



**JAGDM**  
**22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017**  
**London - UK**

**REPORT**

**1. Opening of the Meeting**

The Chair Lloyd Slaney (Canada) opened the meeting and welcomed the participants, in particular CCAMLR and SEAFO Secretariats representatives.

The following Contracting Parties were present: DFG Faroes and Greenland, the European Union, Iceland and Norway from NAFO and NEAFC and Canada from NAFO.

Both NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats were present.

The full list of participants can be viewed in document JAGDM 2017-01-02, annexed to this report.

**2. Appointment of the rapporteur**

The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed as the rapporteur.

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

The Agenda was adopted with the addition of two new items in agenda point 8.a Management of the websites / JAGDM and 9 “Any other business”.

- 8. Changes to the presentation of agenda on JAGDM website
- 9. Testing XML import into NEAFC EPSC application.

**4. Data Exchange Statistics**

a. *NAFO*

The NAFO Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-13. The participants discussed the information provided in the document and requested clarification on some of the

anomalies outlined in the tables. It was noted that some of the anomalies were due to technical issues.

It was agreed:

That STACTIC should be advised of technical issues so that inconsistencies are not misinterpreted as compliance issues.

**b. NEAFC**

The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-08 Rev1 on “Messages received in 2016” and document JAGDM 2017-01-09 on “Data exchange statistics”. The participants discussed the documents, noting some anomalies, but agreeing that there was a slight improvement from previous years and also commented that the new presentation charts were a positive development.

**5. NEAFC issues**

**a. Any technical implications of the implementation of recommendations**

**i. Implementation of NEAFC Recommendation 2017:18**

The NEAFC Secretariat presented JAGDM 2017-01-05 on “Technical implications of implementing NEAFC recommendation 2017:18” which changed the use of IMO numbers. The implementation of a mandatory “IMO number” in NEAFC created specific technical challenges as the required validation was not detailed. The IMO number is already mandatory in the vessel notification (NOT) when a vessel does not have an “external registration” (XR) number. Some vessels still do not have an IMO number and it is only required for vessels subject to IMO Resolution A.1078 (28), as such, it will be optional for the time being. The participants considered various possible technical options and the limitations of what could be done without specific instructions. The agenda item is a standing item for information so no decision was required.

**ii. NEAFC Recommendation 2017:15**

The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-04 on the amendment of the PSC 3 form. The Secretariat considered it important to officially inform the NAFO Secretariat of the changes since the form was specifically harmonised for use in NEAFC and NAFO. No further actions were required.

**b. Issues Raised by PECMAC**

**i. EU Presentation on Flux Transportation Layer**

The EU presented document JAGDM 2017-01-16 Rev1 on “FLUX transport layer – Business view”, followed by a technical presentation on recent "developments on the FLUX TL". The participants requested clarification on the current status of FLUX implementation within EU. The EU technical representative agreed to do a specific DEMO showcasing the current use of TFLUX TL among Member States. Further questions were about and the specific system architecture, details of the level of configurability in the Transport layer ‘envelope’ and specific technical ‘stacks’ which are currently supported and which will continue to be supported. Another question was about unique identifiers for the messages generated in the

system, although this was explained at the time, the EU representatives will come back later with a detailed response. The two parts of this presentation were made by the EU participants, Pascal COLLOTTE for the business view, Rafael FERNANDEZ-FONT PEREZ for the recent developments.

**c. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)**

**i. Changes to NEAFC Policy on Access to Documents**

The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-03 on the “Policy on Access to Meeting Documents from NEAFC Meetings”. This document is a NEAFC Head of delegation letter which details the top level policy decision.

The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-07 on “Implementing changes to document access policy”. The participants discussed at length, the extent to which JAGDM is the appropriate body to address this issue and how it should respond. After further discussion regarding practical implications and solutions for daily work, it was decided that the group provide a generic draft definition of what constitutes “business sensitive information”. As PECMAC will have the greatest number of documents which are considered ‘sensitive’ they will need to be fully appraised of the draft definition and given the opportunity to give specific guidelines on business sensitivity, which may be more appropriate..

It was agreed:

That a generic definition for “business sensitive information” be provided.

The revised document (Rev 2) will be sent by the Chair of JAGDM to the Chair of PECMAC for review.

- ii. Possible Upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)**
- iii. Work of the Security System Administrators**
- iv. Information Security Incident Management ( ISMS article 13)**
- v. Risk management ( ISMS article 3) status of the work**

The NEAFC secretariat briefly summarised information regarding the different items. These items were put on the agenda in 2014 but were not fully concluded in 2015, when only one meeting was held, or in 2016 when the work referred from NEAFC AHWG ERS was given priority. Some participants felt that there should be a special meeting to conclude on these issues and others felt that they could be taken at the next meeting, depending on whether or not other issues were referred to the group.

**vi. Review of NEAFC Inventory**

The NEAFC Secretariat introduced documents JAGDM 2017-01-14 on the “Summary of changes to NEAFC system in 2016 requiring changes to ISMS” and JAGDM 2017-01-15 on the “NEAFC system diagram” explaining the changes in 2016 both in the ISMS and the inventory. The participants requested clarification on specific issues. No further actions were required.

## 6. NAFO issues

### a. *Any technical implications of the implementation of recommendations*

There were no recommendations with technical implications introduced in NAFO this year.

