



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

21 March 2023
Virtual Meeting

1.	Opening of the meeting.....	2
2.	Appointment of the rapporteur	2
3.	Discussion and adoption of the agenda.....	2
4.	Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair	2
5.	Joint NEAFC/NAFO Issues	2
6.	NEAFC issues.....	3
a.	Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations	3
b.	Issues Raised by PECMAC.....	4
i.	EPSC catches export pilot (for information).....	4
ii.	Issues relating to Code lists	4
c.	NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)	5
i.	Update to data classification and website content access tables	5
7.	NAFO issues	6
a.	Technical implications of Recommendations.....	6
b.	Issues Raised by STATIC	6
c.	Update on NAFO (JAGDM proposal to change COX messages)	6
d.	Update on NAFO Projects	6
8.	Any other business	6
9.	Report to the Annual Meeting.....	6
10.	Date and place of the next meeting	6
11.	Closure of the meeting	6



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

21 March 2023
Virtual Meeting

1. Opening of the meeting

The Vice Chair, Natasha Barbour (Canada), acting as Chair, 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 Russian Federation was represented by the NEAFC Secretariat. The NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats were also present.

The Chair noted several new members in the group and invited them to introduce themselves.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed as rapporteur.

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes, although it was reconfirmed the item on data exchange would be taken in JAGDM 02.

4. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair

The acting Chair explained that there had been no Chair in post in JAGDM since early 2021. In early 2022, JAGDM heads had agreed that the European Union would provide a Chair, with Norway providing a Chair after this period – timing yet to be decided.

Suzana Vodovnik (European Union) was duly nominated and elected by general acclamation. The Contracting Parties thanked the acting Chair for her excellent chairing in the long interregnum between Chairs. Ms Vodovnik took up the Chairing for the rest of the meeting.

The NEAFC Secretary agreed that Natasha Barbour had done a great job working closely with the Secretariat as she acted as Chair at very short notice following the departure of the previous Chair (and the start of the Pandemic). As Ms. Barbour was willing to continue in the role of vice-Chair, she was re-elected by general acclamation.

5. Joint NEAFC/NAFO Issues

[JAGDM-2023-01-03 & JAGDM-2023-01-04](#)

Proposals from EU on updating maximum allowable characters in some NAF data elements (for decision).

The Format for Electronic Exchange of Fisheries Monitoring, Inspection and Surveillance Information sets down the technical specifications (data format, data type, etc.) of the data to be transmitted in NAF messages. The European Union explained that, in developing and testing its internal system on notifications and

authorisations, it had noted that the current provision of the maximum characters limitation for certain fields in Annex IX C1) of the NEAFC Scheme prevents exchanging the complete business information for certain reports. Therefore, it was proposed to extend the maximum number of characters for the relevant fields.

For NAFO the situation was similar; Part C of Annex II.D (Format for electronic exchange of fisheries monitoring information (The North Atlantic Format)) of the NAFO CEM also required amendment to allow for longer character strings to be transmitted in relevant fields in the NAF messages.

JAGDM agreed that the proposals should proceed to PECMAC and STACTIC respectively to make the necessary changes to the Scheme and CEM.

6. NEAFC issues

a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations

[JAGDM-2023-01-08](#)

The NEAFC Secretariat introduced its briefing on the implications of Recommendations 2023: 07, 2023:11 and 2023:13 adopted at the NEAFC 2022 Commission Meeting, which would be likely to require technical changes to implement.

Recommendation 07: 2023 had been adopted to extend the Barents Sea Existing Fishing Area under the Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem recommendation 19:2014. This recommendation meant an update was needed to the NEAFC system which alerted the Secretariat when vessels may be infringing closed or restricted areas. Specifically, the Secretariat maps and alert settings needed updating.

