Executive Summary

AGDC evaluated (agenda item 4.1) the overall performance of data transfers.

AGDC discussed (agenda item 4.2) the security of management systems and two Norwegian proposals:

Proposal 1: NEAFC shall no longer act as a certification authority. (CA). No NEAFC certificates will be renewed when expired.

Proposal 2: The Secretariats of NEAFC and NAFO will evaluate their current procedures for data communication via HTTPS, especially the use of digital certificates to ascertain that the systems are in accordance with the common recognized standards and ‘best practice’.

The group agreed to advise PECCOE to accept proposal 1, and PECCOE and STACTIC to accept proposal 2.

AGDC discussed at length (agenda item 5) the implications for the NEAFC Scheme of the use of electronic logbooks. It was agreed to try to use the existing EU-Norway electronic logbook system as a starting point for discussions on a new NEAFC system and to harmonize as much as possible so that the implementation of the new NEAFC system will be as easy as possible for as many Contracting Parties as possible.

When PECCOE has drafted the changes in the articles needed for electronic logbook AGDC was prepared to draft new annexes. There is a need to map different elements. Norway and the EU agreed to do the mapping before the next meeting. This mapping should involve other parties considering the use of electronic logbooks. It should be possible to draft a document for circulation before 1 July 2011. AGDC then has the summer to consider it and report by mid-September. NAFO suggested a video conference as means of communication.
AGDC discussed the web application of PSC electronic forms (agenda item 6.2). AGDC will look into the problem, but the NEAFC Secretariat should continue to explore solutions in the short term.

AGDC discussed new error codes for detecting duplicate reports (agenda item 6.3). It was agreed to send a revised version of the Russian proposal (AGDC-02-18 rev 1) to PECCOE to stress the need for these new error codes.

AGDC discussed possibilities for the cancellation of messages/reports (agenda item 6.4). A Russian proposal was tabled outlining how this can be done. It was simplified and amended in discussion in AGDC, was adopted and will be forwarded to PECCOE and STACTIC as AGDC-02-19 rev 1.

AGDC discussed a proposal from Iceland to amend Article 12 – daily catch (agenda item 6.5) to introduce generally daily catch reporting from fishing vessels. It was agreed that AGDC should report to PECCOE that the amendments of Article 12 listed in the Icelandic proposal was feasible and that the range for fishing days should start from zero.

AGDC discussed NEAFC/NAFO issues including the NAFO stewardship of the NAF format (agenda item 7.1). The aim is that the NAF website contains a unique NAF element list. There will also be a blog to discuss the elements between parties.
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1. Opening
The Chair, Ms Ellen Fasmer, Norway called the meeting to order on 13 May at 10 am in the meeting room at NEAFC HQ. She welcomed everybody. All Contracting Parties, some reporting parties and the NAFO Secretariat were present. The Chair reminded delegates that this was a group of technical experts and everybody could speak freely in his or her technical capacity. The participants presented themselves and the institutions they represented.

2. Appointment of rapporteur
The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
The Chair went through the agenda. The Chair informed that item 6 should be corrected to include STACTIC. The following new items should be added to the agenda:

4.2. Information on security management systems,
6.4 Cancellations of messages/reports,
6.5 Amendments of Article 12, daily catch
8.2 Information on the Fishbizz traceability project.

The representative of Denmark (Greenland) asked if it was appropriate to discuss the mandate of the AGDC. He would like NAFO to have a more permanent role in AGDC. The Chair suggested that this was taken up under a new point 8.3. A document with the current Terms of Reference will be distributed and the AGDC can comment and make proposals for amendments.

There were no further comments and the agenda was adopted as amended. The Chair noted the point has been made that the AGDC does not necessarily have to meet back to back with PECCOE. One meeting annually of two days could be a solution. Norway asked if the meetings could start earlier in the morning. This is for the Chair to decide and participants could be informed accordingly. The Chair informed that she wanted to close this meeting around 4 pm.

