Executive summary

There was a discussion on technical aspects of FMC performance.

There was a discussion on the implementation and future development of the electronic Port State Control system. In this context it was agreed to propose to the Annual Meeting to amend PECCOE’s proposal of an end date for the fax based system. 15 January is considered to be a more suitable first date than 1 January for a fully electronic system. It was also noted that NAFO is looking into setting up a Port State Control system.

There was a discussion on cancellation reports.

There was a discussion on the pilot project testing online utilities for uploading all types of reports listed in the Scheme.

A draft recommendation on security and confidentiality was discussed and amended. It was agreed to send the amended version to the Annual Meeting as a proposal by AGDC for an overarching recommendation on the issue. If the recommendation is adopted, a number of guidelines must be formulated. AGDC agreed on the prioritisation and way of working in formulating the guidelines.

It was agreed that it should be communicated to PECCOE that ERS must be consistent with the new security and confidentiality provisions. It was also agreed to communicate to PECCOE that AGDC will be able to give advice regarding the development of ERS once the basic architecture of the ERS will be clear.

It was agreed that the proposal agreed by AGDC in April, regarding error codes, should be presented to the Annual Meeting as a proposal from AGDC.
There was a discussion on the process that has been set up to work on the possibility of making AGDC a joint group of NEAFC and NAFO.

**It was agreed** to re-visit the following documents on the next AGDC meeting:

- AGDC 2012-03-09 “Definition of duplicate reports”
- AGDC 2012-03-12 Proposal to amendment Annex IX.D 2b) “Return error numbers” to prevent the loss of correct reports/messages.

**It was agreed** to re-elect the current Chair, Ellen Fasmer, Norway, and the current Vice Chair, Jacques Verborgh, EU, for another two years in their positions.

1. **Opening**

The Chair, Ellen Fasmer, Norway, opened the meeting and welcomed the delegates. She pointed out that the nature of AGDC is such that they should speak freely. Delegates attend AGDC as experts and should look at their participation first and foremost in that capacity, rather than feel that they can only say things that have been officially declared as the policy of their Contracting Party.

2. **Appointment of rapporteur**

The Secretary was appointed as rapporteur.

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

The Chair pointed out that one agenda item had been added to the draft agenda that had been circulated before the meeting. This was agenda item 5.4, on changes to return error numbers, which was added after PECCOE had the previous day asked AGDC to look at the issue.

The agenda was adopted, as amended.

4. **Data exchange**

   4.1. Overall view (first semester 2012)

   The representative of the Secretariat pointed out that this agenda item was only to look at technical aspects of the transmissions, but not the substance. Looking at the substance was a task for PECCOE. He noted that some Contracting Parties need to improve their performance, while others have been complying well for years. He pointed out that
everyone has technical problems every now and then, but these are normally solved quickly.

He stated that, of the 19 Contracting Party FMCs, more than half are performing as they should, but the others have technical problems which may in some cases actually be administrative rather than technical. He stated that there had not been clear improvement in the technical side in the last year, but at least things are not getting worse.

The representative of the Secretariat was asked about improvements in the EU’s FMCs following the workshop that he took part in with them. He stated that some of the FMCs that were having problems did unfortunately not take part, but there had still clearly been positive outcomes from the workshop. He pointed out that the vessels themselves were generally fulfilling their obligations, but that their FMCs sometimes let them down.

The representative of the Secretariat was asked about instances during the past summer where inspectors had not had access to all the data that they should have, even if it seemed that it had been received by the Secretariat. He stated that the Secretariat will investigate what happened with communications with EU-Denmark in the summer. Some messages were sent, but others seem to be missing. He noted that there had not been a general problem as other recipients of the data had received it.

4.2. Review of EPSC implementation

The representative of the Secretariat presented document AGDC 2012-03-10. She noted that the electronic forms for Port State Control had now been in place for over nine months and no major problems had come up. The minor problems had also been few and had been dealt with. She encouraged relevant parties to provide the Secretariat with feedback on their experience in using the electronic system, as that helped in its development.

The representative of the Secretariat noted that 37% of authorised landings in the Port State Control system so far this year had used the electronic forms. A relatively low proportion used the electronic forms at the beginning of the year, but since April the proportion has been about half of the total. She also noted the difference between the PS1 and PS2 forms. PS2 forms were electronic in around 70% of cases, while the number is lower for PS1 which is simpler. The user saves more time by using the electronic forms in the case of the PS2 than the PS1, and the incentive is therefore greater for the former.

The representative of the Secretariat also went over some issues that are being looked at in the context of developing the system. This includes cancellations and the format of the forms. She noted that the Secretariat has looked at the technical needs associated with the possible expansion of the scope of the system. She stated that scaling the system up was not expected to cause great problems, but web hosting costs could increase by around 50%. She noted that an upgrade of the hardware was planned anyway and that this should make the Secretariat comfortable even if the extension of the scope happens.
The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thanked the Secretariat for its work on the electronic system, which he stated was of a very high standard. He noted that the Faroe Islands had tested the system with several parties, and had no problems. He stated that he expected the Faroe Islands to have 100% uptake of the electronic forms very soon.

