



JOINT ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA MANAGEMENT (JAGDM)

October 10, 2019 – NEAFC Secretariat – London, United Kingdom

REPORT

1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair, Leifur Magnusson (Iceland) opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to the 3rd meeting this year.

The following Contracting Parties were present: European Union and Norway, with Denmark (in respect of Faroes and Greenland), and the Russian Federation joining via Webex. The NAFO (via Webex) and NEAFC Secretariats were also present.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed as rapporteur

3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the agenda

4. Data Exchange Statistics

Standing item, not for this meeting

5. NEAFC issues

a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations

Standing item not for this meeting

b. Issues Raised by PECMAC

i. Business Continuity Plan for FLUX network

The Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2019-03-07. While the environment in which the FLUX VMS and ERS systems resided was resilient, any communication with the Secretariat in response to a problem was limited to business hours in which suitable staff were available. The recently agreed extended Time Out Date Time (TODT) offset parameter of 72 hours would however address the issue for ERS Version 1 and VMS. It was acknowledged that the details of a BCP become more important when the TODT is lower. Plans for Version 2 ERS were not yet established, however the TODT set in version 1 was intended to be a temporary value while experience is gained, other issues analysed and possible solutions developed. In clarification, the Secretariat explained that the document did not propose any changes to 14.2 of the ISMS, but clarified what had been agreed and where there were differences in interpretation between CPs which meant that the existing plan needed further work before it was accepted in practice.

It was noted that the only times the Secretariat could accept any other format for messages in view of a failure was if an inspection platform was in the Regulatory Area and operational information was needed urgently. It was also noted that the old NAF VMS system formed a fall back in case of 'total' failure, during an initial production roll out, however it was the Secretariat's view that this possibility cannot apply to the normal running of the total network.

In discussion it was suggested that the BCP needed more details about what was required if communications had been down. These detailed requirements are to be agreed by JAGDM. Such details were not included in the current plan which was earlier adopted on the basis that automatic detection of up time was a requirement in order for messages to be transmitted as soon as the receiving system was up, however it was subsequently apparent that this was not a shared understanding of all parties.

It was agreed therefore that while the extended TODT resolved the issue for now, the Secretariat would produce a document for JAGDM in Spring 2020 considering a more detailed procedure, which could be used to inform further discussions.

ii. Master Data Register (MDR)

The Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2019-03-10 which set out how one code list of the Master Data Register, the master species list, intended for use in all NEAFC applications, was being updated. This 'master species' list was harmonised with the FAO AFSIS fish species list, as an ASFIS 'plus', with the 'plus' being the additional meta data which NEAFC uses for specific purposes related to NEAFC rules and applicable to the species which are relevant to NEAFC. The master species list would become the basis for the various species lists in use in NEAFC; namely Annex 1 and 5, the MCS and PSC, future ERS database lists and the WG Statistics list and application.

The CONST_SPECIES table is the list in the current VMS database being used to check incoming data against the species.

The proposed actions on the CONST_SPECIES dataset were responded to by JAGDM as follows:

- a) Where a non-reported species is not on ASFIS then it will be deleted from CONST_SPECIES. **Agreed.**
- b) Where a reported species is not on ASFIS then it will left in CONST_SPECIES but marked as NEAFC_TYPE=No. (5 records); **Agreed in principle but the Secretariat was to inform PECMAS on which 5 records had been removed.**
- c) Where a reported species is not on Annex 5 but is in ASFIS then it should be reviewed for possible update of Annex 5. Similar to PSC reported species – i.e. Changing NEAFC_TYPE from

NO to YES. (149 species); **Agreed in principle, but the Secretariat should first advise PECMAS of the added species for assessment before the next action to amend Annex 5.**

- d) Advice is requested on how to resolve major disparities between CONST_SPECIES species names and ASFIS species names - e.g. ALL = All Species vs ALL = Warty dory. **Agreed that the Secretariat should go ahead and make the changes but offering the changes up to PECMAS for review.**
- e) Advice is requested on how to resolve minor disparities between CONST_SPECIES species names and ASFIS species names - e.g. spelling differences between English or scientific names. **Agreed that the Secretariat should go ahead with these.**

The European Union commented that the contents of the agreed MDR code list (FAO_SPECIES) for ERS exchanges should not be changed. The Secretariat confirmed that the above changes are for the CONST_SPECIES code list for internal use in their systems only.

iii. TODT for ERS V2

No document was presented for this item. JAGDM agreed that ERS-Implementation Group could refer this issue to JAGDM in future according to relevance to ongoing ERS discussions for a version 2.

c. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

i. Upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)

The Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2019-03-04 which informed JAGDM about a recent external independent Gap Audit under ISO 27001:2013. This reflected the greater management focus in the 2013 version of the ISO 27001 compared to the 2005 version NEAFC had adopted. The Secretariat set out 9 detailed requirements the audit had identified for meeting the 2013 standard, noting that some aspects are of more or less importance for NEAFC given its specific circumstances and nature. Initial priorities identified by the Secretariat related to avoiding theft of NEAFC money or commercially exploitable data, as well as avoiding failures that could imply costs to NEAFC including to its Contracting Parties.

