



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

26 October 2021
Virtual Meeting

1.	Opening of the meeting	2
2.	Appointment of the rapporteur.....	2
3.	Discussion and adoption of the agenda.....	2
4.	NAFO issues	2
i.	Issues Raised by STACTIC	2
5.	NEAFC issues	3
i.	NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS), upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 and managing the existing ISMS.	3
ii.	JAGDM and other NEAFC structures to support information security	3
iii.	Amendment to ISMS Article 7.2.....	4
iv.	The implications of also referencing ASFIS in the NEAFC Scheme or NAFO CEM – including update on PECMAC discussions on Annex V of the Scheme.	4
v.	Comparison of NEAFC Scheme Annex IV & FLUX Fishing FA doc.....	4
vi.	Analysis of denied forms in NEAFC Port State Control (PSC)	4
vii.	Other code list issues.....	5
6.	Any other business.....	6
7.	Election of Chair	6
8.	Report to the Annual Meeting	6
9.	Date and place of the next meeting.....	6
10.	Closure of the meeting.....	6



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

26 October 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.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

- 1.3 The NAFO Secretariat was appointed as rapporteur with the support of the NEAFC Secretariat.

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda

- 3.1 The agenda was adopted without changes.

4. NAFO issues

i. Issues Raised by STACTIC

[JAGDM-2021-02-03_stacticwp21-36_PossibleClarificationRAinCOX](#)

- 4.1 The NAFO Secretariat presented JAGDM-2021-02-03, containing STACTIC WP 21-36, clarifying the Relevant Area (RA) field in the Catch On Exit (COX) message to ensure there are no technical issues with the proposal. The European Union noted that more consultations are required with their member states to determine if there are any potential technical issues if an onboard report system automatically assigns the RA field. A participant raised a technical implication of fishing in multiple relevant areas since the RA field is suited for only one relevant area. However, Canada clarified that the NAFO CEM defines a means to submit Catch message(s) (CAT) in addition to the COX when there were catches in multiple relevant areas.
- 4.2 Currently, for NEAFC, only the last catch needs to be reported in the COX. In the new scheme, the prior notification of exit message will include all the catches in the fishing trip. Also, for NAFO the RA field is mandatory, but for NEAFC, the RA field is optional in the COX unless management measures require it.
- 4.3 **In conclusion, it was agreed to continue discussions at the next JAGDM meeting to allow the EU more time to research the technical implications of the proposal. The goal is to provide a response to STACTIC before their next meeting in May 2022.**
- 4.4 Based on agenda item 4.1, there was a preliminary, high-level discussion concerning the consistency of the COX messages between NEAFC and NAFO. The NEAFC Secretariat suggested the new FLUX system

should be taken into consideration in the analysis. The FLUX system's equivalent to the COX message is named Area Exit.

4.5 In conclusion, it was agreed that the JAGDM Vice-chair would confirm with the STACTIC Chair what specific information STACTIC wants to receive from JAGDM. Once verified, the NAFO Secretariat will conduct a complete analysis of the COX messages, including the FLUX Area Exit message. At the next JAGDM meeting, the NAFO Secretariat will present the research.

5. NEAFC issues

i. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS), upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 and managing the existing ISMS.

5.1 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document (JAGDM 2021-02-04). The paper described the process of updating the NEAFC ISMS, based on the ISO27001:2013 standard. It was expected that a new structure for the ISMS based on the 2013 standard would be clearer in 2022. The Secretariat therefore invited JAGDM to note also that while day-to-day attention on information and systems security continued in the Secretariat, routine reviews and updates to the existing ISMS would be frozen until the new ISMS based on ISO 2013 was in place. JAGDM was also invited to agree to the update of the NEAFC IT inventory (a routine and necessary task under the ISMS) by correspondence by the end of 2021.