4. Data communication
4.1 Overall view of data transfer in 2010 (FMCs / Secretariat).
The representative of the NAFO Secretariat presented AGDC 2011-02-13. He noted that the percentage of errors was small. There had been an increase in 2010 because the reporting frequency was changed. Not all parties received return messages, and AGDC may encourage FMCs to become able to receive return messages. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) noted that Greenland was indicated as not able to receive return messages and that should be corrected. There were no further comments.
The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat presented AGDC 2011-02-08, messages stored in the NEAFC database. The EU had proposed having this available, giving information on messages and the errors created, rejections etc. The representative of the Russian Federation thought it would be very helpful to see what typical errors look like. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat had seen that NAFO had produced this and NEAFC would follow suit. The Norwegian representative informed that Norwegian vessels fishing for shrimps received first a Not Acknowledged (NAK) return message and then an Acknowledged (ACK) return message for the same report. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat said the problem is that shrimp is a non-regulated species and will receive a warning, but the information is stored. A warning is sent out by first sending a NAK return messages with the warning code and then an ACK to inform that the data is stored. He had tried to solve this with the provider.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat found that there was no standard to deal with error checking. This may be for the AGDC to look into. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat said there was no obligation under the Scheme to report shrimp to the NEAFC database. NAFO had not encountered problems when they started daily catch reporting on 1 January and received information about species not covered by the CET. The Chair understood the problem, but inspectors may be interested in having the full picture. The Norwegian representative pointed out that, with electronic logbooks, there may be a new situation.

The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat presented AGDC 2011-02-07 on implementation of the NEAFC Scheme. This should be seen in conjunction with AGDC 2011-02-09. The CFCA representative pointed out that there is confusion about who sends transhipment messages. He noted that there were no TRA from Belize. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat said that there should be a pair of transhipment messages from the donor and the receiving vessels. This was rarely the case and he would present an updated analysis of this problem next year.

4.2. Information security management system.

The Chair invited the Norwegian representative to present AGDC 2011-02-06. This document has been seen by both PECCOE and STACTIC. Norway had alerted FMCs earlier that their certificates were about to expire. It was agreed in 2005 that NEAFC should be a certification authority(CA). Today such systems have to be in line with ISO standards. Many parties are now looking for other ways to obtain certificates. The proposal is a more modern and up-to-date way to do things. There were two proposals.

Proposal 1: NEAFC shall no longer act as a Certificate authority. (CA). No NEAFC certificates will be renewed when expired.
Proposal 2: The Secretariats of NEAFC and NAFO are asked to evaluate their current procedures for data communication via HTTPS, especially the use of digital certificates to ascertain that the systems are in accordance with the common recognized standards.
and ‘best practice’ and to report to PECCOE and STACTIC before their Annual meetings in 2011.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat informed that STACTIC agreed with proposal two and wished to refer this to AGDC. The NAFO Secretariat had not been able to deal with an individual Contracting Party request. A protocol had to be followed before responding. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat had had the same problem with one FMC that had gone ahead and lost the link to NEAFC. The NEAFC Secretariat had suggested that this could not be accommodated without a decision by the Commission and that PECCOE and AGDC must be involved. It was not possible to accommodate individual requests on the spot and without consultation.

The Chair asked whether NEAFC should continue to be a certification authority. The representative of the Russian Federation supported the Norwegian proposal. The representative of Denmark asked if there was an alternative. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat noted that security had not been jeopardized by the action of individual parties. He also supported the stand NEAFC had taken. STACTIC had just ended its meeting and adopted a similar position to NEAFC, i.e. that changes should not be effected before STACTIC has a chance to look at it. If one FMC proposes a change that does not affect other FMCs, it should be accepted. If not, the issue has to be raised in the appropriate subsidiary bodies, probably STACTIC and PECCOE. This could be dealt with by electronic communication.

The EU Commission representative pointed out that revoking security certificates had to be dealt with immediately. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat was quick to reassure delegates that revocation of certificates was handled very efficiently by the client software created by Trackwell as part of the NEAFC VMS system. This method of handling revocation was chosen when the VMS was first designed when the market for commercial certificates was in its earliest stages. NEAFC, as a certification authority, has no Certificate Revocation List (CRL) for the NEAFC certificates. This different approach to handling revocation is the specific issue which makes the NEAFC system incompatible with the current standard that Norway would like to see introduced. Although the Secretariat agrees that this is a very good time to revaluate procedures, it should also be emphasised that the substance of this issue is one of standardisation and not security. The Chair thought that there should not be a problem to make changes if there is no fundamental difference. The EU Commission representative noted that many people responsible for security had to accept the rules of their organisation, not those of outside parties. The Chair noted that the ISO standard would help.