There was a discussion on several issues regarding the use of the electronic forms, where the Secretariat clarified some aspects and received comments.

The representative of the Secretariat pointed out that PECCOE had agreed to have an end date for the use of the fax based system. PECCOE had agreed to propose to the Annual Meeting that from 1 January 2013 only the electronic forms will be used, with the fax based system kept only as a back up system if there was a failure in the electronic system.

She noted that further consideration of that date had let her to conclude that 1 January was perhaps not the best date to make a change, as it is a period when many people are on holiday and it will be difficult to respond to any initial problems that could otherwise be easily solved.

The Chair agreed that 1 January would not be the best date in this context. She suggested that AGDC would advise the Annual Meeting to rather use 15 January as the date to move to a fully electronic system. This was agreed.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat stated that NAFO was looking into setting up a system for Port State Control and was therefore following closely the developments in NEAFC.

4.3. Review of the implementation of the cancellation (CAN) report (rec 09:2012)

The Chair pointed out that a new cancellation report had been adopted last year.

The representative of the Secretariat presented document AGDC 2012-03-11. She noted that there had not been many cancellations, and that only one Contracting Party had used them. The fact that the reports had not been used extensively meant that it was not possible to review it thoroughly.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat noted that a similar cancellation report had just been adopted in NAFO.

There was a discussion on how the cancellation reports are designed and how they work in practice. In this discussion, it was noted that the formulation of the reports had already been finalised and that the issue under this agenda item was the experience in implementing them. However, some delegates pointed out that there were some concerns
related to having such cancellation reports in the system, such as the issue that cancellation reports might potentially be used to manipulate data. The Chair stated that the task of AGDC was only to look at the technical aspects of the reports, and that issues that were control issues rather than technical issues should be raised in PECCOE rather than AGDC. Some delegates considered that AGDC should still point to relevant issues that those dealing with control matters might have overlooked.

The Chair stated that AGDC should only focus on technical aspects, but noted that the report of the meeting should nevertheless reflect that the other point of view had been raised.

4.4. Information from the NEAFC Secretariat on the status of the pilot project testing online utilities for uploading reports

The representative of the Secretariat made a presentation explaining the pilot project, which had not started yet.

There was a discussion on various aspects of the project, and on how it can be developed from a pilot project to be a fully operational way to upload reports.

5. Documents referred by PECCOE for discussion

5.1. NEAFC - Security and confidentiality issues

The Chair noted that much work had been done on this issue. PECCOE had asked AGDC to formulate a draft recommendation. The current draft was in document AGDC 2012-03-04. If adopted by the Annual Meeting, this would be the overarching recommendation on security and confidentiality that all aspects of the information security management system would be based on. This system would also include a number of guidelines that would be formulated if and when the recommendation was adopted by the Annual Meeting.

The Chair noted that the ISO standard that NEAFC’s policy would be based on used a cyclical approach. She explained that this meant that a plan had to be made and then implemented. The next step would be a review of the plan and its implementation. This review would then result in the action of a revision of the plan and/or its implementation. The plan and implementation, as amended, would then again be subject to review and revision, and so the cycle would go on. She noted that regular reviews were missing in the current NEAFC system, but the new recommendation would ensure that they would be regular in the future.

There was a discussion on the draft recommendation and several amendments were agreed. It was agreed to send the revised version of the recommendation to the Annual Meeting as a proposal from AGDC. The revised recommendation is Annex 1 to this
The Chair noted that there were a number of guidelines that needed to be formulated following the adoption of the recommendation, as presented in document AGDC 2012-03-06. She stated that this meant that AGDC should prioritise the work it would do on this if the Annual Meeting adopts the recommendation.

There was a discussion on what would be the most appropriate prioritisation. It was agreed to prioritise the following, in the order presented here:

- Communication and operation Security Guidelines,
- Access control Security Guidelines,
- Business continuity management Guidelines, and
- Physical and environmental Security Guidelines.

*Guidelines for NEAFC risk management* and *System acquisition, development and maintenance Security Guidelines* have to be formulated in cooperation with PECCOE.

The Chair opened a discussion on how intersessional work on the guidelines would be arranged. She noted that Sharepoint that had earlier been set up to facilitate drafting had not been utilised much. She raised the issue of whether it would be more productive to send new drafts and comments to all the relevant experts through email. In the discussion, the point was made that Sharepoint could still be a useful tool. The conclusion was that all new drafts will both be sent by email and put up on the Sharepoint website.