5.2 JAGDM agreed that the current ISMS routine updates would be put on hold until a clearer structure for the ISMS was developed in 2022, based on ISO 27001:2013. It also agreed but on that the IT inventory update could be agreed by correspondence with JAGDM by the end of 2021.

ii. JAGDM and other NEAFC structures to support information security

5.3 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document (JAGDM 2021-02-05). This was linked to the previous discussion on the ISMS update. The ISMS set out clear roles for the Secretariat, Contracting Parties and the relevant NEAFC Committees and JAGDM, however over the last years some gaps were appearing in these roles and responsibilities. These were particularly highlighted in the lack of a Chair for JAGDM over two years and also that the Security System Administrators (SSA) group had not met since 2017. Given the important role these two groups played in the ISMS, the paper offered several options, including the re-creation of an SSA like group and/or for JAGDM to reformulate its structure or format to help address these issues.

5.4 In discussion, there was some support for re-instating a specialist group on information system issues, but also consideration of JAGDM including such expertise. Another Party noted that strategic concerns should drive the data security approach. The NEAFC Secretariat also noted that implementation of systems cost money, and the ERS and ISO standard were driving the need for more discussion and consideration of issues. It was also noted that the current informal experts' group advising the Secretariat on the development of ISO style information security policies could play a role in the future, or be formalized as a replacement SSA group (noting also the previous experience of the SSA group had to be taken into account to avoid a repeated failure).

5.5 In conclusion, JAGDM noted that the SSA group was already mandated in the ISMS so its re-creation would not require any special authorisation or procedure. Nevertheless, it was agreed that a strategic discussion meeting would be useful for JAGDM to consider its own structure and functions including how these may relate to a reinstated SSA group. This meeting was pencilled in for a 2-hour slot at on 13th January 2022 from 12:30 UTC. In the meanwhile, Contracting Parties were asked to nominate suitable experts for an SSA like group/function which would be

formalized as a group (or merged with JAGDM membership) as appropriate following the strategic discussion in January. Nominations of experts were requested by 26 November 2021.

iii. Amendment to ISMS Article 7.2

5.6 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2021-02-06 explaining this was a minor amendment to the ISMS agreed last year but by error not put up as a Recommendation to the NEAFC 2020 Annual Meeting. JAGDM 1 2021 had agreed to forward this to NEAFC AM 2021, however in the interim another minor update was needed to reflect further small changes in the NEAFC Port State Control publicly accessible pages.

5.7 JAGDM agreed that JAGDM 2021-02-06 should be forwarded to the NEAFC Annual Meeting as a proposal for a Recommendation to amend Article 7.2, Annex 1 of the ISMS.

iv. The implications of also referencing ASFIS in the NEAFC Scheme or NAFO CEM – including update on PECMAC discussions on Annex V of the Scheme.

5.8 The NEAFC Secretariat updated JAGDM on the insertion of a reference to the FAO ASFIS list to Annex V of the Scheme, to be a recommendation at the AM 2021. The Secretariat enquired as to the experience of NAFO in inserting a similar reference in its Scheme of Control.

5.9 JAGDM noted the update and invited Contracting Parties and the Secretariats to provide any information of relevance to this issue. The next meeting of JAGDM would then consider any such information.

v. Comparison of NEAFC Scheme Annex IV & FLUX Fishing FA doc

5.10 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2021-02-08 and its annex. JAGDM was asked to examine the NEAFC Scheme Annex IV in light of the ERS FLUX Fishing Activities Implementation Documents that had been adopted by NEAFC over the last few years. The implementation documents potentially required some further changes to be introduced into the version of Annex IV that had preceded them. Furthermore, a question was raised as to whether the text needed to respond to a likely additional readership now that IT developers' information was set out there.

5.11 In discussion, it was explained that the document presented included a comparison of the relevant parts of the Scheme and the ERS FLUX Implementation Documents. The aim was a for Contracting Parties to double-check the Secretariat's understanding of how the Scheme text needed updating in respect of the Implementation Documents, with no expectation of new formal recommendations being needed.