The Chair invited the representative of the NEAFC Secretariat to introduce AGDC 2011-02-10 and AGDC 2011-02-12. Appendix 1 of Annex IX is related to changes since 2005. The proposal in AGDC 2011-02-12 gives the possibility of correcting, clarifying and updating this Appendix in relation to confidentiality and security. The Chair suggested that the items above item 4 are a matter for PECCOE. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat explained that security questions had migrated out of the Scheme and we needed an umbrella recommendation to cover the new situation. The Chair pointed out
that this would probably be similar in NAFO. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat explained that both NAFO and NEAFC had to do something in 2005 when X.25 disappeared. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat explained that PECCOE has already asked for a text as a template for the umbrella recommendation. AGDC had to advise.

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat said that both organisations had to document what we have and what we need. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) thought it a good idea that the two Secretariats cooperate. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat thought that general principles should be in the Scheme with an umbrella recommendation on confidentiality.

The Icelandic representative raised the question of what is a technical matter and what is a management issue. The Chair responded that this group should concentrate on the technical parts. The EU Commission representative did not see it would be possible to separate security from the technology used. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat understood that. In the NAFO case it would have to be generic. He proposed that the Secretariats started to describe what we have and work from there. The Chair proposed that progress should be dealt with by AGDC intersessionally and results be reported to PECCOE before the October meeting. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) supported the idea that the Secretariats took the lead. This was agreed. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat felt that it would be possible for the Secretariats to produce texts for PECCOE and STACTIC to look at in September and October.

The Chair suggested that if nobody was against proposal 1 this should be reported to PECCOE. This was agreed.

With respect to proposal 2, there was support and the Secretariats have already started the process. AGDC will communicate electronically on texts developed so reports can be submitted to STACTIC and PECCOE later this year.

5. The implications for the Scheme of the use of electronic logbooks

This was discussed by PECCOE on 11 May based on the findings of AGDC in February 2011 summarised as follows (AGDC-02-03):

The Group has agreed on some issues and these are listed in the paper.

1. There is a common understanding that one of the implications for the Scheme is that the possibility for inspection authorities at sea has been weakened when inspecting vessels using electronic logbook in the RA. The reason is lack of access to official data from the logbook.
   a. Short term solution: To increase the frequency of CAT reports from weekly reports to daily reports.
   b. To define a template for a new report to be used in reporting daily of catch
and fishing effort from a certain date in the near future to be used by Contracting Parties using electronic logbook (to enter into production from June 2012).

c. Other reports should be modernized pointing more directly on the intended activity when active in the RA (to be used by Contracting Parties using electronic logbook from June 2012).

d. Articles relating to electronic logbook should be modernized (by PECCOE) to reflect the suggested changes in the Annexes.

e. There is a common understanding for modernization of the method for exchange of reports between Contracting Parties and secretary using xml, web service and NAF codes. The EU – NOR agreed method should be the basis for the proposal.

2. There is a common understanding that the methods for access to data for inspection authorities should be modernized. Methods were VMS and other reports are made available by logon to the secretary website or access to data by web service is considered to be a way forward. Such methods could be combined by pushing data using existing methods.

3. There is a common understanding that the introduction of electronic logbook calls for new error codes (RE).

4. There is a common understanding for the need of correcting reports and cancel reports. The method agreed upon by EU and Norway is regarded as a suitable method for handling cancellation and correction of reports.

Summing up the points, the AGDC found that one should try to use the existing EU-Norway electronic logbook system as a starting point for discussions on a new NEAFC system. This means that one should try to harmonize as much as possible so that the implementation of the new NEAFC system will be as easy as possible for as many Contracting Parties as possible.

AGDC will have to be prepared to take on tasks from PECCOE on new articles. AGDC cannot proceed until it has a response from PECCOE. The Chair noted that there was a need to map different elements. This was a job for Norway and the EU. She asked when this mapping would be available. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) expected that this mapping should involve other parties considering the use of electronic logbooks.

Norway and the EU agreed to do the mapping before the next meeting. It would probably be possible to circulate this document before 1 July. AGDC then has the summer to consider it and report by mid-September. NAFO suggested a video conference.

6. Documents referred by PECCOE and/or STACTIC for discussion
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6.1 PSC NEAFC and FAO
The Chair drew the attention of AGDC that 2011-02-05 from the AHWGPSC was for information. The alignment of the FAO and NEAFC PSC systems could lead to a lot of change. AGDC could not do anything before a final result was available for consideration. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat informed that this report was a final list of differences. The next step was to produce a version of the Scheme which would show the consequences of the differences.

