

**Compilation of communications and information materials
regarding the North Atlantic Format (NAF)
for the intersessional CWP meeting in Madrid 14-15 February 2006**

INDEX

Kick-off email from Johanne Fischer CWP WG ON NAF (March 2005)	1
NAFO – Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Annex XXI: Data Exchange Format and Protocols	3
NEAFC Scheme, Annex VIII. Format for electronic exchange of fisheries monitoring, inspection and surveillance information	8
Email from CCAMLR regarding amendments to the present NAF (June 2005)	12
CCAMLR Catch and Effort Report	14
Invitation from NEAFC Advisory Group for Data Communication (AGDC) (February 2005)	16
Response by CWP to AGDC (April 2005)	18
AGDC Agenda 12 April 2005	19
AGDC Draft Report 12 April 2005	20
Recommendation by NAFO Scientific Council September 2005	23
Invitation from NEAFC AGDC (September 2005)	24
Response by CWP to AGDC (October 2005)	25
AGDC Report 13 October 2005	26

Johanne Fischer

From: Hans Lassen [hans@ices.dk]
Sent: March 31, 2005 10:12 AM
To: Wongsanga, Pouchamarn (SEAFDEC); Allison, Cherry (IWC); Johanne Fischer; Tissa Amaratunga; Cross, David; Hinton, Michael (IATTC); NASCO; Anganuzzi, Alejandro (IOTC); Kebe, Papa (ICCAT); Kennedy, Bob (CCSBT); Hans Lassen; Lawson, Tim (SPC); Ramm, David (CCAMLR); Schmidt, Carl-Christian (OECD)
Cc: Bolster, Lynda (FIDI); FI-Registry; lena.westlund@swipnet.se; DeGraaf, Gertjan (FIPD); Garibaldi, Luca (FIDI); Vannuccini, Stefania (FIDI); Lowther, Alan (FIDI); Taconet, Marc (FIDI)
Subject: FW: CWP inter-sessional Working Group on the North Atlantic Format
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red
Attachments: NAF-NEAFC.pdf; NAF-NAFO.pdf

Dear colleagues,

To kick off the CWP inter-sessional Working Group on the North Atlantic Format for Electronic Exchange of Fisheries Monitoring Information (NAF) as agreed during the last CWP Meeting in Copenhagen I circulate two versions of the NAF:

- The NAFO-NAF included in the Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Annex XXIII.c. I also include a link to the html version on the NAFO website: <http://www.nafo.int/activities/Fisheries/CEM/annex23.html>
- The NEAFC-NAF from the Scheme of control and Enforcement, Annex VIII (<http://www.neafc.org/measures/docs/Scheme-2005.pdf>)

The versions deviate slightly reflecting different requirements in each of these North Atlantic RFMOs. However, for our discussion we should look at both of them combined. NAFO FC Doc 04/8 clarifies that "the purpose of this Annex is to explain the structure of the data exchange format and to list or make reference to agreed communication protocols. Show template for Return messages (RET) with its error codes and list all data elements from the North Atlantic Format which are used in reports and messages in the NAFO Regulatory Area with explanation on the content and size of each".

The CWP Working Group was asked to propose possible amendments to the present NAF that would ensure its usefulness for assessment and scientific purposes. The results will be made available to the NEAFC Advisory Working Group and discussed in CWP-22. Following our mandate, I propose that we concentrate on those entries that contribute to a determination of

- fishing effort (e.g. vessel and gear details, trip length, no of hauls, etc),
- fishing location (coordinates and qualifiers, e.g. depth, bottom type, etc.)
- catch composition and quantities,
- discards,
- and any additional information that might be considered useful for bio-ecological purposes.

I think it doesn't hurt if we compile a wish list of all types of information from fishing vessels that fishery scientists might find useful for their work and let not get in our way right now a perception of what is realistic and what is not (e.g. bottom type). Some of the entries we might come up with may be difficult or impossible to obtain from the master of a fishing vessel. However, we should not forget that observers on board can often perform additional work and will also use the NAF on the on-board computers for their reports. This is reflected in the NAFO table under the heading "Pilot Project" (referring to the "Pilot Project on Observers, Satellite Tracking and Electronic Reporting", see NAFO CEM Chapter VII). Also, the NAF is intended as a "complete" table of possible entries that will not be all obligatory in all fishing areas.

The Advisory Group for Data Communications (AGDC) will meet in Iceland in 2 weeks. I will write to the Chair of this group and to the NEAFC Executive Secretary to inform them of the CWP commitment to look into the North Atlantic Format inter-sessionally and at its next meeting. Probably, it will be too early for any results from our group for the first AGDC meeting but I understand that the AGDC will continuously work over the next years. Also, NEAFC and NAFO are developing a NAF website that might be an appropriate forum to communicate the results from the CWP discussions.

Best regards, Johanne

<<NAF-NEAFC.pdf>>

<<NAF-NAFO.pdf>>

Dr. Johanne Fischer

Executive Secretary

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization www.nafo.int

Tel: (+1-902) 468 6582

Fax: (+1-902) 468 5538

Email: jfischer@nafo.int

NAFO, P.O. Box 638

Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9

Annex XXII
Data Exchange Format and Protocols

A. Data transmission format

Each data transmission is structured as follows:

1. Data characters in accordance with ISO 8859.1
2. Each data transmission is structured as follows:
 - double slash (“//”) and the characters “SR” indicate the start of a message;
 - a double slash (“//”) and field code indicate the start of a data element;
 - a single slash (“/”) separates the field code and the data;
 - pairs of data are separated by space;
 - the characters “ER” and a double slash (“//”) at the end indicates the end of a record.

B. Data exchange protocols

Authorised data exchange protocols for electronic transmission of reports and messages between Contracting Parties and the Secretary shall be in accordance with Annex XIX, Rules on Confidentiality.

NAFO

C. Format for electronic exchange of fisheries monitoring information (The North Atlantic Format)

Category	Data Element	Field code	Type	Contents	Definitions
System	Start Record	SR			Indicates start of the record
Details	End Record	ER			Indicates end of the record
	Return Status	RS	Char*3	Codes	ACK / NAK = Acknowledged / Not Acknowledged
	Return Error Number	RE	Num*3	001 – 999	Codes indicating errors as received at operation centre, see Annex XXII D2
Message	Address destination	AD	Char*3	ISO-3166 Address	Address of the party receiving the message, “XNW” for NAFO
Details	From	FR	Char*3	ISO-3166 Address	Address of the transmitting party, (Contracting Party)
	Type of Message	TM	Char*3	Code	Code for the message type as
	Sequence Number	SQ	Num*6	NNNNNN	Message serial number
	Record Number	RN	Num*6	NNNNNN	Serial number of the record in the relevant year
	Record Date	RD	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Year, month and date
	Record Time	RT	Num*4	HHMM	Hours and minutes in UTC
	Date	DA	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Year, month and date
	Time	TI	Num*4	HHMM	Hours and minutes in UTC
Vessel	Radio Call Sign	RC	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the vessel
Registration	Vessel name	NA	Char*30		Name of the vessel
Details	Ext. registration	XR	Char*14		Side Number of the vessel
	Flag State	FS	Char*3	ISO-3166	State of registration
	Contracting Party internal ref. number	IR	Char*3 Num*9	ISO-3166 +max. 9N	Unique vessel number attributed by the flag State pursuant to registration
	Port Name	PO	Char*20		Port of registration of the vessel/homeport
	Vessel Owner	VO	Char*60		Name and address of the vessel owner
	Vessel Charterer	VC	Char*60		Name and address of the vessel charterer
Vessel Character. Details	Vessel capacity unit	VT	Char*2 Num*4	“OC”/“LC” Tonnage	According to: “OC” OSLO 1947 Convention /“LC” LONDON ICTM-69 Capacity of the vessel in metric tons
	Vessel Power unit	VP	Char*2 Num*5	0-99999	Indication of which measurement unit applies "HP" or "KW" Total main engine power
	Vessel Length	VL	Char*2 Num*3	“OA”/“PP” Length in meters	Unit “OA” length overall, “PP” length between perpendiculars Total length of the vessel in meters, rounded to the nearest whole meter
	Vessel Type	TP	Char*3	Code	As listed in Annex V.A.
	Fishing Gear	GE	Char*3	FAO Code	International Standard Statistical Classification of the Fishing Gear as Annex VI
	Limited Authorization	LU	Char*3	Yes or No	Yes or No to indicate whether a limited authorization is valid or not

