



JOINT ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA MANAGEMENT (JAGDM)

25 May 2023 – Virtual

REPORT

1) Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Chair, Suzana Vodovnik (European Union), opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the virtual meeting of JAGDM. The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Norway and the United Kingdom. The NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats were also present.

2) Appointment of the rapporteur

2.1 The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed as rapporteur.

3) Discussion and adoption of the agenda

3.1 The agenda that had been circulated before the meeting (document JAGDM-2023-02-01) was adopted, with additional item for AOB raised by the NEAFC Secretariat (see item 7).

4) Data Exchange Statistics

JAGDM-2023-02-03, JAGDM-2023-02-04, JAGDM-2023-02-05 and JAGDM-2023-02-06.

a. NEAFC

4a.1 Before opening the floor for the NEAFC Secretariat to present the NEAFC Exchange Statistics, the Chair explained this would be done in a bit different way than in previous years, after the NEAFC Secretariat had extracted some interesting information on e.g., return errors for rejected VMS positions.

4a.2 The NEAFC Secretariat presented its data exchange statistics overview (document JAGDM 2023-02-3, JAGDM 2023-02-04, JAGDM 2023-02-05 and JAGDM 2023-02-06), and explained the reason for the different approach, which focused more on issues and fixes. The Secretariat hoped this to be as useful as possible, hoping for good feedback about what would be most valuable for the

Parties.

In discussion,

4a.3 The Chair further explained the background for this 'new' approach. I.e., it had previously been agreed that the Secretariat should not only present statistics in itself, but also analyse what happened; where was the problem and what kind of errors arose. Furthermore, the Chair asked participants if they had any feedback on the analysis from the NEAFC Secretariat and raised the question if Parties had any suggestions on how to follow-up the issues highlighted and presented by the NEAFC Secretariat.

4a.4 The NAFO Secretariat informed JAGDM that it had attempted to work with its VMS Vendor, TwoDays (formerly Vtrack/VISMA). However, the information was not logged to its database. The details were only logged about 25% of the time, and for this reason the NAFO Secretariat was not able to provide a similar or equivalent analysis for the NAFO system. However, if this presentation was something continued going forward, the NAFO Secretariat would make sure that it would work with the Vendor and that these details being logged in the database.

4a.5 The Chair noted that next time the NAFO Secretariat could present their analysis (similar to what the NEAFC Secretariat presented). This would give the NAFO Secretariat a bit more time to prepare.

4a.6 The EU thanked the NEAFC Secretariat for the work done. For the EU, having this detailed information was very useful, because unlike the other Parties EU, does not have insight into the direct NAF communications of its Member States (MS). Therefore, EU does not have the same information as the NEAFC Secretariat and the national FMCs. For the EU, the summary gave a very good insight into what was happening and thus moving into the right direction. The EU planned to circulate the information to its Member States and request some feedback on the different issues. The EU would then try to summarise the issues, focusing on the most important first. The EU thought this being a good standing item for the JAGDM agenda. However, rather than focusing on issues that happened a long time ago, the focus should be on issues experienced in the last few months.

4a.7 DFG-Greenland concurred with the EU that it was very useful for the Parties to see the statistics and the errors encountered. Furthermore, DFG-Greenland noted that there was number of issues raised in the documents and one of them the operation of the system in general. For DFG-Greenland it was important to differentiate between important and less important warnings. For those errors and warnings important for the understanding of what was happening in the NEAFC Regulatory Area and beyond, it hoped this to be taken up between the NEAFC Secretariat and the relevant FMC to some extent, thus, focusing on the important issues. Another issue is how to go forward as NEAFC goes from the NAF system to the FLUX system and to provide statistics beyond this group for PECMAC to be able to get impression of compliance in general, was of most importance.

4a.8 Canada thanked the NEAFC Secretariat for compiling the information. It thought it was very interesting to see the different errors and messages that the NEAFC Secretariat was receiving, noting the comments made by the NAFO Secretariat, Canada would be very interested to receive a similar analysis from the NAFO site. Canada agreed with the comments raised by the other Parties.