6.2 Web based application for PSC electronic forms
The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat introduced AGDC 2011-02-14. This deals with necessary decisions that have to be made before the digitalised forms can enter into operation.

It had been decided that the first part of the system should be open, but persons validating will need individual passwords. The other problem is that the Secretariat will become the primary holder of the data. The Secretariat would like advice on how to create a secure backup to ensure business continuity.

The Chair asked if this could be covered by the general security and confidentiality considerations and the texts developed by the two Secretariats. It was agreed that testing could start. NEAFC needed some immediate advice and asked if a backup outside the NEAFC premises would be enough for a start. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat stated that this depends on a lot of factors. We should start with the ISO standard when evaluating a more permanent solution. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat informed about the present arrangement.

The Chair summarised that AGDC will look into the problem, but the NEAFC Secretariat should go on and find solutions in the short term. NAFO informed that they see themselves as the sole repository of VMS data.

6.3 New error codes for detecting duplicate reports
The Chair referred to the original Russian proposal calling for these error codes. She felt that the numbers proposed by the representative of the Russian Federation fitted well into the NEAFC system and that the NEAFC system needed this change. AGDC had not responded to STACTIC and PECCOE on this proposal last year. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) thought that this was straightforward. The Norwegian representative noted that the text for error code 155 was not correct. This will be corrected. There was also the question of whether changes should be made now or whether there should be an immediate alignment with the codes agreed between Norway and the EU. The EU Commission representative asked if it was not possible to use the EU-Norway codes at once. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) felt that we should keep the NEAFC system intact at present. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat agreed. The representative of the Russian Federation did not feel there was anything in principle against using the EU-Norway codes.
The Chair suggested that the Group accept sending the Russian proposal as outlined in AGDC 2011-02-18 rev 1 to PECCOE to stress the need for these new error codes. It was agreed.
6.4 Cancellation of messages/reports

The Chair referred to AGDC 2011-02-04 and AGDC 2011-02-19. AGDC-2011-02-04 had been sent to the Chair of PECCOE. There are no procedures in the current NAFO and NEAFC it-systems to address this. In the new EU-Norway system there are methods in use that have proved to be functional. The Russian proposal showed how this could be done in the existing NEAFC and NAFO systems. There was agreement last October on elements of the Russian proposal. The proposal is very simple. She asked whether agreement could be reached to accept the proposal in AGDC 2011-02-19. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat found that this was a start and should be agreed by the AGDC. The EU Commission representative asked why fields for a simple cancellation should be included. The Chair agreed that it was possible to reduce the number of fields. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat accepted that several irrelevant fields could be removed. The Secretariat produced a revised proposal based on the discussion. AGDC 2011-02-19 rev 1 was tabled.

The document was adopted and will be forwarded to PECCOE and STACTIC.

6.5 Amendment of Art 12 – daily catch

The Chair noted that AGDC 2011-02-20 had only been made available that morning. PECCOE had asked AGDC to look at an Icelandic proposal introducing daily catch reports generally. There was a question about keeping in and taking out a footnote. There was no indication in the proposal about deadlines for reporting catches. There was also the question on rounding procedures to nearest 100 kg and of how large amounts could be reported as MZZ; at present when reporting weekly one tonne is the maximum. Should that be the same when reporting daily? But these issues might be more for PECCOE to deal with.

The Chair urged delegates to compare the present system with an amended Icelandic proposal. She asked for comments.

The Norwegian representative reminded the meeting that the Icelandic representative in PECCOE had accepted that AGDC could freely revise their proposal and send it back to PECCOE. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat noted the move from weekly to daily catches, but AGDC should analyse whether this would create any problems with the present system. His feeling was that it would be no problem to handle this in the present system. The EU representative understood that this was about introducing daily catches in the present system. He asked if it was opportune to move to another system, which may involve investment for vessels. Is it worth investing in the present system rather than in the new one? The Icelandic representative informed that Iceland supported general daily reporting and wanted to move in that direction as soon as possible. The NAFO experience with introducing daily catches was that the present system was fully capable of handling this. This would probably be the same in NEAFC.