NAFO

Category	Data Element	Field code	Type	Contents	Definitions	
Activity Details	Latitude	LA	Char*5	NDDMM (WGS-84)	e.g. //LA/N6235 = 62°35' North	
	Longitude	LO	Char*6	E/WDDMM (WGS-84)	e.g. //LO/W02134 = 21°34' West	
	Latitude (decimal)	LT	Char*7	+/-DD.ddd	Value negative if latitude is in the southern hemisphere ¹ (WGS84)	
	Longitude (decimal)	LG	Char*8	+/-DDD.ddd	Value negative if longitude is in the western hemisphere ¹ (WGS84)	
	Trip Number	TN	Num*3	001-999	Number of the fishing trip in current year	
	Catch	Species	CA	Char*3	FAO species code	The cumulative catch retained on board by species, in kilogram live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg since the vessel entered the R.A. or since the last CAX report if such a report is sent, in pairs as needed.
		Quantity		Num*7	0-9999999	
	Quantity onboard	Species	OB	Char*3	FAO species Codes	Quantity onboard the vessel by species in kilograms live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg, in pairs as needed
		Quantity		Num*7	0-9999999	
	Transferred species	Species	KG	Char*3	FAO species Codes	Information concerning the quantities transferred between vessels by species in kilograms live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg. whilst operating in the R.A.
Quantity		Num*7		0-9999999		
Relevant Area		RA	Char*6	ICES/NAFO Codes	Code for the relevant fishing area	
Directed Species		DS	Char*3	FAO species codes	Code for the species the vessel is targeting. Allow for several species, separated by a space. E.g. //DS/species species species//	
Transhipped From		TF	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the donor vessel	
Transhipped To		TT	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the receiving vessel	
Master Name		MA	Char*30		Name of the vessels master	
Pilot Project	Apparent Infringement	AF	Char*1	Y or N	For onboard observer to report his observations	
	Discard		RJ	Char*3	FAO Species Code	Detailed information regarding discard in kilograms live weight, in pairs as needed.
				Num*7	0 - 9999999	
	Undersize		US	Char*3	FAO Species Code	Detailed information regarding undersize catch in kilograms live weight, in pairs as needed.
				Num*7	0 - 9999999	
	Daily Catch	Species	CA	Char*3	FAO species code	The cumulative catch retained on board by species, in kilogram live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg since the vessel entered the R.A. or since the last CAX report if such a report has been sent, in pairs as needed.
		Quantity		Num*7	0-9999999	
	Mesh Size		ME	Num*3	0 – 999	Average mesh size in millimetres
	Production		PR	Char*3	Code	Code for the production Annex XX(c)
	Log Book		LB	Char*1	Y or N	For onboard observer to approve the entries in the vessels log book
Hails		HA	Char*1	Y or N	For onboard observer to approve the hails sent from the vessel	
Observer Name		ON	Char*30	Text	Name of the onboard observer	
Free Text		MS	Char*255	Text	Activity detail; for further comments by observer	

¹ The plus sign (+) does not need to be transmitted; leading zeros can be omitted.

D. 1) Structure of reports and messages as laid down in Annex IX and Annex X when forwarded by Contracting Parties to the Secretary.

Where appropriate, each Contracting Party shall retransmit to the Secretary reports and messages received from its vessels in accordance with Articles 22 and 23; subject to the following amendments:

- the address (AD) shall be replaced by the address of the Secretary (XNW)
- the data elements “record date” (RD), “record time” (RT), “record number” (RN) and “from” (FR) shall be inserted.

D. 2) Return messages.

If a Contracting Party so requests, the Secretary shall send a return message every time an electronic transmission of a report or message is received.

A) Return message format:

Data Element	Field Code	Mandatory/Optional	Remarks
Start Record	SR	M	System detail; indicates start of record
Address	AD	M	Message detail; destination, Contracting Party sending the report
From	FR	M	Message detail; XNW is NAFO (who is sending the return message)
Type of message	TM	M	Message detail; message type RET for return message
Radio call sign	RC	O	Reporting detail; international radio call sign of the vessel, copied from the report which is received.
Sequence number	SQ	O	Reporting detail; serial number of the report from the vessel in the relevant year, copied from the report which is received.
Return Status	RS	M	Reporting detail; code showing whether the message is acknowledged or not (ACK or NAK)
Return error number	RE	O	Reporting detail; number showing the type of error. See table B) for return error numbers.
Record number	RN	M	Reporting detail; record number of the message which is received
Date	DA	M	Message detail; date of transmission
Time	TI	M	Message detail; time of transmission
End of Record	ER	M	System detail; indicates end of the record

B) Return error numbers

Subject/Article:	Errors		Error Cause
	Follow up action required	Accepted	
Communication	101		Message is unreadable
	102		Data value or size out of range
	104		Mandatory data missing
	106		Unauthorized data source
		150	Sequence error
		151	Date / Time in the future
Article 16		250	Attempt to re-Notify a vessel
		251	Vessel is not Notified
Article 23	302		Transshipment prior to Catch on Entry
	303		Catch on Exit prior to Catch on Entry
	304		No position received (TRA, COX)
		350	Position without Catch on Entry

NAFO

E. Types of reports and messages

Annex	Provisions	Code	Message / Report	Remarks
IV. A	Article 16	NOT	Notification	Notification of authorised fishing vessels
IX	Article 22(1)	ENT POS EXI MAN	Entry Position Exit Manual position	VMS messages
	Article 22 (5)			Reports transmitted by fishing vessels with a defective satellite tracking device to the Contracting Party
X	Article 23 (1a)	COE	Catch on Entry	Report transmitted by fishing vessels, prior to entering the R.A.
	Article 23 (1c)	TRA	Transshipment	Report on quantities on-loaded or off-loaded in the R.A.,
	Article 23 (1c)	POR	Port of Landing	Report on catch onboard and weight to be landed
	Article 23 (1b)	COX	Catch on Exit	Report transmitted by fishing vessels, prior to leaving the R.A.
	Article 22 (1) Article 23 (2)	RET	Return	Automatic electronic message pursuant to reception of records
XX (a)	1	CAX	Catch	Daily Catch report in Pilot Project
	2	OBR	Observer	Daily Observer report in Pilot Project

NEAFC

Annex VIII

C.1 Format for electronic exchange of fisheries monitoring, inspection and surveillance information

