



**NEAFC**  
**ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA COMMUNICATION**

**5 October 2006, 10.00 – Tallinn**

**1. Opening**

The Chairman, Mr Gylfi Geirsson, Iceland, opened the meeting welcoming everybody - all those Contracting Parties present and an observer from NAFO. He aimed to end the meeting at around 3 pm.

**2. Appointment of the rapporteur**

The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur

**3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda**

The EU representative suggested that the NAFO tender was dealt with early in the meeting. This was accepted and the agenda adopted.

**4. Data communication**

**4.1 Exchange of information within AGDC**

The Chairman felt it was necessary to review this. The Secretariat had suggested that a communication facility could be established on the NAF website. Another way was to create a unique AGDC e-mail address in the Contracting Parties. There were no comments, but the Chairman suggested that further comments could be made electronically.

**4.2 Implementation of the Schemes**

The Secretariat introduced AGDC 2006/2/08. Some parts are of interest to PECCOE, but most to AGDC. The document describes the performance of each Contracting Party with respect to the submission of messages. He asked for comments and corrections from Contracting Parties. He also highlighted a study of transshipment messages. It showed that there was a mismatch between donor and receiver vessels. It was noted that the number of messages had stabilised between 350000 and 400000 per annum.

The Norwegian representative noted that there were a number of flag states that only sent position messages. The EU representative informed about the HTTPS connections, as the information in AGDC 2006/2/08 was a bit out of date. EU-Denmark, EU-Germany, EU-Lithuania, EU-Malta, EU-Portugal, EU-Spain and EU-Sweden have migrated to HTTPS.

Migration in October has been indicated by EU-Belgium, EU-Estonia, EU-Finland, EU-Ireland, EU-Latvia, EU-Netherlands, EU-Poland and EU-UK. He expected this to improve data communication. EU-Estonia informed that they had been using HTTPS since the end of September. The Secretariat had been approached by some parties and had directed them to the provider. This development will reduce communication costs.

The Secretariat informed that those FMCs that use the old entry and exit messages alongside the COE and COX cause problems and there was a danger of messages being rejected. The Chairman urged parties to report in the same format. EU-Sweden informed that they did not normally send SEN and SEX messages by e-mail, but only as a backup if there were problems. The Secretariat confirmed this.

The Chairman found the transshipment study interesting, but had not expected the situation to be so bad. Quality control had to be part of the system in order to avoid false information. He also noted the confusion caused by using the RED code for redfish. The Norwegian representative reported experiences with strange characters inside messages in bilateral arrangements, but had not been able to find out what was behind it. The Secretariat noted that it happened with both HTTPS and X-25, but this specific problem had only been experienced in 2006. Only a very small percentage of messages were affected, however. The Norwegian representative had experienced this particularly with messages from Greenland. The Chairman suggested that this should be looked into more closely by the Secretariat.

#### **4.3 Access to meeting documents**

The Secretariat informed about access on the protected site to documents. He wanted Contracting Parties to let the Secretariat know if they experienced any problems. The Chairman suggested that the NEAFC Secretariat look into how NAFO had set this up. Access to agendas, annotations and documents was very well organised on the NAFO website. This was agreed.

#### **4.4 (1) Access and data transfer into the inspector site and (2) Access and data transfer into the statistical site**

The Secretariat introduced AGDC 2006/2/06, "Activities with relevance to PECCOE and the Advisory Group on Data Communications". The Norwegian representative reported that they would see it as a retrograde step if they had to enter catch data manually to the new facility on the website. The facility had to be able to receive data electronically. The Chairman noted that we are still in a trial period, so this could be looked into. Such techniques should be available and the Secretariat should look at that. Contracting Parties should assist the Secretariat in this.

#### **4.5 Review of Attachment V of Scheme of Control and Enforcement**

This came out of actions arising from last year's meeting. The Chairman referred to the discussion in PECCOE. There had been agreement that no major revisions seemed necessary. However there may be a need to mention the service provided to SEAFO. Changes a couple of years ago should cover everything else. The NAFO reform and possible exchange of data between NAFO and NEAFC may also need to be addressed.

The Secretariat explained the arrangements with SEAFO. All Attachment V requirements were applicable to both the SEAFO and the NEAFC part of the database. The storage of data at the Secretariat should be considered.

The Norwegian representative concurred, but noted that new uses could make it necessary to review procedures. One example was the distribution of passwords and how that was done. The Secretariat pointed out that Attachment V only related to the VMS database to which only the Secretariat had access. However, the point is valid and the Secretariat would meet this concern. If the new COE and COX comparison systems are adopted there may be a need for a new paragraph. There were no further comments. EU-UK drew attention to UK legislation on data confidentiality.