It was agreed, in view of restricted resources at the Secretariat, the Audit Consultants could draft relevant policy over the next year to address any shortfalls in the ISMS, with a focus on the specific nature of NEAFC's business. The Secretariat should update the next JAGDM meeting.

ii. Risk management (ISMS article 3) status of the work

As part of the above Gap Audit a draft risk assessment was carried out by the Secretariat. A summary of this was presented to JAGDM in document JAGDM 2019-03-08. JAGDM was requested to note that a simpler framework than JAGDM's own risk template had been suggested by the consultants. The main elements of risk related to the need to carry out staff training, harden devices, improve physical security, assess risks from suppliers and create a development policy. The Chair noted the need to balance benefits against workload – i.e. keep actions proportional to risk.

In discussion various views were expressed on using the consultants' or the ISMS' risk framework.

It was agreed that the Secretariat should continue the work, looking at how to merge the ISMS and the consultants' risk frameworks, reporting to the next JAGDM.

6. NAFO issues

- a. Technical implications of Recommendations
- b. ISMS for NAFO
- c. Items Requested by STACTIC

No items raised.

7. Any other business

- a. Archiving

The Secretariat presented JAGDM 2019-03-09 setting out the proposed NEAFC operational data archiving policy.

In discussion, it was noted that JAGDM could cover the technical issues but legal/policy advice would be needed for consideration on data such as anonymization or numbers of years held before deletion. This was also in the light that NEAFC operated within the guidance of its parties rather than one set of national legislation on data. The Secretariat clarified where various messages were stored. There remained a question as to the differing data – did it need to be treated in the same way, for instance data from inspections, statistics, the EPSC system. Appendix 1 to Annex 9 of the Scheme was also relevant here.

It was agreed to keep this item on the agenda for next the meeting. The Secretariat was asked to come back with more information to the next JAGDM meeting.

- b. NAK reports and NEAFC string validator (for information)

The Secretariat explained its system to follow up failed messages i.e. NAK reports and the use of an informal NAK string validator, developed by the Secretariat (document JAGDM 2019-03-06. The string validator was demonstrated online.

In discussion, while it was noted that the validator was not 100% fool-proof it was considered useful to shorten the time in diagnosing the cause of failures of messages. It was suggested it would be useful to test the validator with users for feedback with the ultimate aim of less NAK reports. It was also noted that access to the tool needed to be restricted as the tool was hosted on the NEAFC server system.

JAGDM agreed that the Secretariat should share the tool with a user group of registered operational users from NEAFC FMCs.

- c. Data issues arising from the 2018 Compliance Report

The Secretariat introduced an information document (JAGDM 2019-03-03) on issues arising from the 2019 Compliance Report.

The first issues discussed was the incorrect use of separators between species codes found in the AUT authorisation message. This was when multiple species were listed and a space should have been used. The use of a slash instead led to an error where only the first species was accepted by the data base but no error message was returned. There was also a question related to the fact that AUT messages were accepted with non-regulated species and unclear handling of the deep sea species code XDS, as

opposed to individual deep sea species. Although the authorisations were still going ahead, the missing information was thought to be particularly relevant as the information was likely to be public in the future.

In the discussion it was also noted that authorisations applied to species but not to stocks such as the Redfish in the Irminger or Norwegian seas. The reporting systems nevertheless focused on species.

JAGDM agreed the following;

- a) **On the use of correct separators for species, a Scheme Letter should be sent to FMCs. Over the longer term, when resources were available, the technical solution to improve handling of separators should be looked at by the Secretariat.**
- b) **No limit should be currently put on the species listed under AUT, including non-regulated species i.e. to avoid rejections of AUT messages.**
- c) **XDS species should continue to be allowed to be reported individually, however a filter should be applied if a public version of a NEAFC Authorised Vessels list is adopted in November. This is to avoid showing species authorisations for species which do not require one under the NEAFC Scheme reporting rules.**
- d) **The Secretariat should report to PECMAS on the discussion on stocks and species in the context of AUT messages in case PECMAS wants to comment on this issue.**

8. [Report to the Annual Meeting](#)

- a. Proposal to update ISMS to reflect a Public Authorised Vessels List

The Secretariat introduced a document (JAGDM 2019-03-05 Rev 1) which would form JAGDM's proposal to the Annual Meeting to update the ISMS information classification (Article 7.2) in light of the proposal to make parts of NEAFC's vessel register public.

JAGDM agreed to adopt JAGDM 2019-03-05 on an update to the ISMS Article 7.2 (Data Classification) which would be required if NEAFC adopts the PECMAC proposal for a public authorised vessels list, at the Annual Meeting in November 2019.

9. [Date and place of the next meeting](#)

No date set yet.

10. [Closure of the meeting](#)

The Chair closed the meeting and wished all participants a safe trip home, in particular thanking Rachel Lewsley for her input in advance of her imminent maternity leave.