Category	Data Element	Field code	Type	Contents	Definitions
System	Start Record	SR			Indicates start of the record
Details	End Record	ER			Indicates end of the record
	Return Status	RS	Char*3	Codes	ACK / NAK = Acknowledged / Not Acknowledged
	Return Error Number	RE	Num*3	001 – 999	Codes indicating errors as received at operation centre, see Annex VIII D2
Message	Address destination	AD	Char*3	ISO-3166 Address	Address of the party receiving the message, “XNE” for NEAFC
Details	From	FR	Char*3	ISO-3166 Address	Address of the transmitting party, (Contracting Party)
	Type of Message	TM	Char*3	Code	First three letters of the message type as in Annex VIII E
	Sequence Number	SQ	Num*6	NNNNNN	Message serial number
	Record Number	RN	Num*6	NNNNNN	Serial number of the record in the relevant year
	Record Date	RD	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Year, month and date
	Record Time	RT	Num*4	HHMM	Hours and minutes in UTC
	Date	DA	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Year, month and date
	Time	TI	Num*4	HHMM	Hours and minutes in UTC
Vessel	Radio Call Sign	RC	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the vessel
Registration	Vessel name	NA	Char*30		Name of the vessel
Details	Ext. registration	XR	Char*14		Side Number of the vessel
	Flag State	FS	Char*3	ISO-3166	State of registration
	Contracting Party internal reference number	IR	Char*3 Num*9	ISO-3166 +max. 9N	Unique vessel number attributed by the flag State pursuant to registration
	Port Name	PO	Char*20		Port of registration of the vessel
	Vessel Owner	VO	Char*60		Name and address of the vessel owner
	Vessel Charterer	VC	Char*60		Name and address of the vessel charterer
Vessel	Vessel capacity unit	VT	Char*2 Num*4	“OC”/“LC” Tonnage	According to:“OC” OSLO 1947 Convention /“LC” LONDON ICTM-69 Capacity of the vessel in metric tons
Character.	Vessel Power unit	VP	Char*2 Num*5	0-99999	Indication of which measurement unit applies "HP" or "KW" Total main engine power
Details	Vessel Length	VL	Char*2 Num*3	“OA”/“PP” Length in meters	Unit “OA” length overall, “PP” length between perpendiculars Total length of the vessel in meters, rounded to the nearest whole meter
	Vessel Type	TP	Char*3	Code	As listed in Attachment IV A
	Fishing Gear	GE	Char*3	FAO Code	International Standard Statistical Classification of the Fishing Gear as (Attachment I)
Licence	Date of issuing	IS	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Date of Authorisation to fish for one or more regulated species
Details	Regulated Resources	RR	Char*3	FAO Species Code	FAO Species Code for the regulated resource
	Start Date	SD	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Date on which the validity of the authorisation/suspension commences

NEAFC

	End Date	ED	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Expiry date of the validity of the authorisation to fish for the regulated resource
--	----------	----	-------	----------	---

NEAFC

Category	Data Element	Field code	Type	Contents	Definitions
	Limited Authorisation	LU	Char*1		“Y” or “N” to indicate whether a limited authorisation is valid or not
	Relevant Area	RA	Char*6	ICES Code	Area(s) prohibited
	<u>Species Name</u>	<u>SN</u>	Char*3	FAO Species Code	Prohibited species
Activity Details	Latitude	LA	Char*5	NDDMM *WGS-84)	e.g. //LA/N6235 = 62°35' North
	Longitude	LO	Char*6	E/WDDMM (WGS-84)	e.g. //LO/W02134 = 21°34' West
	Latitude (decimal)	LT	Char*7	+/-DD.ddd ¹	Value negative if latitude is in the southern hemisphere ¹ (WGS84)
	Longitude (decimal)	LG	Char*8	+/-DDD.ddd ¹	Value negative if longitude is in the western hemisphere ¹ (WGS84)
	Trip Number	TN	Num*3	001-999	Number of the fishing trip in current year
	Days Fished	DF	Num*3	1 – 365	Number of days the vessel spent in the Regulatory Area during the trip
	Predicted Date	PD	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Estimated date UTC for future event
	Predicted Time	PT	Num*4	HHMM	Estimated time UTC for future event
	Weekly catch Species Quantity	CA	Char*3 Num*7	FAO species code 0-9999999	The cumulative catch retained on board by species, in kilogram live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg since the vessel entered the R.A. or, in the event a previous has been transmitted during the same trip, since the last “Catch” report, in pairs as needed.
	Quantity onboard Species Quantity	OB	Char*3 Num*7	FAO Codes 0-9999999	Quantity onboard the vessel by species in kilograms live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg, in pairs as needed
	Transferred species Species Quantity	KG	Char*3 Num*7	FAO Codes in pairs 0-9999999	Information concerning the quantities transferred between vessels by species in kilograms live weight rounded to the nearest 100 Kg. whilst operating in the R.A.
	Transhipped From	TF	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the donor vessel
	Transhipped To	TT	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the receiving vessel
	Coastal state	CS	Char*3	ISO-3166	Coastal state
	Port Name	PO	Char*20		Name of the actual port
Reporting Details	Catch Species Quantity	CA	Char*3 Num*6	FAO species code 0-9999999	Aggregate catch, landed or transhipped, taken by fishing vessels of the Contracting Party, by species as listed in tonnes live weight, rounded to tonnes, in pairs as needed
	Cumulative catch Species Quantity	CC	Char*3 Num*6	FAO species code 0-9999999	Cumulative aggregate catch, landed or transhipped, taken by fishing vessels of the Contracting Party, by species as listed in tonnes live weight, rounded to tonnes, in pairs as needed
	Relevant Area	RA	Char*6	ICES/NAFO Codes	Code for the relevant fishing area
	Zone	ZO	Char*3	ISO-3166	The code for a Contracting Party’s zone
	Year and month	YM	Num*6	YYYYMM	The relevant year and month of reporting

NEAFC

Category	Data Element	Field code	Type	Contents	Definitions
Surveillance / Observed details	Latitude	LA	Char*5	NDDMM (WGS-84)	e.g. //LA/N6535 = 65°35' North
	Longitude	LO	Char*6	E/WDDMM (WGS-84)	e.g. //LO/W02134 = 21°34' West
	Speed	SP	Num*3	Knots * 10	e.g. //SP/105 = 10,5 knots
	Course	CO	Num*3	360° degree scale	e.g. //CO/270 = 270°
	Activity	AC	Char*3	Activity code	First 3 characters of the activity, see Attachment IV B
	Means of Surveillance	MI	Char*3	NEAFC Code	“VES” = surface vessel, “AIR” = fixed wing aircraft, “HEL” helicopter
	Assigned Inspector CP ID	AI	Char*7	NEAFC Code	ISO-3160 code for the Contracting Party followed by 4 digit number repeated as needed
	Observation Ser. No.	OS	Num*3	0 - 999	Serial number of the observation during relevant patrol in the Regulatory Area
	Date of sighting	DA	Num*8	YYYYMMDD	Date when the vessel is sighted
	Time of sighting	TI	Num*4	HHMM	Time in UTC when the vessel is sighted
	Object Identification	OI	Char*7	IRCS Code	International Radio Call Sign of the sighted vessel
	Photography	PH	Char*1		Was there a photography taken, “Y” or “N”
	Free Text string	MS	Char*255		Free text area
	Radio call sign	IV	Char*7	IRCS Code	International radio call sign
	Inspection requirement	RQ			Prepare for inspection latitude and longitude ETA

¹ - The plus sign (+) does not need to be transmitted; leading zeros can be omitted.

Johanne Fischer

From: David Ramm [david@ccamlr.org]
Sent: June 10, 2005 1:01 AM
To: Johanne Fischer
Cc: Richard.Grainger@fao.org
Subject: ref 8.5.2 - amendments to the present NAF
Attachments: CCAMLR eform TACv2005 ASCII.xls

Dear Johanne

Thank you for initiating the working group's development of amendments to the present NAF that would ensure its usefulness for assessment and scientific purposes.

CCAMLR took account of the NAF format when we considered the standards for VMS position reports to be submitted to our Centralised VMS (C-VMS). The adopted CCAMLR format for VMS position reports is largely based on the NAF format but has some differences.

At the time of adopting the C-VMS, CCAMLR considered the potential use of the NAF format for integrating catch and effort reports with VMS position reports. However this idea has not been developed in the context of CCAMLR and has not been included, to date, as part of the C-VMS.

However, as we discussed at CWP, the CCAMLR Secretariat has developed a 'NAF-like' format for the submission of fishery catch and effort reports. These reports, which are required under our Conservation Measures in Force, are submitted to the Secretariat every 5-day, 10-day or month, depending on the fishery. We have used various formats for these reports over the years. At present, most Members use an electronic form in Excel format. However, increasingly, the catch and effort reports are submitted directly from the vessels. Therefore, the NAF-like format which we developed last year provides a more compact, and possibly easier to use, format than the excel format. A number of vessels have provided catch and effort reports in the NAF-like format during the current 2004/05 fishing season.