**Actions arising:** The Secretariat will look into the problem of strange characters inside messages. It will also look into the possibility of organising agendas, annotations and relevant papers so these were more easily accessible on the website. The possibility of reporting catches electronically into the new catch reporting facility will also be investigated by the Secretariat.

## 5. Requests from PECCOE

### 5.1 Consolidated Scheme text

This had been discussed extensively in PECCOE. A new development is communication with respect to port state control. AGDC should prepare itself to do this electronically. The Chairman outlined the flow of information and necessary questions and answers to allow landing. This can be done by fax, but he felt that this should be done via the NEAFC website as soon as possible in various ways which he outlined. He asked for comments.

The Norwegian representative agreed that this should be done on the web, but that would probably not be possible immediately so a paper trail should also be planned. The Chairman concurred. The new scheme would enter into force in a few months, so the work to make everything much easier by using efficient electronic communication should start soon. This was supported by everybody. EU-Denmark noted that the form was envisaged as needing stamps and signatures which complicated electronic communication. The Chairman noted that this had been technically solved by business, but we should note the legal implication. EU-Spain pointed out the necessity for the paper trail of non-Contracting Parties that should be developed. The Chairman expected PECCOE to take care of this as it is not a technical problem.

**Actions arising:** The Secretariat will look into the paper work involved in the new port control measures in the scheme and the possibilities of using efficient electronic communication in this respect.

### 5.2 Article 11 Pilot project taken off the agenda.

## **6. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF) – NEAFC issues**

### **6.2 Proposal by Norway**

The Norwegian representative introduced AGDC 2006/2/03. This is rather detailed and reflects that Norway uses the NAF for various purposes. Two should be highlighted. First, new Norwegian legislation came into force in spring 2005 allowing Norwegian and foreign vessels to use electronic report systems (ERS) for catch and activity reporting in Norwegian waters if the Flag State principle is used. Second, Norway has started testing electronic logbooks using NAF for the reports. Norway has created some new two-letter codes and some new reports for these two systems. She noted that there was delay in introducing NAF code into the NAF website, 60 days after presentation the proposals will be put into the list of codes and list of reports. They saw a need to have all codes on the website.

For use in NAF, ISO alpha 3 codes for NEAFC and NAFO have been assigned and, in this proposal, a new code has been introduced SEAFO (XSA). She also noted that they have introduced two-letter codes in relation to electronic logbooks that could be used to allow a more flexible use of NAF. The same two-letter code can now appear more than once in one message if the special trailer code is used. The trailer is used as in the old Danish format. This may also point to solutions in other instances where special combinations of information are needed in a NAF report.

These new developments are at the moment being tested in Norway. Two other systems, with the EU and the Russian Federation, will be presented on the NAF website in the near future.

The Secretariat noted that this document would be put under Norway on the website and the new codes would be added to the general code list. He also referred to discussion with the NAFO Secretariat on how to put special NAFO documents into the NAF site. This had led the NAFO Secretariat to respond that they did not seem to have any responsibility for the NAF website. He clarified that codes should be universal not user specific in the NAF list. Specific codes and documents related to Contracting Parties and Regional Fisheries Bodies should put under those individual NAF partners.

The Chairman concluded that the NAF seems to be appropriate for shorter messages. For larger amounts of data other solutions may have to be found. The Norwegian representative agreed that we have to allow for other possible formats but, at the stage we are now, NAF with the proposed extensions may suffice for the information authorities also need in electronic logbooks. If all the scientific information has to be included, it will not. We are in a process.

The Russian representative thought that the Norwegian submission was very interesting and especially the audit report used for testing. Further, he suggested that NEAFC should organise a working group for electronic logbooks.

The Chairman concluded that the Norwegian submission would be integrated into the NAF website. He suggested that partners should have a chance to comment until the end of October.

## **7. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF) – other RFMOs' issues**

### **7.1 NAFO – document on COE/COX comparison - by Iceland**

The Chairman presented AGDC 2006/2/04 proposed by Iceland on COE/COX comparison between NAFO and NEAFC and noted that NAFO-STACTIC recommended that both Secretariats should coordinate in setting such a system. The implementation will have consequences for the Scheme of Control and Enforcement but, being fully automated, no paperwork should be involved. He also noted that FMCs would not be involved in such implementation and therefore it should be done quite rapidly. The Chairman then explained the technical implications of the presented document and called the attention of delegates to the compatibility of security and confidentiality between Secretariats and the accuracy of data transmitted by FMCs.

