



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

26 May 2021  
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
	a. NAFO .....	2
	b. NEAFC.....	2
5.	NEAFC issues .....	3
	a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations .....	3
	i. Recommendation 13:2021; amendment to the NEAFC Scheme to add an option to the backup procedures. ....	3
	ii. 2021 Recommendations regarding the implementation of the Electronic Reporting System. ....	3
	b. Issues Raised by PECMAC .....	3
	i. Introducing the NEAFC Master Data Register.....	3
	ii. NEAFC Master Data Register – review of code lists .....	3
	iii. Adding PSC Species to Annex V of NEAFC Scheme .....	4
	c. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS) .....	5
	i. Update on upgrade to ISO 27001:2013; Security Policies .....	5
	ii. Risk management (ISMS article 3).....	5
	iii. Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS article 7.1).....	5
	iv. ISMS Incident Log.....	6
6.	NAFO issues.....	6
	a. Technical implications of Recommendations .....	6
	b. ISMS for NAFO.....	6
	c. Items Requested by STACTIC .....	6
7.	Any other business.....	6
8.	Election of Chair.....	6
9.	Report to the Annual Meeting.....	6
10.	Date and place of the next meeting.....	6
11.	Closure of the meeting .....	7



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

26 May 2021  
Virtual Meeting

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

- 1.1 The Vice Chair, Natasha Barbour (Canada), opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the virtual meeting of JAGDM.
- 1.2 The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom. The NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats were also present.
- 1.3 The Chair noted in her opening remarks the great contribution of Ellen Fasmer (Norway) – now retired - to the work of JAGDM and its predecessors.

### **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, although some re-ordering of points was agreed to facilitate discussion.

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

#### **a. NAFO**

- 4.1 The NAFO Secretariat presented its data on fishing days at sea in the NAFO area (document JAGDM 2021-01-12)
- 4.2 After a brief query, JAGDM noted the presentation by the NAFO Secretariat.

#### **b. NEAFC**

- 4.3 The NEAFC Secretariat presented its data exchange statistics overview (document JAGDM 2021-01-13) together with a more detailed analysis (document JAGDM 2021-01-14).
- 4.4 The Secretariat noted that the departure of the United Kingdom from the European Union had more than doubled the number of entries under the Port State Control system. An additional change in the figures reflected the move from NAF-based position reports to FLUX-based ones for the European Union.
- 4.5 In discussion, JAGDM enquired about the numbers of denials of PSC forms, which were subsequently followed by resubmission of a new form leading to authorisation to land.

- 4.6 **In conclusion, it was agreed that the NEAFC Secretariat would carry out an analysis of denials of forms and subsequent re-submission of new forms and succeeding authorisations. This would be presented to JAGDM, and also to PECMAC if of interest.**

5. **NEAFC issues**

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

[JAGDM-2021-01-03\\_tech-implications-of-neaft-recommendations](#)

i. ***Recommendation 13:2021; amendment to the NEAFC Scheme to add an option to the backup procedures.***

ii. ***2021 Recommendations regarding the implementation of the Electronic Reporting System.***

- 5.1 The NEAFC Secretariat presented information on the technical implications of 2021 Recommendations adopted by its Annual Meeting (document JAGDM 2021-01-03). The first of these Recommendations added a backup procedure for PSC forms to be sent by e-mail when the e-PSC system was unavailable (a very rare occurrence). The second group of Recommendations covered the implementation of the new ERS system in NEAFC. Provision had been made for 2 versions FLUX Fishing Activities (FA) with either time of sending or time of acceptance to be used as a time stamp. Three systems (NAF, ERS FLUX FA version 1 and ERS FLUX FA version 2) would run in parallel until all Contacting Parties have moved to a FLUX version that included the date and time of transmission data element.