I have attached a brief description of the new NAF-like format for our catch and effort reports. The format is based on a standard NAF positional report (e.g. as used to communicate VMS data). However, we have extended the data sentences and codes to include the catch and effort information required in CCAMLR's catch and effort reports. This information includes:

Effort

- Reporting period
- Type of fishing
- Management area fished
- Intended activity during the next reporting period

Catch

- Catch for all species taken, including by-catch and species caught incidentally
- total weight and number of individuals caught
- condition of species caught incidentally (i.e. whether alive, dead or injured, as defined by CCAMLR)

At this stage, CCAMLR has no intention to integrate the submission of VMS data and the catch and effort reports. Such

integration would require additional and substantial consideration of various important aspects in addition to the processing of catch and effort data by the Fishing Monitoring Centres and at-sea use of the VMS equipment. In both cases, any potential interference arising from the manual input used to transmit catch, effort and biological data with the automated generation and transmission of VMS position reports would be of substantial concern. This is because the transmission of VMS data is required to be automated and tamper-proof.

We look forward to further ideas and discussion.

Best wishes – David

<<CCAMLR eform TACv2005 ASCII.xls>>

CCAMLR

From: CCAMLR Explorer
Sent: Saturday, 11 September 2004 16:03
To: data@ccamlr.org
Subject: 5-day catch and effort report for period September B

Please find attached the report from the CCAMLR Explorer covering period September B.

SR/XYZ/CCAMLR Explorer/ABCD1/5/060904/C/TOT/5841/A/5/LLS/22/54800/fishing/SC/TOP/2256/280/SRX//15/GRV/23/2/SI/DIC/2/1/PRO//1/ SO/new format/ER

Complete a separate report for each target species, SSRU or MA, type of fishing or fishing gear. A report must be completed even if no fishing took place.

Guidelines for Completing the Catch and Effort Report - ASCII formatv2005			
Field	Definition	Value to Enter	Data in example
Start of report	Start of catch and effort report, in accordance with Conservation Measures 23-01 (5-day), 23-02 (10-day) and 23-03 (monthly).	SR	SR
(1) Vessel Information			
Vessel flag	Flag State of vessel for which data are reported.	3-alpha code	XYZ
Vessel name	Registered name of the vessel for which data are reported.	text	CCAMLR Explorer
Vessel call sign	International radio call sign of the vessel for which data are reported.	text	ABCD1
(2) Reporting Details			
Reporting period	Period for which catch and effort data are summarised as defined by conservation measures in force: (5) -day, (10) -day, (m) onthly.	alphanumeric	5
Start date	Start date of the reporting period: 5 day reporting periods - A (01), B (06), C (11), D (16), E (21), F (26). 10 day reporting periods - A (01), B (11), C (21). Month reporting period - A (01).	ddmmyy	060904
Type of fishing	Main activity undertaken during the reporting period: Commercial fishing, Research, Not fishing.	1-alpha code	C
Target species	Species targetted during the reporting period, use CCAMLR codes e.g. TOT, ANI, KRI, KCX.	3-alpha code	TOT
ASD	Area, Subarea or Division where fishing took place during the reporting period, use CCAMLR codes e.g. 483, 486, 5843b, 881.	alphanumeric	5841
SSRU or MA	CCAMLR code for Small-Scale Research Unit or Management Area where fishing occurred during the reporting period, as defined by conservation measures in force.	1-alpha code	A
(3) Fishing Effort			
Days fished	Total number of days fished during the reporting period.	number	5

CCAMLR

Guidelines for Completing the Catch and Effort Report - ASCII formatv2005			
Field	Definition	Value to Enter	Data in example
Fishing gear	Type of fishing gear used during the period for which data are reported e.g. LLS, FPO, OTB, OTM.	alphanumeric	LLS
Number of sets	Total number of lines, trawls or drifts set during the reporting period.	number	22
Number of hooks or pots set	Total number of hooks (longline fisheries) or pots (pot fisheries) set during the reporting period.	number	54800
Intention	Intended activity during next reporting period (e.g. fishing, entry into area, movement, exit area).	text	fishing
(4) Catch Data			
	Start of the section for Catch Data	SC	SC
Species	The identity of the species, or species group, caught during the reporting period, use CCAMLR codes.	3-alpha code	TOP
Whole weight (kg)	The total live (unprocessed) weight of the individuals of the species caught during the reporting period, reported in kilograms.	Weight (kg)	2256
Number	The total number of individuals of the species caught, including individuals landed and retained, landed and discarded, cut off line, shaken off line, lost at the surface.	number	280
<i>Repeat as required - ALL species caught, including by-catch must be reported.</i>		.../SRX//15/GRV/23/2	
(5) Incidental Catch			
	Start of the section for Incidental Mortality Arising from Fishing	SI	SI
Species	The identity of the species, or species group, caught incidentally during the reporting period, use CCAMLR codes.	3-alpha code	DIC
Alive	The total number of individuals of the species caught alive and released uninjured.	number	2
Dead or injured	The total number of individuals of the species caught dead or injured, including individuals dead not landed on board, dead landed on board or alive landed on board injured.	number	1
<i>Repeat as required - ALL incidental catch must be reported.</i>		.../PRO//1	
(6) Other Information			
	Start of section for Other Information	SO	SO
Comments	Provide comments as required	text	new format
End of report	End of report	ER	ER



NORTH EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

22 Berners Street London UK W1T 3DY

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7631 0016

Fax: +44(0) 20 7636 9225

info@neaftc.org /www.neaftc.org

10 February 2005

To:

NAFO
CCAMLR
SEAFO

THE NEAFC COMMISSION ESTABLISHES AN ADVISORY GROUP FOR DATA COMMUNICATION

I am writing to notify you of one of the recommendations adopted at NEAFC's 23rd Annual Meeting. The following excerpt from the Report of the 23rd Annual Meeting explains the background:

"It is recommended that, in accordance with Article 3(8), the Commission establishes an Advisory Group for Data Communication and, in accordance with Article 14(3) of the NEAFC Convention, the Commission shall develop working arrangements with the Northwest-Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (NAFO) and other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) in the field of data communications.

The Chairman of PECCOE noted there has been harmonisation of the NAF; NAFO in particular had brought their formats more in line with those used in NEAFC and had discussed this matter this year. PECCOE felt the best way forward was for NEAFC to establish this Group. It would probably, to a large extent, work via e-mail or other forms of communication to be able to act fast and would supersede the Ad Hoc Group on Computerisation.

The Norwegian representative supported the proposal and considered the idea excellent. He informed the meeting that CCAMLR already uses NAF and that CCAMLR should be approached. He suggested that Iceland chaired this Group. The Icelandic representative responded that he would propose Commander Gylfi Geirsson as Chairman."

This recommendation became binding on all NEAFC's Contracting Parties on 11 January 2005.



NORTH EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

22 Berners Street London UK W1T 3DY

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7631 0016

Fax: +44(0) 20 7636 9225

info@neafc.org /www.neafc.org

A short meeting to establish contacts and set up the Group in Reykjavík has been called on 12 April 2005, in conjunction with the meetings of NEAFC's Permanent Committee Control and Enforcement (PECCOE) and NAFO's Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) and we would be very pleased if you or a representative could attend.

Kjartan Hoydal
Secretary

Cc Gylfi Geirsson, Iceland (Chair of the Advisory Group on Data Communication)
Martin Newman, EU (Chair of PECCOE)
Mads Nedergaard (Chair of STACTIC)

Circulated to FAO and RFMBs for information



Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization

P. O. Box 638 • Dartmouth • Nova Scotia • B2Y 3Y9 • Canada
Telephone (+1-902) 468-5590 • Fax (+1-902) 468-5538
Email: info@rafo.int • Website: www.nafo.int

Our reference: M/05-2

5 April 2005

To Mr. Gylfi Geirsson
Chair of the Advisory Group on Data Communication

Re: CWP response to the letter received from NEAFC on the Advisory Group for Data Communications


Dear Gylfi,

The Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) appreciates to have been informed about the establishment of the NEAFC Advisory Group for Data Communications. At the last CWP meeting 1-4 March 2005 in Copenhagen the North Atlantic Format (NAF) was discussed in conjunction with the Report of the FAO Expert Consultation on Data Formats and Procedures for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (October 2004). This report states that “the Consultation considered whether or not the design, concepts and codes used in the NAF could be adopted as an international standard for VMS position, catch and activity reporting, and it was agreed that the suitability of the NAF for such purposes be brought to the attention of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP)”.