The Chair noted that in February AGDC had recommended that the Scheme should move towards daily catch reporting. This was what the Icelandic proposal followed up on. She
asked if the amended Icelandic proposal would cause any technical problems. The representative of the Russian Federation noted that the NEAFC COX report had to be brought in line with the NAFO COX. The Chair accepted the point, but it was not necessary to deal with it now. If there was a wish to harmonise completely, the Russian point had to be taken into account. The representative of Denmark (Faroes) supported the amended Icelandic proposal. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) thought that there should be the option for both 0 and 1 for fishing days and for the year 366 days. There seemed to be a discrepancy between the NAF definition and NEAFC NAFO definition of fishing days, days on ground and days fishing. Allowing zero is a technical problem, it defines a range 0 to 1. Under some special circumstance more than 1 day will have to be reported.

It was agreed that AGDC should report to PECCOE that the amended Icelandic proposal was feasible and that the range for fishing days should start from zero.

7. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)

7.1 NEAFC / NAFO issues

The representative of the NAFO Secretariat introduced AGDC 2011-02-15, 16 and 17 on the NAF database in a PowerPoint presentation. The aim was to create a unique NAF element data list. This is a list of the NAFO and NEAFC NAF list. The Norwegian list had not yet been analysed in full. The end product will be a full NAF format inventory, which can be analysed. He would like AGDC to give guidance on how this can be accommodated. It will take time to do this. We do not have an official list at present. He had created an AGDC share point to support discussion of these matters. It also contains a blog on data elements. He urged that people should become engaged in creating an official NAF list. He was hoping to create collaboration in the intersessional period. AGDC, as a technical body, has a responsibility to supply STACTIC and PECCOE with this list. He proposed that users would make presentations on updates at the next meeting of AGDC.

The Chair complimented the NAFO Secretariat on what it had accomplished. This was very much needed. She asked for comments. The representative of Denmark thanked the NAFO Secretariat. He proposed that the website should contain agreed formats messages, which could be sent to users. The Chair proposed that the passwords for the share point had to be changed. She asked if each Contracting Party should have a NAF person. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat considered this imperative.

The share point address is agdc.naf-format.org. For a test period the username agdc, password agdc can be used. There were no other comments.

7.2 Issues raised by other NAF users

No issues raised by other users.
8. Any other business

8.1 Possible use of video conferencing
This was raised at the last meeting. The NEAFC meeting room did not have this kind of equipment. NAFO uses CISCO software which has not caused problems and had used this facility at several meetings. The NAFO representative noted that it was difficult to manage with more than 10 participants and it is not expensive. The Secretariat is able to host such meetings. The sound and image quality is acceptable. Iceland had experience with this and saw the main problem was for the Chair to manage the meeting. They had bought an expensive system which in one year had had been paid by savings in travel costs.

The meeting took note of the information. One big advantage of using such equipment is that it could be easier for persons to participate in particular items on the agenda.

8.2 The FishBizz traceability project
AGDC 2011-02-11 gives information on a workshop on fish stocks traceability. The representative of the NEAFC Secretariat considered it important that fisheries experts participated in this kind of work. PECCOE had been informed in 2006 by an expert on traceability. The EU representative informed that there was a lot of interest in the EU to assist control and monitoring. One EU project “Fishpoptrace” (genetic traceability of fish populations) is about to be concluded now.

8.3 Terms of reference for AGDC
AGDC 2011-02-21 gives the present Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure. AGDC could make proposals as to whether there is a need to update these documents. The representative of Denmark (Greenland) felt that there was a need to give NAFO a more formal role and status in the AGDC. The representative of the NAFO Secretariat saw a difference between the Secretariat participating and Contracting Parties participating. The legal status of AGDC is only defined by a NEAFC document. This had to be looked into. One way would be to create a partnership like FIRMS. This would allow the involvement of other RFMOs and possibly FAO. NAFO supported a broadening of the scope. The NEAFC Secretariat will draft a paper for the consideration of AGDC describing the present situation and possible ways forward.

9. Report to the 2011 Annual Meeting
The drafting of the report will follow the usual procedure

10. Date and place of next meeting

This will take place at NEAFC HQ on Friday 7 October at 10.00
11. **Closure of the meeting**

The Chair closed the meeting at 4 pm and thanked everybody for a productive meeting, wishing everyone a safe trip home. She thanked the incumbent Secretary for his support to the Group.