**JAGDM noted the update**

b. **Issues Raised by PECMAC**

i. ***Introducing the NEAFC Master Data Register***

[JAGDM-2021-01-04\\_NEAFC\\_MDR\\_Introduction](#)

[JAGDM-2021-01-09\\_iso-progress-summary](#)

- 5.2 The Secretariat explained the use of a Master Data Register (MDR) by NEAFC in the context of the ERS (document JAGDM 2021-01-04). The code lists use by NEAFC were now being moved into the MDR with appropriate links provided in the NEAFC Scheme. Advice was sought from JAGDM on how to harmonise lists with similar existing lists at the European Union. This would not only deal with existing species, location and territories lists, but agreeing a protocol, versioning and distribution to deal with future lists.

ii. ***NEAFC Master Data Register – review of code lists***

[JAGDM-2021-01-05\\_NEAFC\\_MDR-Code-List-Management](#)

**Species code:**

- 5.3 The European Union explained that there were no discrepancies between the EU list of species and that of AFSIS, additional species were just a record of older codes used. It advised the Secretariat (supported by other JAGDM members) that the full AFSIS list should be used; this would save effort in continually needing to update a shorter list based only on regulated species. On the concern expressed by other members of JAGDM on codes entered in error, it was noted that warnings ‘for review’ could be used to highlight potential errors without risking rejecting valid catch messages.
- 5.4 **JAGDM noted the above explanation for apparent discrepancies between EU and AFSIS lists, as well as the advice to keep a full list of species with a warning system to alert for errors in codes.**

### Location Code:

- 5.5 The European Union and Norway explained that the UN had so far not included smaller ports with location codes, which explained the difference between the EU list and the UN/LOCODE. It was also noted that business rules could be developed to exclude internal ports/airports, as well as the option of using geographical references or specific NEAFC codes. In terms of an option to restrict location code lists to only the NEAFC region, it was noted that for reefer vessels a wider list would be needed.
- 5.6 **In conclusion, it was agreed that the aim should be to end up with an MDR location code list that included the UN/LOCODE and any additional ports needed by NEAFC (i.e. equivalent to the EU MDR with any additional ports needed, and any duplications removed). Business rules could be used to remove any additional codes, such as airports.**
- 5.7 **The Secretariat would first carry out an analysis of the UN/LOCODE and additional location codes used by the Contracting Parties/NEAFC and report back to JAGDM.**

### Territories

- 5.8 The NEAFC Secretariat explained that the MDR Territory code list included 5 locations more than the ISO Code country code list. The Contracting Parties noted that the 4 sub-regions of the NEAFC international waters would need to be included along with some other potential codes. The Secretariat explained that it could use the current MDR list and would need also to understand how the locations operated within the new ERS application.
- 5.9 **JAGDM agreed that the MDR should go ahead with inclusion of the longer territories list. At the same time a structured approach to decisions to add locations would need to be developed.**

### Code List Management; Protocol:

- 5.10 JAGDM discussed a protocol on code list management. The European Union explained it no longer used versioning information for code lists, but instead used date-based validation periods. This retained historic information. Other JAGDM members agreed that such a date-based approach was useful, but also that such lists needed to be distributed and maintained. It was also explained that changes could be agreed by Recommendations on the NEAFC Scheme then communicated by distribution lists and publication. The European Union added that Webservices based on FLUX could allow queries on historic codes. In terms of process, it was suggested it was important to have a single owner of code lists. If for instance a Working Group such as NEAFC Statistics proposed content, a decision on adoption and start and end date could be agreed by JAGDM as owner of the code list.
- 5.11 **In conclusion, JAGDM agreed that a proposition for a change/update to a code list should come from the NEAFC body needing to make the change but JAGDM would then need to examine the proposal for technical issues. The proposal could then be forwarded to the Annual Meeting for adoption as a Recommendation. JAGDM agreed that, rather than versioning, a start date and end date should be used. The Secretariat was tasked to double check on all code list ownership in case of conflicts with the above proposal.**

### *iii. Adding PSC Species to Annex V of NEAFC Scheme*

#### [JAGDM-2021-01-06\\_Species-listed-in-EPSC-not-in-AnnexV](#)

- 5.12 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2021-01-06, explaining the background to an established process for automatically forwarding codes in use in NEAFC PSC application to JAGDM for assessment regarding their formal inclusion into the NEAFC Scheme. In most recent years this had involved the inclusion of a few stocks each year, however due to changes in patterns of fisheries landings

following Brexit, there was now an addition of about 162 species to the existing species list in Annex V of 118 stocks. The Secretariat also explained that fishing activity reporting under FLUX would use the FAO AFSIS list of fish species.