In its report CWP acknowledged the first initial meeting of the NEAFC Advisory Group for Data Communications in Reykjavik, Iceland, in April 2005 and encouraged its members to participate in the process of developing NAF noting that in addition to NEAFC, NAFO and CCAMLR are already being actively involved. CWP noted that the NAF is not yet fully developed and that therefore CWP was not in a position to review and possibly recommend NAF as a standard. However, it was agreed that an inter-sessional electronic working group consisting of all CWP members be set up and I was asked to coordinate it. The working group was asked to propose possible amendments to the present NAF that would ensure its usefulness for assessment and scientific purposes. The results will be made available to the NEAFC Advisory Group and discussed in CWP-22.

The inter-sessional CWP discussion on the NAF was started 31 March 2005 but I do not expect a substantial contribution in time for the first Advisory Group meeting. However, you will be informed of any results from our discussions in a timely manner. I also hope that the NAF website (soon to be finalized by NEAFC with input from NAFO) will be a useful tool for all interested parties to keep up with the latest developments.

For your information I attach the last CWP report and the Report of the FAO Expert Consultation on Data Formats and Procedures for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance.


Dr. Johanne Fischer
NAFO Executive Secretary

cc. Kjartan Hoydal (Executive Secretary NEAFC)
CWP members



N E A F C

ADVISORY GROUP FOR DATA COMMUNICATION

12 April 2005 – Grand Hotel, Reykjavík

Proposed draft Agenda

1. Opening
2. Election of Vice Chair
3. Appointment of the rapporteur
4. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
5. Rules of procedures
6. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)
7. Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO.
8. Any other business
9. Date and place of the next meeting
10. Closure of the meeting

NORTH EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE ADVISORY GROUP FOR DATA COMMUNICATIONS

12 April 2005

Grand Hotel Reykjavík, Iceland

1. Opening

The Secretary called the first meeting of the Advisory Group for Data Communications to order at 10:30 am at the Grand Hotel Reykjavík, Iceland. He welcomed representatives from all Contracting Parties, except Poland, and from DFO, Canada and the NAFO Secretariat to the inaugural meeting of this Group. He informed the meeting that Commander Gylfi Geirsson, Iceland had been proposed as Chairman of the Group and asked if there were other proposals. There were none and Commander Gylfi Geirsson was elected Chairman by consensus. The Chairman welcomed representatives to Iceland and he also used the opportunity to thank the outgoing Chairman of the now disbanded Ad Hoc Working Group on Computerisation, Jacques Verborgh of the EU.

No opening statements were made.

2. Election of Vice Chair

The EU representative proposed Mr Fergal Nolan of the EU as Vice Chair. There was no other proposal, so Mr. Nolan was elected Vice Chair by consensus.

3. Appointment of rapporteur;

The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

4. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The EU representative indicated that they would like to raise some issues under any other business. The Secretariat stated that it would like to take the opportunity to make a presentation of the new NAF website. The agenda was adopted without further comment.

5. Rules of Procedure

The Chairman asked if there were any suggestions for Rules of Procedure. The EU representative indicated that there was a need for rules on participation, decision making, the length of chairmanships, etc. The Icelandic representative agreed that Rules were necessary and referred to the Terms of Reference. He felt they should be flexible because this was a technical group, political decisions were taken elsewhere. The Chairman proposed that Rules be drafted and circulated for comments in time for the meeting in October.

6. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)

The Chairman informed the meeting that he had received a letter from the Vice Chair of the FAO body, the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics, CWP with respect to the NAF format. (Appendix 1). The Norwegian representative proposed that the contents and the management of the website should be discussed and also the ways in which the Group should communicate and solve problems. The EU representative agreed and indicated that its Member States, which had the practical experience, had to be involved. A list of contacts – e-mail addresses – should be established. The Chairman agreed and proposed that Contracting Parties submit points of contact to the Secretariat. He then asked the Secretariat to present the new NAF website. This was done and the Secretariat also outlined procedures for proposing and accepting new data elements.

The Chairman invited Contracting Parties to comment and come up with new ideas on how to make the website as useful as possible. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) acknowledged that the website was a start in establishing a NAF handbook, but additional work needed to be done. He recommended that a standard procedure for implementing new data elements be established. This could be done by electronic vote after it had been ascertained that new elements were in conformity with the general concept of the NAF.

The Norwegian representative congratulated the Secretariat on having established the website and supported the development of standard procedures for introducing new data elements in an efficient manner. She suggested that the Secretariat should continue the process of developing the site and the meeting in October could then evaluate practical experience with the proposed procedures. She thought that categorisation by types of messages would be a natural point of departure. The error codes should also be included. Elements that have not been finally been agreed upon and defined should be kept separate.

The EU representative referred to the discussion of the interrelationship between PECCOE and the Group and the decision to have the meeting of the Group after PECCOE. The interrelationship with STACTIC had also to be decided. The Secretariat noted that some procedures would be NEAFC specific and should be solved in the formal NEAFC context. Other questions are NAF specific and could be less formal.

The EU representative suggested that the website could contain a NAF discussion forum listing all contacts. He also asked whether there should be any specific software tools to record development.

The Chairman asked if the website should be public or have restricted access. The Norwegian representative proposed that one part should be public and another part restricted, for example the forum. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed.

There were no further comments and the agenda item was closed.

7. Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO

NEAFC has established the Group under Article 3(8). The Secretariat issued invitations to NAFO. CCAMLR and SEAFO have sent apologies, but will be informed about the outcome of the meeting and invited again in October. The EU representative enquired about the contents of the NAF website as a vehicle for information and stressed the need to inform other RFMOs about further developments of the format. The Secretariat reported that it had presented the ideas at the 4th Meeting of Regional Fisheries Bodies in Rome in March 2005.

8. Any other business

There was none

9. Date and place of the next meeting

The Chairman hoped that the Group would be able meet continuously electronically, but felt that one meeting in person was necessary every year. It has been recommended that the next meeting will be in London on 13 October 2005.

10. Closure of the meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting and thanked everybody for their participation..

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL MEETING – SEPTEMBER 2005

North Atlantic Format

In July 2005, STACREC recommended that the North Atlantic Format (NAF) for vessel communications *via* VMS be submitted to Scientific Council for consideration. The rationale for this recommendation is the following: CWP is presently reviewing the NAF which is being developed by NAFO and NEAFC and which is meant to become a comprehensive list of possible data formats for real-time communications by fishing vessel masters and/or observers via VMS. Any recommendations of the Scientific Council or dedicated working group of the Council should be communicated to the Executive Secretary to be included in the assessment of the CWP working group.

Johanne Fischer

From: Kate Partridge [kate@neafc.org]
Sent: September 1, 2005 11:07 AM
To: driss.meski@iccat.es; Johanne Fischer; denzil@ccamlr.org
Subject: Advisory Group on Data Communications

Attachments: 02-01 Agenda ocotober 2005.doc



02-01 Agenda
ocotober 2005.doc..

We would like to invite you, or one of your colleagues, to attend this meeting as observers. The meeting will take place in Copenhagen on 13 October 2005 and I am pleased to attach an agenda.

I would be grateful if you would let Kjartan Hoydal (kjartan@neafc.org) whether or not you will be able to attend

Best wishes

Kate Partridge
NEAFC
22 Berners Street
London W1T 3DY

Tel +44 0 207 631 0016
Fax: +44 0 207 636 9225

email: kate@neafc.org
website: www.neafc.org

<<02-01 Agenda ocotober 2005.doc>>

Johanne Fischer

From: Johanne Fischer
Sent: October 12, 2005 3:52 PM
To: 'Gylfi Geirsson'; 'kjartan@neafc.org'
Cc: Hans Lassen; Bev McLoon
Subject: Meeting of the Advisory Group on Data Communication

Dear Gylfi and Kjartan,

Unfortunately I cannot come to Copenhagen to attend the AGDC meeting as planned. However, as coordinator of the CWP discussion group regarding the North Atlantic Format I would like to reiterate the interest of the CWP in the NAF and its potential use for scientific (assessment) purposes. This could possibly require consideration of additional field entries to the NAF. So far, no specific proposal regarding such entries has been made by CWP. Nevertheless, I would appreciate if the interest of CWP in this matter could be expressed to AGDC participants.

