



## Report of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM) Meeting

10 September 2020  
NEAFC Secretariat, Virtual Meeting

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | Opening of the meeting.....  | 2 |
| 2.  | Appointment of the rapporteur .....                                      | 2 |
| 3.  | Discussion and adoption of the agenda.....                               | 2 |
| 4.  | Data Exchange Statistics.....  | 2 |
| 5.  | NEAFC issues.....  | 2 |
|     | a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations ..... | 2 |
|     | b. Issues Raised by PECMAC .....   | 2 |
|     | c. Issues Referred to JAGDM by ERS IMP WG .....                          | 3 |
|     | d. Proposed NEAFC Password requirements (ISMS) .....                     | 3 |
|     | e. Update to Port State Control (PSC) operational lists .....            | 4 |
| 6.  | NAFO issues .....  | 4 |
|     | a. Technical implications of Recommendations.....                        | 4 |
|     | b. Cyber Attack directed at the NAFO Secretariat .....                   | 4 |
|     | c. ISMS for NAFO .....   | 4 |
|     | d. Items Requested by STACTIC .....                                      | 4 |
| 7.  | Election of Chair.....   | 5 |
| 8.  | Report to the Annual Meeting.....  | 5 |
| 9.  | Date and place of the next meeting .....                                 | 5 |
| 10. | Closure of the meeting .....   | 5 |

## **Report of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM) Meeting**

17 March 2020  
NEAFC Secretariat, Virtual Meeting

### **1. Opening of the meeting**

1.1 The Vice-Chair of JAGDM, Natasha Barbour, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the virtual meeting of JAGDM. The Chair reminded JAGDM that nominations for the new JAGDM Chair would need to be made known later for discussion.

1.2 The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of Faroes and Greenland), the European Union, the Russian Federation, Iceland and Norway. 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 was adopted without changes.

### **4. Data Exchange Statistics**

4.1 No update.

### **5. NEAFC issues**

#### **a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations**

5.1 No update.

#### **b. Issues Raised by PECMAC**

5.2 The NEAFC Secretariat presented JAGDM 2020-02-06 – NEAFC Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for FLUX Network, asking JAGDM for advice on how NEAFC would need to address its BCP in light of recent experience in existing VMS and the changes in the move over to FLUX ERS, especially in regard to avoiding loss of messages when the system at the NEAFC Secretariat goes down. As the Secretariat has no way to enter these messages received by e-mail or other communications into the NEAFC IT-system.

5.3 In discussion,

It was noted that the European Union had built a system that resent messages quickly after the receiver node goes back up again within a long retry period, but it did not now envisage an automatic detection of 'up time' being developed. It was also noted that the system evolved between Member States that were both the receivers and users of the information was different from that where NEAFC was the interim receiver, where the Contracting Parties with an active inspection platform were the end users of the information. It was noted by some that a system that enabled NEAFC inspectors to be able to ask the flag State (sender) to send the data directly during NEAFC down times would be useful.

The NEAFC Secretariat indicated it would follow up with the European Union to discuss technical issues related to dealing with down time in FLUX. However, JAGDM considered a broader question remained for PECMAC on how to deal with business continuity in particular with regard to the drafting of the text of the BCP to reflect the current limited ability of the Secretariat to forward any messages received as emails, etc., and also with regard to the requirements of the NEAFC Scheme. The NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement provisions, Article 14.1 on technical malfunctions

and Article 14.2 on data exchange formats and data communication systems (covered in detail in Annex IX B of the Scheme) were relevant.

JAGDM **agreed** that: the NEAFC Secretariat would draft a paper to be presented to PECMAC 2, inviting PECMAC to note and comment on the inaccuracies in business continuity arrangements in light of current practice with regard to down times in NEAFC fishing activity communications and the current requirements of the Scheme.

**c. Issues Referred to JAGDM by ERS IMP WG**

5.4 The NEAFC Secretariat presented JAGDM 2020-02-04 – an update on risk management for the NEAFC ISMS, requesting JAGDM to note the progress on addressing the risks highlighted by the NEAFC ISMS gap audit.

5.5 In discussion,

The NEAFC Secretariat agreed it would remove the acronyms or include an acronym key list. It was noted the Secretariat was using Slack as a better way of collaboration in view of increased virtual work.

JAGDM **noted** the: update on risk management for the NEAFC ISMS.

5.6 The NEAFC Secretariat presented JAGDM 2020-02-05 – NEAFC IT Security Policies. The document requested JAGDM to consider the draft policies set out in order for NEAFC to align with the ISO27001 information management security standards. The Secretariat explained that it was not expecting any detailed comments at this meeting, but would appreciate comments to be provided by written procedure. However, the question on the role of JAGDM in advising on such policies needed further attention, including whether JAGDM should sign such policies off or simply to note these leaving sign off to the Secretary of NEAFC.

5.7 In discussion,

It was noted that when the ISMS of NEAFC was introduced, an advisory group under (only) NEAFC existed, having the responsibility of signing such policies off. Then when the group became a joint advisory group, the group had the same responsibility. The group acknowledged that while JAGDM had responsibilities in this regard, it was considered that national System Security Administrators should be the experts to comment in detail, and therefore needed to be approached for another meeting.