- 5.13 In discussion, there was support for the use of the complete AFSIS list, but with automatic warnings if wrong codes were entered. This was thought preferable by some to adding stocks in a piecemeal fashion. This would however also require consideration of how to manage drop-down lists in the PSC application to make these manageable. The code MZZ for non-specified fish below 50 kg catch would also need consideration.
- 5.14 **JAGDM agreed to add the current further 162 species to the PSC application with relevant changes made in the NEAFC Scheme Annex V. It would also propose to PECMAC that the full AFSIS list should then be adopted into the Scheme Annex V. The Secretariat should at the same time investigate how best to implement a full list within the electronic PSC system.**

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

[JAGDM-2021-01-011\\_Info-sec-summary](#)

- 5.15 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2021-01-11, a summary of standing items and actions related to the ISMS. This included an update on the ongoing review of security policy, risk management, the NEAFC information system inventory and the incident log. No further items had been identified by an Internal Security Review by the Secretariat.
- 5.16 JAGDM noted the overview. Detailed discussion of the key points followed in subsequent agenda sub-items.

#### ***i. Update on upgrade to ISO 27001:2013; Security Policies***

- 5.17 The NEAFC Secretariat updated the meeting on the review of security policies and management actions that was helping NEAFC making progress towards aligning with ISO 27001:2013. The Security Policy Review group with experts from Contracting Parties was playing the key role in this, reviewing 17 out of 25 policies so far. The Secretariat noted that the current Statement of Applicability (SOA) remained too wide and too detailed, for an organisation such as NEAFC. It was therefore continuing work into 2022 to harmonise the SOA with the ISMS and contextualizing work. The external audit on the corporate environment had already been responded to on high priority issues, such as closing down the outlook web service and carrying out IT security awareness training for staff.
- 5.18 JAGDM noted the update.

#### ***ii. Risk management (ISMS article 3)***

[JAGDM-2021-01-08\\_risk-assessment](#)

- 5.19 The NEAFC Secretariat presented the detail of the NEAFC Risk assessment framework (document JAGDM 2021-01-08), which included 20 risks and their impact/likelihood ratings.
- 5.20 JAGDM noted the details within the framework.

#### ***iii. Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS article 7.1)***

- 5.21 JAGDM had noted earlier the key points in document JAGDM 2021-01-11.

#### ***iv. ISMS Incident Log***

[JAGDM-2021-01-010\\_incidnetlog](#)

- 5.22 The NEAFC Secretariat presented the ISMS incident log (document JAGDM 2021-01-10), which included incidents related to data forwarding to active inspectors; PECMAC documents release; and on Linux server patching.
- 5.23 JAGDM noted the incident log

### **6. NAFO issues**

#### **a. Technical implications of Recommendations**

#### **b. ISMS for NAFO**

#### **c. Items Requested by STACTIC**

- 6.1 No papers were tabled under these items.
- 6.2 In response to a query as to whether it was possible to implement an electronic Port State Control in NAFO, the NAFO Secretariat explained there was a plan to do so. However, a timeline had yet to be established to do this.

### **7. Any other business**

[JAGDM-2021-01-07\\_JAGDM-Output-to-NEAFC-2020](#)

- 7.1 The NEAFC Secretariat presented a summary of JAGDM 2020 outputs to NEAFC (document JAGDM 2021-01-07). It pointed out that some actions were ongoing. These included implementing a new password policy for NEAFC and JAGDM websites, developing a policy on archiving operational data and a delayed adoption of a draft Recommendation to update references in the ISMS to the PSC publicly accessible pages.
- 7.2 JAGDM noted the update.

### **8. Election of Chair**

- 8.1 JAGDM discussed the apparent inability to find a Chair for the joint group since the departure of Leifur Magnusson (Iceland)
- 8.2 **The European Union, Norway and the United Kingdom indicated they would each discuss the issue at their home administrations, including the possible need for an extraordinary meeting. The Secretariat would liaise with these parties to provide any required information.**

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

- 9.1 The Vice-Chair would update NAFO, while the Vice-Chair (or NEAFC Secretary on behalf of the Vice-Chair) would update NEAFC.

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

- 10.1 Date and place of the next meeting was planned to be held after NAFO Annual Meeting and PECMAC 2, so on **Tuesday 12 October 2021.**

**11. Closure of the meeting**

- 11.1 The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their positive and effective participation in the virtual meeting.