### b. *Recommendations for adopting an ISMS for NAFO*

#### i. *Secretariat backup policy*

The NAFO Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2017-01-11 on the “NAFO Secretariat Backup Policy”. There were no comments.

#### ii. *MCS access rights*

The NAFO Secretariat briefly introduced document JAGDM 2017-01-10 on “Access rights pilot: MCS Website”. The participants briefly discussed the update.

### c. *Issues raised by STACTIC*

No new requests were received from STACTIC.

### d. *Updated from STACTIC*

#### i. *MCS website changes*

The NAFO Secretariat did a demonstration of their MCS (development) website including PSC management system; there was some consideration on the development and sharing of open source software and the participants also discussed the pros and cons of development and programming in different machine languages stressing the importance of developing strict rules for interfaces.

#### ii. *Review of NAFO CEM Annexes*

Canada briefly summarised recent developments on the NAFO Control and Enforcement Measures (CEM) annexes.

Canada will continue to work reviewing the CEM annexes for inconsistencies and cross references accuracy and Norway offered to support Canada’s work on issues if any were discovered. In several occasions it has been discovered that the use of footnotes have caused problems. Norway will prepare a document where the CEM Annex II.E VMS Data Format is splintered, one form for each message instead of using footnotes. This document will be discussed at the next JAGDM meeting. In this context the participants also discussed the need to review the use of FAO codes and other possible international standards.

NEAFC secretariat foresee that the annexes of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement are likely to change substantially following the work of the ERS group and are considering any further harmonisation efforts in this content.

Canada will continue to review the CEM annexes and will prepare a document proposing additional amendments to provide further clarification within the annexes which will be discussed at the next meeting. Norway offered to support Canada on this initiative as needed.

It was agreed to continue the work (in particular CEM IIb) and discuss it at the next meeting. In this context, the participants also discussed the need to review the use of FAO codes and other possible international standards. NEAFC secretariat foresees that the annexes of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement are likely to change substantially following the work of the ERS group and are considering any further harmonisation efforts in this context.

It was agreed:

That Canada and Norway will prepare documents in an effort to provide further clarification within the CEM annexes which will be discussed at the next meeting.

e. *Status of other NAFO Projects*

i. *Flux transportation layer*

The NAFO Secretariat gave a verbal update on the use of the EU ERS data using FLUX. Participants discussed aspects of the EU ERS data transfer.

ii. *VISMA contract renewal*

The NAFO Secretariat summarised the context of the contract renewal with the service provider VISMA.

7. **Management of the North Atlantic Format**

No issues were raised under this agenda point.

8. **Management of the websites**

a. *JAGDM*

The NEAFC Secretariat briefly commented on the new agenda module which would make small changes to the way agenda sections and subsections were numbered. This was raised as these changes will also need to be reflected in any paper documents for consistency. No comments were made.

The participants raised the issue of the login / logout timing when using the JAGDM website.

It was agreed:

That the NEAFC Secretariat will look into the login/logout timing issue on the JAGDM website.

b. *NAF*

i. *Updating the NAF website with codes in use by Contracting Parties*

The NAFO Secretariat clarified which codes required updating within the site.

Norway raised the possibility to upload into the site documents relating to the ERS work on new NAF format codes taking place in NEAFC.

## 9. Any other business

The NEAFC Secretariat briefed the participants on the pilot develop upon request from Norway allowing for vessels' operators to export XML files generated from their own systems and send them into the application PSC forms, avoiding the need for any manual data entry. The participants did not comment.

The representative from the CCAMLR Secretariat summarised the experience with data gathering, processing and storage. Issues such as data quality evaluation and aggregate dispersed data (in different databases) and the use of recent technical developments to optimise data flow.

The Chair described recent developments in NAFO to improve data collection.

DFG Faroes described briefly the data collection and validation process.

The representative from the SEAFO Secretariat raised the point that there is a need for global agreement on data standards between international fisheries bodies. He questioned whether JAGDM's mandate included the possibility to establish JAGDM as a repository of data standards for fisheries data. The NEAFC Secretariat confirmed that JAGDM's Rules of Procedure make provision for collaboration amongst fisheries bodies to establish global standards for fisheries data.

Norway elaborated on the national data collection framework in particular related to scientific data and ERS data. Data exchange harmonisation between RFMOs is needed.

The EU elaborated on the different data sources and processes that often lead to different results.

DFG Greenland elaborated on the different users of data and the need to have ICES as a repository of data from the Regulatory Areas (NEAFC) and cross-validation (VMS, ERS, PSC landing notes, etc.)

The Chair concluded that there is a need to better understand and consider all global developments on standardisation and harmonisation of data processes, particularly data collection.

Participants exchanged views on data management and a possible way forward for JAGDM. No conclusion was reached.

## 10. Report to the Annual Meetings

The Chair will report to the NAFO Annual Meeting in September and the Vice-Chair will report to the NEAFC Annual Meeting in November.

**11. Date and Place of the next meeting**

The participants agreed to set tentative dates for the next meeting as 20/21 June 2017 in NAFO headquarters in Canada.

**12. Closure of the Meeting**

The Chair thanked the participants, the observers and the Secretariats for the excellent work and wished all a safe return home.

\*\*\* END OF REPORT \*\*\*