I wish you a fruitful meeting and send my best regards to all participants, Johanne

Dr. Johanne Fischer
Executive Secretary
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization www.nafo.int

Tel: (+1-902) 468 6582
Fax: (+1-902) 468 5538
Email: jfischer@nafo.int

NAFO, P.O. Box 638
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9



REPORT OF THE ADVISORY GROUP FOR DATA COMMUNICATION

13 October 2005 – Nordatlantens Brygge - Copenhagen

1.	Opening.....	2
2.	Appointment of the rapporteur.....	2
3.	Discussion and adoption of the agenda.....	2
4.	Rules of procedure	2
	Actions arising	2
5.	Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)	2
	Actions arising	4
6.	Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO	4
	Actions arising	5
	• Relationship with the MCS network.....	5
	Actions arising	5
7.	Any other business	5
	• Request from the NEAFC Deep Seas Working Group.....	5
	Actions arising	5
	• Format/message types for NAFO 3L.....	6
	Actions arising	7
	• HTTPS	7
	• Catch report with catch according to area (NAFO).....	7
	Actions arising	7
	• Encryption protocol (NAFO).....	7
	Actions arising	8
	• Content and modalities of the transmission of information to the EU by third-country vessels operating in Community waters	8
	Actions arising	9
	• Review of technical changes suggested by PECCOE.....	9
	Actions arising	9
8.	Date and place of the next meeting.....	10
	Actions arising	10
9.	Closure of the meeting	10

1. Opening

The Chairman, Mr Gylfi Geirsson (Iceland), opened the second meeting of the Group welcoming everybody. He noted that NAFO had been invited, but unfortunately was not able to participate. He stressed that this was a meeting of experts, which would not take decisions, but could make recommendations on technical matters to PECCOE or others who were seeking technical advice.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

The Secretariat was appointed rapporteur

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda

The Chairman went through the agenda and pointed out the additions under any other business. He asked if there were any proposal for amendments to the agenda. The EU representative drew attention to their document AG 02/15. The agenda was adopted (Annex 1).

4. Rules of procedure

The rules of procedure reflected the terms of reference adopted by PECCOE and confirmed by the Commission. The EU and Iceland had produced the draft in document AG 02/03. The EU had since reviewed the rules and suggested some amendments to the first draft. The Norwegian representative asked how, in practice, the Group would be able to answer requests within 30 days. The Chairman found this a very valid point and assumed that all correspondence on requests would be transmitted via the Secretariat.

Based on the revised paper, changes were accepted and the final version in document AG 02/03 1.rev. was adopted (Annex 2).

Actions arising

The rules of procedures will be added to NEAFC's basic texts

5. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)

The Chairman asked the Secretariat to introduce AG 02/12, which shows the volume of messages. The information was noted. The Chairman asked why there was such a large difference in the number of messages received from different FMCs. The Secretariat explained that the number of vessels and the period fishing vessels were active influenced the numbers.

The Secretariat then reviewed AG 02/13. It had been presented to PECCOE and there had been concerns that the bottom of the table on communication did not give a fair picture of the situation. The Secretariat noted that there are two FMCs that use

HTTPS at the moment and one or two more FMCs were in the process of moving to HTTPS. The EU pointed out that the European Commission had officially ceased to use X.25 on 1 January 2005 and expressed concern that the table on communication gave the impression that the European Commission was still using X.25. The Secretariat responded that the Commission does submit messages in some sort of emulation, but they arrive at the Secretariat through the X.25 network. Sweden corrected that it did not send Annex X messages by e-mail. A more detailed version of table 02/12 has been prepared by the Secretariat and substituted the former version in this report.

The Chairman asked where we were in the process of switching to secure Internet protocols. The Icelandic representative observed that the bottleneck problems in X.25 would be solved by switching. The Secretariat added that this would particularly be the case if some of the bigger 'players' moved to secure Internet protocols. The representative of the Russian Federation informed the meeting that they had considered moving from X.25 to Internet. The Icelandic representative informed that they had seen a big drop in costs when they changed to HTTPS.

The Norwegian representative asked if it was correct that 13% of sent messages were not accepted; this was confirmed. The Norwegian representative then pointed out that the introduction and use of the new error codes, adopted last year, was important. The new error codes give great flexibility and the adoption of these codes in the system at the Secretariat would help in identifying errors. The Secretariat noted that the rejection of messages was not because of technical errors, but rather because the formats used were not correct. This could stem from split responsibilities in national administrations. JRC asked about the error codes in connection with the rejected messages. The Secretariat responded that it was in the process of producing EXCEL sheets illustrating error messages for each FMC. The Chairman noted that the use of return messages with error codes would help to solve the problem.

The Chairman then asked the Secretariat to introduce document AG 02/14 (Annex 3), Implementation of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement – 2005, and the Group took note of the information it contained. JRC asked for clarification on the number of IUU vessels. The Secretariat informed that this was based on the IUU B-list. JRC studies validating VMS data indicate higher numbers of vessels in addition to vessels detected by the VMS. The Chairman noted that Iceland, as a partner in IMPAST, is very pleased with the outcome of the VMS and remote sensing satellite validations. A comparison of VMS data, aerial surveillance and remote sensing satellite detection had shown that satellite detection was better than aerial observations. Cost comparisons also came out very favourably for satellite detection.

The Secretariat informed about the discussion in PECCOE about making VMS data available to the JRC. JRC reported on recent projects and developments. The Chairman reported on the Icelandic experience of bringing all observations into one maritime activity picture, servicing the needs of surveillance, security etc.

The Secretariat then introduced the protected inspector's area on the website. There was a need to find solutions on how access should be regulated in the future. It was noted that PECCOE had asked for the inclusion of lists of authorised vessels. A new facility will allow inspectors to track other inspection platforms in the area and

records of their inspections. The Netherlands asked if this could include contact details. The Secretariat informed that there would be an option for that. Observations are stored in the database and could be picked up from there if needed. One possibility would also be to allow inspectors to download data from the database; given the present set up that would be a big step. It was noted that we are still in a trial phase and the area is not regularly updated. Catches could be included and it was felt that would be useful.

The system under the Scheme is that there is only access to information from the database when there is an active inspection presence in the Regulatory Area. Increasing access to information is not a technical problem, but demands policy decisions. Sweden asked if in future there would be limitations on the number of times one could attempt to access the site. The Secretariat repeated that there was a need to make decisions on how to manage access to the website. The Secretariat will prepare a note on the options available. This may call for an inter-sessional meeting of the AGDC to deal with questions of security and access.

The Norwegian representative agreed that there was a need to tighten the system of monitoring the access to the inspector's website. The Secretariat responded that, when changing passwords, it was necessary to have a central contact point - a NEAFC liaison officer - for each FMC. Hopefully this could be in place at the end of this year. Another option would be to issue personal users and passwords. The Norwegian representative pointed out that one option was to distribute a new password to the actual user after the reception of a SEN message from that user, but that may be too cumbersome. The Secretariat promised to prepare a note listing the different options. Spain noted that it was necessary to consider the various inspection services, also those acting onshore.

The Norwegian representative expressed appreciation of the inspector's area, but agreed that security and access had to be tightened so as to increase its usefulness. The Chairman reminded the meeting of a comment from a Scottish inspector that graphics should be reduced in websites used by vessels. The Chairman asked Contracting Parties to take an active part in developing the area.

Actions arising

The Secretariat will prepare a note on the options available to manage access to the website. This may call for an inter-sessional meeting of the AGDC to deal with questions of security and access.

The Secretariat will produce EXCEL sheets illustrating error messages for each FMC.

6. Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO

The Chairman read out a mail from Johanne Fisher, Executive Secretary of NAFO, who is also the vice-chair of the FAO statistical body CWP. The mail reiterates the interest of the CWP in the NAF and its potential use for scientific (assessment) purposes. This could possibly require consideration of additional field entries. So far, no specific proposal regarding such entries has been made by CWP.