4a.9 In conclusion, JAGDM noted the analysis made by the NEAFC Secretariat and agreed to review the statistics, in the same or similar way as presented by the NEAFC Secretariat, focusing on and analysing important issues reported for future meetings, with a view to improvement.

b. NAFO

4.10 There were no documents under this agenda item, noting the comments made by the NAFO Secretariat above.

5) NEAFC Issues

a) Master Data Register (MDR) Code List review

5.1 Before opening the floor for the NEAFC Secretariat, the Chair explained that this was an agenda item already discussed in the last meeting, where it was agreed that JAGDM would continue this discussion at its next meeting.

5.2 The NEAFC Secretariat gave a verbal update, explaining that the priority for this meeting was to coordinate start and end date for the stock codes it currently had in its MDR with EU, prior to the launch of the FLUX fishing activity. Thus, the NEAFC Secretariat raised the question on how to determine a start and end date to be put into its code lists, as currently start and end date was not being used. In general, the NEAFC Secretariat wondered if the start date should be the day JAGDM had reviewed the amendments to any of the code lists, if this had to go to the Annual Meeting of NEAFC or when the body responsible for the code made the amendment.

Regarding International lists discussed at the last meeting, the NEAFC Secretariat also mentioned that it was trying to find out when amendments were made to these lists, (i.e., the FAO species list (ASFIS), the UN LOCODE list and the countries and territories list), which are all managed by international bodies. To the Secretariat's understanding, the ASFIS list was updated in July and the UN LOCODE list was updated twice a year. Finally, the NEAFC Secretariat informed JAGDM that there had been 407 extra species listed on the ASFIS code list in 2022, and thus not on NEAFC's MDR. Ideally, these extra 407 species would need to be added to the MDR to harmonise with the ASFIS code list, and that this would be tackled in 2024 as part of the agreed routine review of code lists.

In discussion,

5.3 Participants noted that the NEAFC Secretariat would present this and any updated information to JAGDM in 2024, as previously agreed, as the start of routine review of code lists. However, JAGDM agreed and noted the following regarding any changes to the code lists:

- That stock code list, in regard to XOS code was missing (from FA_STOCK code list on the MDR) due to an oversight, and would use the same validity period as the other codes or start date '1989-01-01', as it is coming from the same recommendation;
- If a code list has to change following adoption of a NEAFC recommendation, the start date would be when that recommendation enters into force;
- For updating other international code lists such as on species, location and territory, a commonly agreed start and end date would be needed within NEAFC, allowing sufficient notice period so that every Contracting Party could implement it in time (note start date and end date is needed for backwards compatibility within systems, but is not currently used in the above international lists), and;
- A decision was needed on how to align with the international lists, and if this should be done once a year or in real time if possible.

b) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

i) Update to data classification and website content access tables (proposal)

Document JAGDM-2023-02-09

5.4 The NEAFC Secretariat updated JAGDM that the documents under agenda items 'Update to data classification and website content access tables (proposal) and Data Classification (proposal), as they were discussed at JAGDM 1 2023, were forwarded to PECMAC for comments. PECMAC had no further comments on the way the data been classified or the access control roles for the data. Thus, the document would be forwarded to the NEAFC Annual Meeting in November 2023, as a proposal from JAGDM. The document now included a proper header on them in this regard.

ii) Data Classification (proposal)

Document JAGDM-2023-02-08

Please see the previous agenda item.

iii) Report from SSA meeting

The NEAFC Secretariat presented to JAGDM a verbal update from the meeting of the System Security Administrators (SSA), that took place the day before JAGDM, including that the SSA group had reviewed the NEAFC Inventory and incident log as required in the ISMS. The report from the SSA meeting is annexed to this meeting report.

iv) Possible update to Recommendation 11:2013 (ISMS)

Document JAGDM-2023-02-08a (note, in error, two documents 'JAGDM-2023-02-08 ' were uploaded to the website for this meeting). To differentiate between them the draft update to the recommendation will be referred to as '8a'. JAGDM-2023-02-08 is a proposal to be tabled at the Annual Meeting this year).

The NEAFC Secretariat informed JAGDM that document JAGDM-2023-02-08a was a re-wording Recommendation 11:2013 presented to the SSA group, reflecting the actual role and responsibilities of NEAFC SSA. Recommendation 11:2013 was the original framework recommendation for ISMS in NEAFC. The adoption of this recommendation moved provision for the SSA group from the Scheme into this new information security framework. However, the wording agreed at the time was a too strong as it could be construed that the individuals in the SSA group would have ultimate responsibility for information security in NEAFC, which was in practical terms not the case. This was thus a barrier for Contracting Parties to participate in the SSA process. The re-worded document was positively received by the SSA however further internal discussion was needed. The document had already been uploaded to this JAGDM meeting.

