

**Report of the STACTIC Working Group on the Introduction of Flux UN/CEFACT Standard
for fisheries data exchanges in NAFO (WG-FLUX) Meeting**

02 – 03 September 2025
Bristol, United Kingdom

1.	Opening by the Chair, Imogen Smith-Devey (United Kingdom).....	2
2.	Appointment of Rapporteur	2
3.	Adoption of Agenda.....	2
4.	Task 1 – Identify technical developments, and the administrative and economic consequences needed to receive, handle, reply to and preset data in the UN/FLUX standard for	2
	a. The NAFO Secretariat for integration with;	2
	i. The FLUX transport layer	2
	ii. VMS data	2
	iii. ERS Data.....	2
	b. Contracting Parties for integration with;	3
	i. The FLUX transport layer	3
	ii. VMS data	3
	iii. ERS Data.....	3
5.	Task 2 – Consider technical specifications of the system architecture and data flow requirements.....	3
6.	Other Business	4
7.	Adoption of the Report.....	4
8.	Adjournment.....	4
	Annex 1. List of Participants.....	5
	Annex 2. Agenda	6

**Report of the STACTIC Working Group on the Introduction of Flux UN/CEFACT Standard
for fisheries data exchanges in NAFO (WG-FLUX) Meeting**

02 – 03 September 2025
Bristol, United Kingdom

1. Opening by the Chair, Imogen Smith-Devey (United Kingdom)

The Chair (Imogen Smith-Devey) opened the meeting at 11:00 hours (UTC +1) on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, at the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) offices in Bristol, United Kingdom and via Webex. The Chair welcomed representatives from Canada, Denmark (in Respect of the Faroes Islands and Greenland, the European Union, France (in Respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), Iceland, Japan, Norway, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and invited experts from the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) Secretariat (Annex 1).

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

The NAFO Secretariat (Catherine Thompson) was appointed as rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted, as outlined in Annex 2.

4. Task 1 – Identify technical developments, and the administrative and economic consequences needed to receive, handle, reply to and preset data in the UN/FLUX standard for

a. The NAFO Secretariat for integration with;

- i. The FLUX transport layer**
- ii. VMS data**
- iii. ERS Data**

The NEAFC Secretariat shared their experience with FLUX migration. They outlined the required changes to NEAFC's IT systems, their experience with the Transport Layer (FLUX-TL), the preparations for the transition, and the post-FLUX roll out. The NEAFC Secretariat highlighted some of the challenges they encountered with FLUX implementation, such as staff capacity and implementation decisions, which increased administrative costs and complexity at the Secretariat level.

Contracting Parties thanked the NEAFC Secretariat for the presentation and asked several clarifying questions. Contracting Parties discussed the functionality of a hybrid system, meaning some Parties use FLUX and others maintain the NAF format. The NEAFC Secretariat noted that a hybrid system is possible, but more complex. One Contracting Party noted that it may be useful to have a cost comparison between the current NAF format, a singular FLUX system, and a hybrid, NAF/FLUX, system.

During the migration phase of FLUX, the NEAFC Secretariat noted an increase in workload for the Secretariat, however, once the development phase is complete, they anticipate the workload will decrease, as they will be spending less time following up with Parties on queries.

Contracting Parties discussed the potential benefits of FLUX, including increased data accuracy and the potential to track fish at all control points from the catch activity on the vessel to the sale of the fish. The European Union noted that EU domestic legislation allows for enhanced traceability, however, the

administrative measures of the landing country is an important factor for traceability, and this is not consistent across all NAFO Contracting Parties and would not be something required or administered by NAFO.

b. Contracting Parties for integration with;

- i. The FLUX transport layer**
- ii. VMS data**
- iii. ERS Data**

The European Union presented their experience with FLUX, including the implementation components and documents, technical aspects (FLUX standard and transport layer), and challenges and benefits of using FLUX. Contracting Parties discussed the process for creating implementation documents and the Chair asked whether a Blueprint exists for this documentation. The European Union noted that the implementation documents reflect the reporting requirements, therefore they come from the European Union legislation. If NAFO were to create one-to-one reporting requirements, this would make implementation very simple, or this could be an opportunity to enrich the reporting requirements. A question was raised as to whether this could be an opportunity to enhance the reporting requirements in addition to introducing a new data exchange method.

The United Kingdom presented their experience with implementing FLUX, including the data exchange process before FLUX, the Business Domains and Transport Layer, the implementation process, and the challenges and benefits of FLUX. Contracting Parties asked clarifying questions which were technical in nature. One Contracting Party asked about the workload of the Fisheries Monitoring Center (FMC), and the United Kingdom noted that the format does not create an increase in workload.