The Norwegian representative asked about the role of the FAO Coordinating Working Party on fisheries statistics, CWP. The Secretariat explained that there probably would not be much feedback for the time being from CWP. They would however be monitoring the progress of this AGDC. More scientific use of VMS data and progress in developing electronic logbooks would probably bring traditional fisheries statistics and the work of the AGDC closer together.

Actions arising

The AGDC will keep under review the relationship between AGDC and the CWP

- **Relationship with the MCS network**

The Secretariat reported on a presentation on NEAFC Schemes and utilisation of the VMS database given at the Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop in Kuala Lumpur 18 – 22 July 2005, hosted by the Government of Malaysia in cooperation with the International MCS Network and the FAO Fish Code Programme. The MCS network has a lot of support internationally at present.

Actions arising

It is for the Commission to decide the relationship between NEAFC and the MCS network. This will be brought to the attention of Heads of Delegation in November 2005

7. Any other business

- **Request from the NEAFC Deep Seas Working Group**

Documents Letter HOD 05/57sent from NEAFC 25/05/2005, mail from Kjartan Hoydal 18/08/2005

The EU representative expressed doubts that this Group was the appropriate place to deal with the matter of scientific data formats. The Norwegian representative agreed. This type of information had nothing to do with the NAF. It will not be possible for this Group to give proper advice. The response should be that the request has nothing to do with the North Atlantic Format. The representative of the Russian Federation agreed with the two previous speakers. The AGDC is not in a position to do more for the time being than drawing this to the attention of the NEAFC Deep Seas Working Group.

The Secretariat repeated its earlier observation that the development of electronic logbooks may bring data from different data sources closer together in format.

Actions arising

The AGDC will draw to the attention of the NEAFC Deep Seas Working Group that AGDC does not think the request has anything to do with the NAF and the AGDC cannot, therefore, give any advice.

- **Format/message types for NAFO 3L**

Documents: Matter discussed in STACTIC in September, b. Proposal in STACTIC from EU, (STACTIC Working Paper 05/30), c. Communication of catches for vessels entering into NAFO Division 3L, d. Working Group (ISL-EU-CA-DK)

The proposal addresses the problem of reporting from prawn trawlers in 3L. The Chairman informed that this will be taken up by a special Working Group in NAFO but, as elements of the proposals add to the NAF, the AGDC should be aware of what is going on and take note of the proposed actions. The AGDC had a role in commenting on the proposals. The Norwegian representative noted that there had been a pilot project in place in NAFO for two years, which included daily catch reports. If the format from this catch report is used and messages sent when vessels change statistical area this may be enough to solve the problem. Denmark (in respect of Greenland) agreed with the Norwegian representative. The representative of EU-Estonia asked for clarification about how a change of area was reported. The Norwegian representative explained how catch was linked to area.

The Chairman noted that 3L had special status and the suggestion on how to solve the problems, as described by the Norwegian representative, could be solved by sending a catch report before crossing a line. If the new reports proposed in STACTIC Working Paper 05/30 are to be used for reporting from 3L, the coding will have to be looked into. There is an inconsistency in the codes proposed, which can be easily solved, but the proposal is not in conflict with the NAF format in general. The EU representative noted that the NAFO Working Group would benefit from the comments made by the Norwegian representative and others.

The Secretariat noted that the descriptions of codes on the NAF website were not necessarily identical with the descriptions in NEAFC or NAFO, as these were general and generic and did not refer to the specifics of one or other Convention Area. The quality of the NAF website depends on the response from the different Contracting Parties. The Secretariat has to have information about new codes or reports used bilaterally so that these codes can be reserved.

The Chairman introduced AG 02/08. He asked the Group to take note of the paper. The Norwegian representative commented that NAFO already had daily catch reporting in a pilot project. The Secretariat noted that using a message for zone for what in reality is a move would be in conflict with the old hailing system. The general feeling was that the solution chosen should have as little impact on NAF as possible. Introducing a new field would be a major change. The Norwegian representative agreed, but thought that in future the frequency of catch reporting would probably have to be increased.

The Chairman pointed out that technical changes in the system would have cost implications and he would not support a change in philosophy. The problem of travelling through several zones in one reporting week would probably be solved by electronic logbooks anyway.

Actions arising

The AGDC will communicate a summary of the discussion on this item to NAFO.

- **HTTPS**

a. Letter from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) - Greenland

Denmark (in respect of Greenland) introduced two papers 04 and 05 on security certificates. They suggest a simple and secure certificate policy between authorities. The EU representative noted that the Security Directorate of the European Commission is a Certification Authority (CA) and can produce certificates for Member States' needs. JRC asked if self-signing was suggested or if one central authority would be in charge of the security policies. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to describe the present system. Trackwell has explained that NEAFC is the CA with Iceland and the Faroe Islands. However, this does not mean that the same system had to be used vis-à-vis all FMCs: the EU flag states could use another system that would then be certified by NEAFC. There is no need to impose one solution on all. JRC noted if there is more than one CA this had to be managed and monitored and that could have cost implications. NAFO and bilateral arrangements complicate matters and this may increase the number of CAs. The CA function is built into the Trackwell system and will not have any costs for new users. The Norwegian representative thought it would be advisable to keep the number of CAs low.

The Chairman summarised that there seemed to be a wish to keep the number of CAs down, but there was no technical problem in other solutions as proposed by Denmark (in respect of Greenland).

- **Catch report with catch according to area (NAFO)**

a. Canadian proposal in STACTIC (STACTIC Working Paper 05/40)

The Chairman introduced the Canadian proposal in STACTIC, where a weekly catch report is proposed according to areas. The Chairman pointed out that the current configuration of the North Atlantic Format does not allow for reporting catch in multiple areas in the same report. He suggested that the advice should be to require catch reports before crossing the boundaries of the different areas.

The Norwegian representative pointed out that a catch reporting system when crossing lines between divisions, as described earlier in the case of 3L Shrimp fisheries, could be used instead of reporting from different divisions once a week. The frequency of catch reporting when in the division can of course be once a day as in the NAFO pilot project or once a week as proposed by Canada. It is important to keep NAF reporting as simple as possible and stick to the principle that a report is sent when there is a change as, for instance, a change of division.

Actions arising

The AGDC will communicate a summary of the discussion on this item to NAFO.

- **Encryption protocol (NAFO)**

Proposal from the Ukraine in STACTIC (STACTIC Working Paper 05/26).

This is a plain request for advice from the AGDC. The EU representative asked the JRC to make some comments. JRC pointed out that the key proposed was not secure and disencrypting could be a problem. The key suggested lengthened the message and there was the problem of central authority. The Icelandic representative noted that this also caused problems for some software. The Secretariat stated that encryption is included in the NEAFC system, but so far nobody has used this possibility.

The Norwegian representative found it encouraging that a discussion on the security of ordinary e-mails had started. There was no consistency in the way different types of transmissions of data were treated. The Icelandic representative noted that PGP was not freeware. JRC noted that, if NEAFC took this proposal on, there had to be a protocol as to how precisely this was done and somebody had to do the job. The Norwegian representative felt that if NAFO found a solution this might be used by NEAFC. The JRC was concerned that it may be easy for NAFO to introduce something that could create problems for Contracting Parties.

Actions arising

The AGDC will communicate a summary of the discussion on this item to NAFO.

- **Content and modalities of the transmission of information to the EU by third- country vessels operating in Community waters**

The EU representative introduced AG 02/15, which describes attempts to develop a format for the reporting of third-country vessels fishing in Community waters. Elements from NEAFC, NAFO and bilateral agreements have been used. Some parties do not have bilateral arrangements like Norway and have to report directly to the EC. He would like to have comments to assist this development. If that is not possible now, comments can be sent to the NEAFC Secretariat. This is precisely the type of work the AGDC should be dealing with and be useful for.