Recommendation 11:2023 had been adopted to improve monitoring and control of transshipment operations at sea. This created a new data type on authorisation on transshipments, the details of which required confirmation. The authorisations would also need to be displayed on the website, requiring something to be built and decisions taken on who would see the data and how errors/omissions/corrections would be handled. A new user group would need to be created if cooperating non-Contracting Parties were to have access to these data. The recommendation also required TRA and POR messages to be shared between Parties irrespective of inspection presence. This went beyond the expected sharing of POR under the ERS Scheme rules and is applicable to the current (NAF) Scheme. The Russian Federation objection to the recommendation also meant that reports needed to be identified by type and sender before sharing. The Secretariat was considering various options on such implementation to discuss with PECMAC. As a first step, it wanted to establish that FMCs will be able to accept and process such NAF messages via their https gateways.

Recommendation 13: 2023 related to the authorisation for landing/transshipping and use of port services prior to the ETA. Specific authorisation before the ETA could be given, but this would not be recorded in the PSC application. While technical changes were not implied, the Secretariat noted that the information on authorisation to land before ETA may be useful to some even though it was not recorded.

In discussion,

In relation to Recommendation 11:2023 The Secretariat explained it was not yet clear what information on authorisations for transshipment would be circulated. Given the recommendation was already adopted, PECMAC would need to clarify expectations under the Scheme. In relation to Recommendation 13:2023, a Contracting Party noted that the information as to what happened at the landing was the most important rather than the timing. **JAGDM noted the updates.**

Report of JAGDM,
21 March 2023

b. Issues Raised by PECMAC

i. EPSC catches export pilot (for information)

The Secretariat demonstrated a pilot for a new functionality for the e-PSC system whereby catch data from multiple authorised PSC forms could be viewed at the same time, filtered, and the results downloaded. All Parties had joined the pilot, but the number of accounts with permission to use the feature was kept low during that phase of development. The demonstration illustrated the filtering and how users could download data for their own analysis.

In discussion,

The Secretariat noted a suggestion by a Contracting Party to extend the export system to include PSC forms that had not yet been authorised, which could for instance be achieved via filter settings. **JAGDM noted the information.**

ii. Issues relating to Code lists

[JAGDM-2023-01-07 on management of code lists](#)

The Secretariat introduced document JAGDM-2023-01-07 on the issue of code lists. In the context of ongoing discussions at ERS Implementation Group, it reminded JAGDM that it had been earlier agreed that the source body was responsible for proposals related to the Master Data Register (MDR) and JAGDM had a role to double check these. However, for international lists for which responsibility lays outside of specific NEAFC Committees and Working Groups as a source body, it was less clear how this process would work. More specifically, the Secretariat explained that while start and end dates were used for local versions of international code lists, there remained the need to harmonise these dates between the European Union and NEAFC as well as any changes to the values of these lists. JAGDM was therefore invited to consider:

- Should there be a standing agenda item on MDR lists in JAGDM?
- Should changes be formally adopted, or could they be implemented without adoption?
- Should the start date/end dates be set when the changes had been formally adopted?
- In the case of FAO_SPECIES should NEAFC use the same data columns as EU?

On location codes similar issues arose. In addition, JAGDM and ERS Implementation Group had agreed that a truncated version of the UN LOCODE should be used with additions of non-LOCODE landing sites from Contracting Parties. However not all Parties had responded in providing such codes. Thus, the exact way in which the LOCATION list would be finalised and its management in the longer term is remained an outstanding issue prior to the launch of FLUX FA reporting. The Secretariat also reported that it had added code lists from the Scheme annexes to the MDR, indicated with a prefix of "NEAFC_", that were unrelated to ERS. JAGDM was asked whether it would be preferential to separate them from the ERS related ones in some way.

The final issue highlighted in the paper related to a Recommendation adopted at the Annual Meeting 2022 which had adopted new species to Annex 1B but had not provided species codes. There was now an issue to harmonise these between the Annex 1B and Annex V where the generic code was used for both.

In discussion,

The European Union agreed that the MDR should be a standing item. It did not think all changes needed to be formally adopted by the Commission, start dates and end dates would need consensus, but not necessarily a formal adoption. The important thing was harmonisation of the codes themselves among all contracting parties. Additional attributes could be different for each Contracting party as they see fit, as long as the relevant attributes used for validation remain harmonized and synchronized. On the use of LOCOCODES, EU noted the

additional work involved to meet the needs of both NEAFC and the UN provision. Its view remains that it was appropriate to use a location code list adapted to NEAFC and its contracting party needs (ie. including landing sites without a UN LOCODE as necessary). Norway noted that the UN List could be used with additional business rules applied to the function attribute to make irrelevant locations (e.g., airports) invalid in NEAFC context. The European Union seconded that approach.