Various elements of the text were clarified in response to questions. This included a reference to transmission date and time, the potential need for a footnote, whether the Master Data Register reflected the two versions of the Implementation Document, and the use of POR messages for information on transshipments.

5.12 JAGDM agreed that Contracting Parties should send queries and suggestions to the NEAFC Secretariat by 26 November. These should be compiled and presented to the next meeting of ERS Implementation Group for further detailed consideration/finalization of the text. The text would not need further consideration by JAGDM.

vi. Analysis of denied forms in NEAFC Port State Control (PSC).

5.13 The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2021-02-07 which was an analysis of denied forms under the NEAFC PSC. JAGDM 1 2021 had requested this analysis in relation to the NEAFC PSC and the FAO PSMA. The document set out the numbers of PSC forms denied and their subsequent re-submission as new forms and authorisation of entry to port. The Secretariat explained the process by which it linked

denied forms to those it considered subsequently authorised. Reasons for denials were set out in order to help JAGDM understand why such forms were renewed and re-authorised.

In discussion, a Contracting Party noted that the analysis could usefully consider a longer period for linking forms submitted by the same vessel. This was because many vessels could apply for entry close to an ETA deadline and then re-submit a new form for a later ETA. The Secretariat agreed that such analysis could be interesting as well as consideration of the subsequent re-submissions of forms for landing at another port.

- 5.14 JAGDM concluded by asking the Secretariat to extend the analysis to consider the possibility of the resubmission of a request for a port entry at a later date, taking into account the relevant deadlines, to see how this increased the identified numbers of subsequently authorised forms, also to break the report down to the Port State level. This would then be put to PECMAC 2022 for consideration.**

vii. Other code list issues

- 5.15 The NEAFC Secretariat updated JAGDM on its task of including the full ASFIS list of species in the electronic PSC system.

5.16 It was agreed that this did not need further consideration by JAGDM

- 5.17 On UN/LOCODE, the Secretariat indicated its preliminary analysis had been done but further clarification was needed on the scope of the analysis. It was also preparing a list of pros and cons on the proposed use of business rules to validate LOCATION. The Secretariat will be contacting Contracting Parties on user defined LOCOCODES for inclusion. The Secretariat will present all this in a paper to the next JAGDM.

5.18 JAGDM indicated it was happy with the approach set out by the NEAFC Secretariat.

- 5.19 The Secretariat explained there were two data lists that had been identified under ownership of other groups than JAGDM (as the owner of the Master Data Register-MDR). These were the Scheme Annex I - Regulated Resources, under PECMAC and the Recommendation 02/2011 Monthly Statistics Annexes,

under WG Statistics. It would be useful to have a discussion between these two groups and JAGDM as to how to operationalize data ownership and management between them.

5.20 JAGDM agreed that correspondence should be initiated with PECMAC and WG Statistics Chairs on how best to manage the relevant data list ownership and the MDR. The vice-Chair of JAGDM agreed to kindly undertake this correspondence in the absence of a Chair.

6. Any other business

6.1 There was no other business.

7. Election of Chair

7.1 There were no volunteers or nominations for the Chair position. At the JAGDM strategic meeting, scheduled for mid-January, the absence of a Chair will be on the meeting agenda.

7.2 The NEAFC Secretary plans to again raise the absence of a JAGDM Chair with the Head of Delegations.

8. Report to the Annual Meeting

8.1 The Vice-chair will provide the update at the next NAFO STACTIC Meeting. Based on availability, the Vice-chair will report to the upcoming NEAFC Annual Meeting; otherwise, the NEAFC Secretary will provide the update on the Vice-chair's behalf.

9. Date and place of the next meeting

9.1 The next meeting will to hosted by the NEAFC Secretariat on **March 22–23, 2022**. It will be determined closer to the meeting date if the meeting will be conducted in-person or virtually.

10. Closure of the meeting

10.1 The Vice-chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their positive and effective participation in the virtual meeting.