The representative of the Russian Federation asked if the vessels going to land fish in European harbours had to report according to this format. The answer was no. The representative of EU-Sweden asked if the proposal covered situations where fish from different quotas were on board. The Norwegian representative asked if detailed comments should be made now. The EU representative said this could also be done in written submissions via the NEAFC Secretariat.

The Norwegian representative asked how to deal with internal reference numbers, which were not used by some countries. She noted that LT and LG are only relevant to VMS data, not to manually generated messages. Earlier this Group had rejected LI and LN codes. Two sets of position codes must be enough. She pointed out that in other agreements there was only one code for transshipments (in a TRA report only one of TT or TF can be present) and also drew attention to the two new elements of the return message. The Chairman pointed out that it may be alright in this context to have codes like LI and LN, although a year ago this Group had rejected this in another context.

The representative of EU-Netherlands asked why IMO numbers were not used the instead of the IR. There was some discussion of the understanding of the use of CA

and the OB elements in the CAT and COX reports - CA is mandatory and OB is optional. With the definition used for CA in this document there should be no misunderstanding, but the definition of quantity in the NEAFC Scheme is not so clear. The NAFO pilot project has solved the problem by inserting a footnote that makes everything quite clear.

The Chairman concluded that this footnote should also be introduced into the NEAFC Scheme. There were no further comments. The Chairman urged participants to continue to make comments and proposals - this would show that the Group could work without meeting physically.

Actions arising

The AGDC will communicate a summary of the discussion on this item to the EU. The Group will recommend the insertion of a footnote in the NEAFC Scheme explaining quantity

- **Review of technical changes suggested by PECCOE**

The Group then considered the tables submitted from PECCOE. First, the Joint Iceland-Norway proposal, which only introduces two new optional elements. There were no objections to going along with the proposal. Second, the advance notification of entry which PECCOE had asked the Group to scrutinise. The Norwegian representative thought it should be carried out as proposed, but the Group should note that it was not quite in line with the definitions of the date and time elements of NAF because the reports use DA and TI for date and time that can be in the future. She suggested a possible use of the codes already available for predicted date and time, PD and PT, but this may cause problems for the exit message. The Norwegian representative did not have any solution. The Secretariat indicated that it would be easy to override any problem with a future date. The Chairman noted that this was not necessarily a time in the future. It was agreed to keep it simple and keep the proposal at it is. A clarifying footnote may be appropriate.

The Secretariat reported that PECCOE had decided that there should be a facility for Contracting Parties to enter statistical catch data on the private area of the website. It also asked the opinion of the AGDC which distribution list the Secretariat should use. The Chairman suggested that a Group mail list should be created by the NEAFC Secretariat. The Secretariat will make a new e-mail agdc@neaftc.org for the Group. It could perhaps be beneficial if all participants of the Group also had such an e-mail address, but that was not agreed. The Norwegian representative wanted to discuss it back home, but felt that the Secretariat should propose a system for effective data exchanging within the Group. The EU representative would go along with that. If the Secretariat receives an e-mail or letter for AGDC where it is clear that the sender wants it distributed to the group, then it is distributed immediately. If the need for distribution is not clear, the inquiry is sent only to the Chairman and he decides how to handle the case and give a response as required in the rules of procedure.

Actions arising

The Secretariat will propose a system for effective data exchange within the Group.

8. Date and place of the next meeting

The AGDC would recommend to the Commission to arrange two meetings next year: one in the first half of 2006 to deal with any outstanding business, and a second regular meeting in the second half of 2006, back to back with PECCOE. The Secretariat will create an AGDC mailbox and draft a system for distribution to members of the Group.

The Chairman urged participants to make use of electronic communication for further the work.

Actions arising

The AGDC will exchange views on problems and questions inter-sessionally by making full use electronic communication.

9. Closure of the meeting

The Chairman closed discussions meeting at 3:20 pm and thanked everybody for a fruitful meeting.

Annex 1



NEAFC
ADVISORY GROUP FOR DATA COMMUNICATION
13 October 2005 – Copenhagen

1. Opening
2. Appointment of the rapporteur
3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda
4. Rules of procedure
5. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)
6. Relationship with other RFMOs and FAO
 - Relationships with the MCS network
7. Any other business
 - Request from the NEAFC Deep Seas Working Group
 - a. Letter HOD 05/57 sent from NEAFC 25/05/2005
 - b. Mail from Kjartan Hoydal 18/08/2005
 - Format/message types for NAFO 3L – for discussion
 - a. Matter discussed in STACTIC in September
 - b. Proposal in STACTIC from EU, (STACTIC Working Paper 05/30)
 - c. Communication of catches for vessels entering into NAFO Division 3L
 - d. Working Group (ISL-EU-CA-DK)
 - Catch report with catch according to area (NAFO) – for discussion
 - a. CA proposal in STACTIC (STACTIC Working Paper 05/40)
 - HTTPS
 - a. Letter from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) - Greenland
 - Encryption protocol (NAFO)
Proposal from Ukraine in STACTIC, (STACTIC Working Paper 05/26)
8. Date and place of the next meeting
9. Closure of the meeting

Annex 2

DRAFT WORKING PAPER**Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Group
for Data Communications****TERMS OF REFERENCE¹**

- 1) The functions of the Advisory Group shall be to:
 - a) Monitor developments in data communication in relation to NEAFC, NAFO and other RFMOs;
 - b) Promote harmonisation of communications protocols used in NEAFC, NAFO, by Contracting Parties and other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs);
 - c) Ensure the standardization of the North-Atlantic Format and act as repository of the format;
 - d) Examine any relevant issues related to the functioning of the VMS;
 - e) On request from NEAFC, NAFO, or other RFMOs, or from Contracting Parties provide advice on proposals for amendments to message formats or other matters concerning data communications;
 - f) Present recommendations to NEAFC, NAFO, or other RFMOs or to Contracting Parties for amendments to message formats or other improvements in the field of data communication.
- 2) In performing its functions, the Advisory Group shall:
 - a) Invite Contracting Parties of NEAFC, NAFO and other RFMOs to participate in its meetings;
 - b) Develop a close cooperation with the secretariats of NEAFC, NAFO and other RFMOs.
- 3) The advisory group shall elect a chairman and a vice-chairman and draw up its own rules of procedure.

¹ Recommendation adopted by the NEAFC at its Annual Meeting on 12 November 2004

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. Contracting Parties and Contracting Party Flag States may appoint to the Advisory Group experts in the field of Data Communications, and shall inform the NEAFC Secretary of the names of their appointed members of the Group.
2. Contracting Parties to NAFO or other RFMO's, which are not Contracting Parties of NEAFC, shall be invited to appoint to the Advisory Group, experts in this field, and shall inform the NEAFC Secretary of the names of their appointed representatives. Such representatives, as well as the secretariats of the RFMO's concerned shall be invited to participate in those discussions of the Advisory Group which do not concern NEAFC only.
3. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be elected from among the members for a term of two years and shall be eligible for re-election. The Chairman may resign at any time. In the event of the office of Chairman falling vacant the Vice-Chairman shall perform the duties of Chairman until a new chairman is elected at the next meeting.
4. The chairman shall have the following responsibilities:
 - (a) convene a meeting of the Advisory Group at least once a year;
 - (b) chair each meeting of the Advisory Group;
 - (c) approve a provisional Agenda for the meeting after consultation with members of the Advisory Group and the Secretary and, as appropriate, with representatives of non-NEAFC Contracting Parties and secretariats of other RFMO's;
 - (d) open and close each meeting of the Advisory Group;
 - (e) agree the reports of each meeting for transmission to its members, and other interested persons as official documents of the proceedings;
 - (f) between meetings, confer by electronic means with members of the Advisory Group and as appropriate, with representatives of non-NEAFC Contracting Parties and secretariats of other RFMO's, in order to provide advice or recommendations on proposals on which the Advisory Group has been consulted.
5. The Advisory Group shall provide a response to requests for advice or recommendations within 30 days of receiving such requests. Any advice or recommendations shall only be given with the agreement of all those that participated in the discussions. If the Advisory Group fails to achieve a consensus on an issue on which it is consulted this shall be reflected in the report of the meeting.