The Chair noted that the experts who will work on the different guidelines are not likely to be present at NEAFC Annual Meetings. It would therefore be unlikely that a constructive discussion on the respective guidelines could be held there. She therefore wondered if there would be any reason to formally adopt the guidelines at Annual Meetings. The NEAFC Commission would still have to formally adopt them, but she noted that it might be simplest to put them to a postal vote when they have been finalised, rather than put them on hold until the following Annual Meeting. She stressed that there was no need to make any decision on this at this meeting, but encouraged delegates to think about this, consult with their NEAFC delegations as necessary, and revisit this issue at the next AGDC meeting.

**5.2. NEAFC - ERS/Electronic logbooks issues**

The Chair noted that PECCOE had not presented AGDC with any points to develop in this context. **It was agreed** that it should be communicated to PECCOE that ERS must be consistent with the new security and confidentiality provisions. **It was also agreed** to communicate to PECCOE that AGDC will be able to give advice regarding the development of ERS once the basic architecture of the ERS will be clear.
5.3. New error codes (rec 10:2012) - status of the recommendation proposed by the AGDC at the meeting 22/05/2012

The Chair noted that the proposal in document AGDC 2012-03-08 had been agreed to in AGDC in April. AGDC’s conclusion had been that it would be best if the proposal would be adopted by a postal vote. The NEAFC President decided not to have a postal vote, but rather to have the proposal dealt with at the Annual Meeting.

It was agreed that the proposal should be presented to the Annual Meeting as a proposal from AGDC. It was noted that editorial changes might be made, to make this a proposal to amend Recommendation 10:2012 rather than a proposal for a new recommendation. The Secretariat was asked to consult with legal experts to conclude on which for the proposal should be presented in.

The Chair noted that dealing with the issue of duplicates, presented in document AGDC 2012-03-09, would be postponed until the next AGDC meeting.

5.4 Changes to return error numbers

The Chair noted that PECCOE had the day before sent document AGDC 2012-03-12 to AGDC. This concerns the issue of changes to return error numbers. After a brief discussion it was noted that AGDC would not be able to conclude on this at such short notice. The matter was deferred to the next AGDC meeting.

6. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)

6.1. NEAFC issues
6.2. NAFO issues
6.3. Issues raised by other NAF users
No points were raised under agenda item 61, 6.2 and 6.3
6.4. AGDC web based intercessional work
The chair noted that this item had been covered under item 5.1. It was discussed if it is possible to use the SharePoint already made by NAFO for AGDC, as a help in the intercessional work with the NEAFC Guidelines. It was agreed to try to use both mail and the SharePoint in this work.

7. AGDC as a joint NAFO/NEAFC group

The Secretary reminded the delegates of the background to this issue, which had been discussed before in AGDC. He noted that NEAFC had formally invited NAFO to jointly
setting up a working group that would look into the possibility of establishing AGDC as a joint body of NEAFC and NAFO. At its Annual Meeting that had recently finished, NAFO had formally accepted the invitation and would jointly set up the working group. The Secretary noted that the NEAFC and NAFO Secretariats would cooperate to make arrangements for the first meeting of the joint working group, which would be early next year. All Contracting Parties of NEAFC and NAFO would be invited to take part in the group’s work.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat confirmed this and stated that the two Secretariats will work together to support the working group once it begins its work.

There was a short discussion where the point was made that there were both advantages and disadvantages in making AGDC a joint group of NEAFC and NAFO. It was also noted that consideration of whether it is advisable to make AGDC a joint group was a part of the intended work of the joint working group.

The Chair noted that the intention was for this work to result in proposals for the Annual Meetings of NEAFC and NAFO next year. There would therefore not be a change in the basis for AGDC’s work until 2014 at the earliest. AGDC would get on with its work as normal until any decision was made.

8. Election of AGDC Chair and Vice Chair

The Chair pointed out that AGDC elected its Chair and Vice Chair for two year terms. Her current term, and that of the Vice Chair, would expire at the end of the year.

It was agreed to re-elect the current Chair, Ellen Fasmer, Norway, to another two year term as AGDC Chair.

It was agreed to re-elect the current vice Chair, Jacques Verborgh, EU, to another two year term as AGDC Vice Chair.

9. Any other business

No points were raised under this agenda item.

10. Report to the 2012 Annual Meeting

The draft report was circulated on 8 October. Delegates were given until October 15 to make comments and suggest amendments to the draft. The final report was adopted and circulated on October 16.

11. Date and place of next meeting
The Chair suggested that the next meeting of AGDC could be held in March. In any case, AGDC should meet prior to the spring 2013 meeting of PECCOE. She noted that the need to have more than one meeting in 2013 would be discussed later.

12. Closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked all the delegated for making this a fruitful meeting. She thanked the Secretariat for its contributions, its support to the meeting and for the update of documents that had been done before and during the meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.