On the mismatch in code for the Portuguese rabbit fish, there was a brief discussion on context for the new entry which did not have a specific FAO code and the difference in purposes for listing in Annex 1B or in Annex V. This was a reminder of the need to look at codes before a change was pushed through listing a stock/species. Two Contracting Parties suggested this needed to be sorted via another body such as PECMAS. The Secretariat confirmed that it could take the issue to PECMAS as needed. Canada indicated it would like to know if it was possible to add a stock code to the FAO ASFIS database.

In the context of the discussion, the European Union also noted that the NEAFC stock code list might be incomplete and might need to be updated for stock code XOS. The Secretariat explained that the NEAFC MDR was harmonised with the EU list, but an update by WG Stats had not yet been reflected in the MDR and the EU lists. This was a good example of a list owned by NEAFC, updated via a recommendation, without the information reaching all interested parties. This supported the view of having a standing item on MDR (also supported by the NAFO Secretariat) to ensure codes fed through to all.

JAGDM concluded that there would be a standing item on the JAGDM agenda to review MDR code lists at least annually and Chair invited Contracting Parties to send to the Secretariat any comments on the individual items raised in document JAGDM-2023-01-07. These comments could then be discussed more thoroughly at the JAGDM meeting planned for May.

c. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

i. Update to data classification and website content access tables

[JAGDM-2023-01-05 Updates to NEAFC ISMS Article 11 &](#)

[JAGDM-2023-01-06 Updates to NEAFC ISMS Article 72](#)

The Secretariat introduced document JAGDM-2023-01-05 which set out changes to the ISMS related to access control and user roles. The additions related to the new export of catch function in the NEAFC EPSC application. The new user role was created for the pilot project and in due course might be finalised as a new permission for 'core' users if the function was adopted by NEAFC. This update would be sent to PECMAC for information.

JAGDM approved the changes to the ISMS for a proposal to the AM 2023. This document will be sent to PECMAC for information, as the user role pertains to PECMAC business.

The Secretariat then introduced document JAGDM-2023-01-06 which set out changes to the ISMS related to information classification. This related to Recommendation 11:2023 which foresaw the new NEAFC data type of a transshipment authorisation. The update would be sent to PECMAC for information.

The separate change mentioned by the Secretariat was to reflect a decision by WGFD to make objections to Recommendations public on the NEAFC website. Yet it was not clear what the public version should look like in terms of details, reasons etc.

JAGDM approved the changes to the ISMS for a proposal to the AM 2023. This document will be sent to PECMAC for information, as the user role pertains to PECMAC business.

Report of JAGDM,
21 March 2023

7. NAFO issues

a. Technical implications of Recommendations

None

b. Issues Raised by STACTIC

None

c. Update on NAFO (JAGDM proposal to change COX messages)

The NAFO Secretariat explained that, following advice from JAGDM, Canada had made a proposal to STACTIC on catch reporting where a vessel was reporting catch on exit (COX) from a different sub area than the one it had originally fished in. The proposal was that the last catch (CAT) message would be used instead in such circumstances. STACTIC was still considering this and awaiting a revised proposal from Canada (and or the European Union).

JAGDM would await an update in due course.

d. Update on NAFO Projects

NAFO was testing a new observer application, with an at-sea trial planned. This would be the current priority before NAFO moves towards developing a similar tool to the NEAFC EPSC.

JAGDM noted the update.

8. Any other business

Nothing raised.

9. Report to the Annual Meeting

The two ISMS updates were noted for reporting to the NEAFC Annual Meeting.

10. Date and place of the next meeting

Date and place of the next meeting was planned, but to be confirmed as 24 May 2023 for the informal SSA meeting and 25 May 2023 for JAGDM.

11. Closure of the meeting

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for an efficient JAGDM meeting after the hiatus of the previous year.