### **7.2 NAFO – document on CAT report multi-areas - by Iceland**

The Chairman presented AGDC 2006/2/05 regarding daily catch reports proposed by Iceland, presenting the different practical and technical aspects of the document.

The Norwegian representative questioned the practical aspects of the fisheries and benefits from the change. She noted that modification to the data-element “catch” CA would have to be modified by all FMCs, so the “trailer” option (referred to by the Norwegian representative in its proposed AGDC 2006/2/03) would probably be the simplest solution.

The representative of the Russian Federation supported the option where the Secretariats should be responsible for changes rather than FMCs.

### **7.3 NAFO – VMS re-tendering**

The Chairman drew attention to two papers on the tender and also a CD with all the relevant information. He suggested that the Group should concentrate on the technical issues rather than other matters related to the tendering process. He asked the EU to go through their form for assessing the tenders. The EU representative described the reasoning behind the form and the way the scores had been set up (“Assessment of Call for Tender”). He questioned whether the tender is subject to Canadian law and suggested that it would be wise to check it. There were no comments. See also paper “VMS- calls for tender submissions”.

The Chairman questioned whether it was worthwhile spending too much time on companies without fisheries experience. The EU representative pointed out that a panel

would look at the individual tenders. AGDC should concentrate on the assessment form to create the basis for the work of the panels. The Chairman accepted this, but asked if the AGDC should make a first filtering of the companies. With respect to the members of the panel, he asked who would participate. The following panellists were suggested: Andreas Jaunsen - Norway, Mads Nedergaard - Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Ben Whelan, - Canada, Gylfi Geirsson - Iceland and Maris Stulgis - EU.

It was agreed to concentrate on procedures and the form. The EU representative felt that it would be up to the individual assessors to evaluate every tender. Lack of experience would be reflected in the scores. This was agreed.

The assessment form was displayed on the screen and the Group went through each item.

15 % to the quality of the tender and 85% to technical tender was accepted. EU-Sweden pointed out that, if some contents were lacking, that tenderer would almost automatically be ruled out because of the minimum requirement of 10. The EU representative pointed out that there were two phases. The selection phase should ensure that the required information and the technical expertise to do the job are there. In the second phase of evaluating technical criteria, the extremes of marking should be used and carefully recorded, so the process is completely transparent. The point was made that the companies should have been informed about the marking and rating of each criterion in the call for tenders. The EU representative thought that these comments about procedures should be dealt with by STACFAD and the attention of that committee drawn to them. The rules for assessing tenders should be universal and WTO compatible.

The Chairman suggested that the only thing that could be done by the AGDC was to go through the form and look at the technical criteria. There were no proposals for changing the form.

3. No comment

4. No comment

4.1 The Chairman doubted that equal weight to all the four elements was right. There were various ways to change this, for example by multipliers. The EU representative thought that it would be safer to give equal weight as the weights had not been communicated to the tenderers in the call for tenders. He repeated that it would be wise to mark in such a way as to clearly show the difference in quality between tender offers. No other comments

4.2 The EU representative noted that the vessel registry had not been described in the tender so the companies may have problems dealing with this question. The question of the retrieval of data and confidentiality was also mentioned.

4.3 - No comments

4.4 - No comments

4.5 - No comment

4.6 - No comments

4.7 - No comments Will be looked into in more detail later.

4.8 - No comments

4.9 - No comments

4.10 - No comments

4.11 - The EU representative pointed out that the call for tender' did not specify what kind of application (system, software) NAFO has currently and this could create difficulties for companies submitting a qualitative proposal.

5. - No comments

6. - No comments

7. - No comments

8. - No comments

9. - No comments

The EU representative pointed out that some criteria had not been mentioned in the call for tenders. If the information was not there should it get a 0 rating or should additional information be sought? With respect to warnings it was not quite clear on what to base the evaluation. The Chairman did not think the evaluators should ask for additional information, but if there was a misunderstanding the Secretariat could draw the attention of the companies to the fact. With respect to warnings, if the criteria were fulfilled they had to have top score. If they were able to do more it could be noted. The EU representative stressed that if companies were approached after the tender it should be strictly formal ensuring equal treatment under the legal systems operating. The observer from Canada indicated that if information was not provided he would note that and give a score of 0. This approach was agreed.

The Norwegian representative asked if the NAFO Secretariat had GIS today. If they had it they should not lose it. The Secretariat pointed out that the NAFO and NEAFC databases were different from those in Contracting Parties. NAFO and NEAFC were secondary users and did not use GIS in day to day running.