JAGDM **agreed** to: provide written comments to the NEAFC Secretariat before 16 October 2020 on the IT security policies and with a separate NEAFC-focused meeting to be held on this topic after the NEAFC Annual Meeting in November 2020. The NAFO participants would be welcome to join as well.

**d. Proposed NEAFC Password requirements (ISMS)**

5.8 The NEAFC Secretariat presented JAGDM 2020-02-03 – Password requirements for NEAFC, explaining that the Secretariat has developed stricter password requirements for the NEAFC website, and requesting JAGDM to approve the proposed upgrade.

5.9 In discussion,

The NAFO Secretariat informed JAGDM that after the recent cyber-attack on one of the Secretariat's Servers, NAFO had been advised that all admin account password should be at least 16 characters. The NEAFC Secretariat noted separate requirements for administrators and the NAFO suggestion would be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the NEAFC Secretariat noted that JAGDM has a

separate website (account) and suggested that it should have a similar password policy as the NEAFC website.

JAGDM **agreed** to: the password requirements upgrade as proposed by the NEAFC Secretariat and that the same password policy should apply to the JAGDM website.

**e. Update to Port State Control (PSC) operational lists**

5.10 The NEAFC Secretariat presented Document JAGDM 2020-02-10 – Harmonisation of operational code lists, seeking guidance from JAGDM on updates/harmonisation of operational code lists with those of the NEAFC Scheme. The Secretariat has reviewed the NEAFC Port State Control operational lists and found disparities between the lists. In the packaging list, bulk fish is coded as BUL, while in the Scheme no bulk fish category exists.

5.11 In discussion,

It was noted that it was important not to create a new code if there was already a code in place. Also, that JAGDM approval at the technical level was important given its knowledge about other code lists etc. It was confirmed that EU and FAO lists currently do include BUL.

JAGDM **agreed** to: propose to PECMAC to add the BUL code to the Type of Packing and Type of Container list, already listed in the NEAFC EPSC Application, into the NEAFC Scheme.

**6. NAFO issues**

**a. Technical implications of Recommendations**

6.1 No update.

**b. Cyber Attack directed at the NAFO Secretariat**

6.2 The NAFO Executive Secretary provided a brief synopsis on the recent cyber-attack against the NAFO Secretariat and noted that further updates would be provided at the NAFO Annual Meeting.

**c. ISMS for NAFO**

6.3 No update

**d. Items Requested by STACTIC**

6.4 The Chair presented JAGDM 2020-02-07, a letter from the Chair of the STACTIC Editorial Drafting Group, requesting advice from JAGDM on documents 2020-02-08 review of Annex II.C and Annex II.D of the NAFO Scheme and document JAGDM 2020-02-09 Review of Annex II.J of the NAFO Scheme.

6.5 In discussion,

JAGDM discussed the removal of the OA code in the VL field of Annexes II.C and II.D and the removal of the limitation to only have the possibility to report the vessel length as rounded to the nearest whole meter in the VL field of Annex II.D.

At this time, JAGDM recommends against both changes for the following reasons:

- 1) NEAFC notifications also contain the VL field, and many Contracting Parties send the same message simultaneously to both NAFO and NEAFC. A change in the content of this field would need to be jointly implemented in both RFMOs in order to maintain harmonisation.
- 2) NEAFC currently does permit another vessel length classification, so the inclusion of OA in the field was still required to differentiate between the two.

- 3) Implementation of a decimal value would require significant technical changes, especially in the event of a loss of harmonisation between the RFMOs. Additionally, given NEAFC's transition to FLUX, there is reluctance to make such changes at this time unless deemed absolutely necessary.

In addition, JAGDM noted the possibility of rounding down rather than up was raised as a potential alternate solution. However, the group noted that there are widespread implications of changing the rounding (whether up or down) within the current NAFO and NEAFC Schemes.

Regarding the updating of gear codes in Annex II.J, JAGDM recommended implementation of the proposed updates, but also recommended that the implementation period established for the change be of sufficient length. As gear codes are used down to the vessel level, the number of systems to be changed would be extensive, and the change could not feasibly be implemented in the time between NAFO's Annual meeting and January 1 of the following year. JAGDM recommended that Contracting Parties be surveyed regarding their internal implementation of the new standard, to allow NAFO to set timelines for implementation which were in line with Contracting Parties capabilities. JAGDM also recommended that, prior to changes being introduced, NAFO consider the implications on NAFO's existing records – whether that data would be updated or a linkage would be created between the old and new codes, and how such updates/linkages would be implemented.

## **7. Election of Chair**

- 7.1 No nomination were received for the role of Chair. This would have to be raised to Heads of Delegation in NEAFC and NAFO for them to discuss a candidate for JAGDM Chair.

## **8. Report to the Annual Meeting.**

- 8.1 NEAFC Contracting Party/Secretariat to report to NEAFC Annual Meeting. JAGDM Vice-Chair/or the NAFO Secretariat would report to the NAFO Annual Meeting.

## **9. Date and place of the next meeting**

- 9.1 Date and place of the next meeting is to be decided in due course.

## **10. Closure of the meeting.**

- 10.1 The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation in the Virtual meeting.