5. Task 2 – Consider technical specifications of the system architecture and data flow requirements

Contracting Parties reviewed the fishing logbook information outlined in Annex II.A and Annex II.N of the NAFO CEM. The European Union noted that the FLUX standard includes the elements listed in the Annex II.N template, except for NAFO division, however, it was not anticipated to cause any issues with converting all the data to FLUX. Contracting Parties also reviewed the Data Exchange Format and Protocols in Annex II.D of the CEM. There are certain messages, such as the Cross of Boundary (COB) message, that are unique to NAFO, however, FLUX has the flexibility to meet NAFO format requirements if adopted.

Contracting Parties that are not currently using FLUX provided a brief overview of their current methods for data transmission. The United States of America noted that its vessels send the daily reports through the VMS in a free-form email to in-house staff. Staff then enter the data into a vTrack fillable form interface for transfer to the Secretariat. Japan noted that as there is currently only one Japanese vessel operating in the NAFO Regulatory Area, they do not implement a specific data transfer system from the vessel to the FMC. The vessel Master sends the message in NAF format to the FMC via email. Japan currently uses the Excel template to transfer logbook information to the Secretariat. Canada noted that the vessel Master sends their daily reports to the FMC via email which is manually entered and submitted through an internal user interface within the department. The information is then automatically converted to NAF format and sent to the Secretariat. The logbook information is currently transmitted by email to the FMC in the Annex II.N Excel template for review before forwarding the Excel file to the Secretariat.

Contracting Parties reflected on the different approaches to data exchange and the Chair proposed that a mapping exercise be completed to summarize this information. One Contracting Party questioned the utility of undertaking a mapping exercise without a better understanding of approximate costs and approval from the Commission to go forward. Other Contracting Parties suggested that the mapping exercise may inform the cost question. According to most, the mapping exercise is believed to help Parties better understand the specific requirements for FLUX in the NAFO context. The WG-FLUX will continue these discussions in a subsequent meeting, and the Chair noted that both Task 1 and Task 2 remain open. Participants also noted that having a

Report of WG-FLUX,
02-03 September 2025

dedicated technical workshop to review the mapping exercise and share learning would be beneficial to progress these items.

It was **agreed** that:

- **The WG-FLUX report to STACTIC on the outcomes of the meeting.**
- **In advance of the next WG-FLUX meeting, Contracting Parties conduct a mapping exercise to outline the data exchange processes (including formats and technology) of the different NAFO Contracting Parties to assist with further assessment of the requirements and costs associated with FLUX.**
- **Contracting Parties will continue the discussions on a potential hybrid system and the technological, administrative and economic aspects of this approach.**

6. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

7. Adoption of the Report

The report was adopted via correspondence.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 hours (UTC +1) on Wednesday, September 3, 2025.

Annex 1. List of Participants

CHAIR	Smith-Devey, Imogen (United Kingdom) (In-person)
CANADA	Barbour, Natasha Browne, Dion Hickey, Jenelle Robichaud, Paul
DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)	Holm, Jannik Vindt, Christian
EUROPEAN UNION	AF Heurlin, Johanna (In-person) Berzins, Maris Jagt, Milan (In-person) Lathuy, Cédric
ICELAND	Ingibergsson, Jón Gunnar
FRANCE (IN RESPECT OF ST. PIERRE ET MIQUELON)	Michaud, Coralie (In-person)
JAPAN	Batori, Koji Iwano, Taisuke Mitome, Haruki Morimoto, Shiho Suzuki, Hyoue Yatomi, Hidefumi
NORWAY	Wathne, Jens Altern (In-person)
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Tairov, Temur
UNITED KINGDOM	Norman, Gareth (In-person) Plunkett, Bryony Rowland, Chris Set, Jadeson Windebank, James (In-person)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Jaburek, Shannah Pohl, Katie Provencher, Eric
INVITED EXPERTS	Lewsley, Rachel (NEAFC Secretariat) Early, Anthony (NEAFC Secretariat)
NAFO SECRETARIAT	Aker, Jana Benediktsdóttir, Brynhildur Kendall, Matt Laycock, DJ Thompson, Catherine

Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chair, Imogen Smith-Devey (United Kingdom)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Task 1 – Identify technical developments, and the administrative and economic consequences needed to receive, handle, reply to and preset data in the UN/FLUX standard for:
 - a. The NAFO Secretariat for integration with;
 - i. The FLUX transport layer
 - ii. VMS data
 - iii. ERS Data
 - b. Contracting Parties for integration with;
 - i. The FLUX transport layer
 - ii. VMS data
 - iii. ERS Data
5. Task 2 – Consider technical specifications of the system architecture and data flow requirements.
6. Other Business
7. Adoption of the Report
8. Adjournment