG1, that the Global Record should be public to all, the group should give feedback as to whether restricted use could be beneficial in the short to medium term, and, if so, how to move on to public access from there.

The GRG1 also confirmed that flag State endorsement would be necessary should any third party data be included in the Global Record. Therefore, if any of the options for integration of data are selected, a process for the data to be forwarded to the appropriate State authorities for verification would also need to be discussed.

The group should weigh the pros and cons of the various options put forward. The Secretariat does not exclude further discussions and negotiations with IHS-M, should it be requested. However, it should be noted that any payment will have to be covered by Global Record programme funds, which are limited and have not yet been secured past 2016.