The Secretariat presented document JAGDM-2023-02-08a and invited JAGDM to have a look and comment on the document, as realistically the final drafting would come from JAGDM rather than the SSA group. However, from the point of view from the Secretariat there were no pressure to finalise this document this year.

In discussion,

JAGDM noted document JAGDM-2023-02-08a and agreed to come back to this issue at its next meeting.

6) NAFO issues

a) Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations

The NAFO Secretariat provided update about JAGDM advice to STACTIC concerning the COX message. The advice was not to put catches into the COX, however to put catches into the CAT message. That was agreed at the last intersessional of STACTIC in May 2023 and expected to be forwarded to the NAFO Commission in September for final adoption.

JAGDM noted the update from the NAFO Secretariat.

b) Other NAFO Issues

The NAFO Secretariat noted that there were no issues raised by STACTIC to JAGDM for this meeting.

The NAFO Secretariat updated JAGDM that there was an ongoing security audit taking place for its application for monitoring and control. However, the Secretariat had not yet the results from the audit. The NAFO Secretariat would update JAGDM at its next meeting.

7) Any Other Business

Document JAGDM-2023-02-07

The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM-2023-02-07, explaining after analysing the return error log, the NEAFC Secretariat had noticed that one of the returns in the error log was 'no position available for Annex VII message'. Thus, the message had returned NAK-104, which was mandatory fields missing. The Secretariat had not realised that this rule resulted in a rejection, or that there were checks in place against VMS position messages before accepting or rejecting messages such as 'port of landing' or 'transhipment'. Thus, the Secretariat by looking more closely at the NAF POR report realised it had a footnote saying that coordinates were only mandatory in the port of landing (POR) report, if the vessel is not subject to satellite tracking (which is sending VMS positions). The Secretariat wondered if this was a problem as VMS positions are only sent within the NEAFC Regulatory Area. However, from beginning of 2023, Parties were required to send TRA and POR messages from anywhere, if the fisheries resources had been caught inside the NEAFC Regulatory Area (in accordance with the new Article 13 of the Scheme). The Secretariat wondered if this was now a bit of a mismatch. For the NEAFC Secretariat, one possible solution to this was to make coordinates mandatory in the POR report and just remove the footnote from the Scheme. However, after coordinating with the Chair of PECMAC, the Chair suggested instead of removing the footnote a possibility was to update it to explain 'if you are reporting from outside the RA you will need to include the coordinates. The NEAFC Secretariat noted that not only was the current system was quite old, but analysing exceptions and rejection was not something that the Secretariat did on a day-to-day basis. Having spotted this issue, the Secretariat thought it was important to bring this to the attention of JAGDM and flag this issue.

In discussion,

Before opening the floor for comments, the Chair of JAGDM noted, that to her knowledge, amending the footnote would be an easier solution to address this issue.

DFG-GRL noted that from a legal perspective amending the footnote would be acceptable. However, from a technical perspective, NEAFC should seek to the furthest extent possible to have rules that did

not change the content of the messages depending on various other items to make the solution as simple as possible. From a technical perspective DFG-GRL preferred adding the positions to all POR messages, if it was necessary for them to be there. Even if this could be seen as double reporting if the vessel was inside the NEAFC RA (and so sending VMS POS), this was still preferable.

The EU thought from a technical perspective, there could be a practical impact for sender depending on each system. The EU raised the question if one alternative was to provide VMS positions for these vessels outside the NEAFC Regulatory Area and if that would be problematic and would cover the legal requirements.

For the DFG-GRL, it thought this addressing the legal requirements. However, this would require vessel to report positions outside of the NEAFC Regulatory Area and that would be a new requirement.

After some further discussions, JAGDM agreed that Contracting Parties would consult internally and return to this issue at its next meeting.

8) Report to the NEAFC Annual Meeting

Nothing raised.

9) Date and Place of the Next Meeting

Date and place of the next meeting was planned in the beginning of 2024. However, if some important issues needed to be addressed, the next meeting could be considered in September or October 2023. The Chair would inform participants if that would be the way forward.

10) Closure of the Meeting

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for an efficient JAGDM meeting.