The EU representative questioned whether the elements in the specification of requirements 1-12 in the call for tender and the elements in the guidelines should have the same weight, as this was not specified in the tender document. The Chairman suggested that this point should be drawn to the attention of the NAFO Secretariat.

With respect to the sections on quality of tender and suitability of tenderers, the EU suggested taking these out of the assessment form. This was not a part of the technical evaluation, but should be dealt with by, for example, STACFAD. He suggested that the Chairman of AGDC drew this to the attention of STACFAD. This was agreed.

The form was amended accordingly and this led to a score of a total of 85 points. The Norwegian representative asked if 60 points meant that the company was able to do the job. If this was true the scoring should make certain that 60 points should not be reached if major abilities scored zeroes. The EU representative asked how many zeroes could be accepted. It was suggested that if there were zeroes in the 1 to 11 list the company was disqualified. Minimum points required should thus be avoided.

The EU representative suggested that the form was further amended, the first section reflecting the elements in the specification of requirement and a latter section the elements in the guidelines.

The form as amended was displayed on the screen. The first section will require a score of at least one in each element. The EU representative –Spain reverted to the question of GIS. The Chairman referred to the answer given by the NEAFC Secretariat earlier. The form as amended was accepted as the basis for the group of evaluators (Annex I).

The Norwegian representative wanted a specification of what NAFO applications were involved (No 11 of Annex I). The Chairman indicated that this will be provided for the small group in cooperation with the Chairman of STACTIC and the NAFO Secretariat.

It was agreed to circulate the amended form to the evaluators who will complete the evaluation form in respect of each company that submitted a tender proposal. The completed evaluation forms shall be submitted to the Chairman of STACTIC. A deadline for the evaluation should be worked out by him but probably not later than the end of October.

<b>Actions arising:</b> The results of the deliberations will be reported to NAFO
---

## **8. Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO**

- FAOs CWP
- SEAFO VMS database

The Secretariat presented AGDC 2006/2/06.

## **9. Any other business**

- VDS campaign 2005/2006 –JCR

The JRC representative presented the 2005/2006 campaign results and referred to the document presented to ICES. The Chairman noted the positive results of VDS use in Iceland's surveillance tasks.

- PALS

The Secretariat presented the PALS document for information to Contracting Parties - AGDC/2006/2/07. There were no comments.

## **11. Date and place of the next meeting**

The main meeting will be proposed for the second week of October 2007 in conjunction with the PECCOE meeting.

After the Annual Meeting an additional meeting could be needed depending on possible specific mandates to AGDC.

## 12. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was adjourned and the Chairman thanked everybody for their contribution and wished them a safe journey home.

**ANNEX I****Assessment of Call for Tender****NAFO VMS Communication and Database Application****Technical Criteria (90points)**

Company name: \_\_\_\_\_

No	Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>Specification Requirements*</b>			
1.	<b>Automatic handling of VMS reports</b>	/5	Ability to automatically compile, forward and store defined NAFO report formats (using appropriate data elements and codes)
2.	<b>Integration of a vessel registry</b>	/5	Ability to integrate NAFO vessel register into new system ensuring easy maintenance of it
3.	<b>Manual input of data</b>	/5	
4.	<b>Automatic and manual sending of messages from NAFO Secretariat to FMCs</b>	/5	
5.	<b>Updating ability of NAFO data base (certain entries)</b>	/5	Explanation of ability to do that
6.	<b>Updating ability of NAFO data base (new message types)</b>	/5	Explanation of ability to do that
7.	<b>Warning system</b>	/5	
8.	<b>Security and confidentiality</b>	/5	
9.	<b>Existing data (Oracle) transfer ability to the new application</b>	/5	
10.	<b>Reporting system that allows queries</b>	/5	
11.	<b>Data import ability into NAFO own applications</b>	/5	
12.*	<b>GIS component (optional)</b>	/5	
<b>Total</b>		/60	

\* As stated in the call for tender, these requirements are mandatory, with the exception of requirement No 12 on the GIS component, which is optional. Therefore, requirements 1 to 11 each require a minimum score of 1 to fulfil the specification.

No	Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>Conditions for the contract</b>			
13.	<b>System description and database table structures</b>	/5	Is the system properly described and are the database tables user friendly
14.	<b>Development phase</b>	/5	Detailed description of the development phase in the form of steps that are described in detail including time frames for completion for each individual step
15.	<b>Hardware and third party software</b>	/5	Included in the proposal
16.	<b>Elaboration of manuals</b>	/5	Included in the proposal
17.	<b>Training</b>	/5	
18.	<b>Trial period/parallel running</b>	/5	Included in the proposal
Total		/30	
Grand Total		/90	

Evaluator's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Contracting Party: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_