



**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 The EU representative informed about the HTTPS connections, as the information in AGDC 2006/2/08 was a bit out of date.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.















