

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

17-18 June 2014
NEAFC Secretariat, London

1.	Opening of the meeting.....	3
2.	Appointment of the rapporteur	3
3.	Discussion and adoption of the agenda	3
4.	Election of Chair and Vice-Chair	3
5.	NEAFC issues.....	3
	5.a. Issues raised by PECCOE.....	3
	5.a.1. Possibility to use “none” and more than one gear type in the mandatory data-element “vessel gear” (GE) on the notification (Annex II.a.1 of the Scheme).....	3
	5.a.2. Possibility to use more than one regulated species in an authorisation and suspension without having to amend the Scheme. The data-element “regulated resource” (RR) of the authorisation and suspension are in Annex II.b.1 and Annex II.b.2 of the Scheme.....	4
	5.b. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS).....	4
	5.b.1. Upgrade to ISO 27001 2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)	4
	5.b.2. The work of the Security System Administrators.....	4
	5.b.3. Information Security Incident Management (ISMS article 13)	4
	5.b.4. Risk management (ISMS article 3) status of the work	5
	5.b.5. Annual review of the NEAFC inventory (ISMS article 7.1)	5
6.	NAFO issues	5
	6.a. Recommendations for adopting an ISMS for NAFO	5
7.	Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)	5
	7.a. Issues raised by a NAF user	5
	7.b. Issue raised by Norway concerning the use of the two-letter code DS (Directed Species) in the NAFO CEM.....	6
	7.c. CCAMLR follow-up on NAF developments.....	6
8.	Management of the websites.....	6
	8.a. JAGDM.....	6
	8.b. NAF.....	7
9.	Any other business	7
	9.a. State of play of standardisation project of data exchange in fisheries	7
10.	Report to the Annual Meetings.....	7
11.	Date and place of next meeting	7
12.	Closure of the meeting	7
	Annex 1. List of Participants.....	8

Annex 2. Agenda.....	9
Annex 3. Draft List of Documents.....	10
Annex 4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair (Agenda Item: 4)	11
Annex 5. Commission for Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) follow-up on NAF development (Agenda Item: 7c)	13
Annex 6. New Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM).....	14
Annex 7. Recommendation for adopting an ISMS for NAFO (Agenda Item: 6a)	15

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

1. Opening of the meeting

The interim Chair, Ellen Fasmer (Norway), opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. The following NEAFC and NAFO Contracting Parties were represented: Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland, the European Union, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation. Both NEAFC and NAFO Secretariats were present. The Chair noted the absence of some NAFO Contracting Parties considering that their presence is important for the development of JAGDM future work.

The list of participants is Annex 1 of this report.

2. Appointment of the rapporteur

The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3. Discussion and adoption of the agenda

The draft agenda (document JAGDM 2014-02-01 rev2) was approved as circulated before the meeting. The agenda is Annex 2 of this report. The list of documents is Annex 3 of this report.

4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The interim Chair described the different tasks and responsibilities of the Chair and Vice-Chair and questioned the participants on their availability to chair JAGDM. The participants expressed their unavailability and the Chair considered that she would address a letter to the Presidents of NEAFC and NAFO on the matter. The letters are Annex 4 of this report.

5. NEAFC issues

5.a. Issues raised by PECCOE

5.a.1. Possibility to use “none” and more than one gear type in the mandatory data-element “vessel gear” (GE) on the notification (Annex II.a.1 of the Scheme)

The Chair introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-03 summarising that since cargo/reefer vessels do not have gear on board the Mandatory Fishing gear reporting obligation cannot be fulfilled.

Also noted that the Secretary proposed in NEAFC SCH 13/28 an interim solution, use the worth “NIL”. Information about this special situation is in the NEAFC Scheme for 2014 presented as footnotes. The implementation of this is done in the IT system at the Secretariat and probably also in the Contracting parties that want to use this code.

Participants elaborated on possible solutions: keeping the interim solution, or start a process to get better coding. Several proposals for better coding were mentioned, but the fact that ERS will have the gear information as part of catch reports means that doing changes to this coding now is not right. It was agreed that the interim solution (“NIL”) should be kept once it is already implemented by the Secretariat and the FMCs concerned.

The possibility of using more than one “vessel gear” in the notification was also discussed.

It was concluded that it would be technically possible to allow more than one gear code in the data-element GE but it was considered not cost effective to change the IT systems. Allowing more than one gear will most likely not add the information wanted. It would be more correct to give the gear information together with the catches as is done in most ERS systems.

5.a.2. Possibility to use more than one regulated species in an authorisation and suspension without having to amend the Scheme. The data-element “regulated resource” (RR) of the authorisation and suspension are in Annex II.b.1 and Annex II.b.2 of the Scheme.

The Chair invited the Russian Federation to introduce document JAGDM 2014-02-04. The proposal to allow more than one species code in the data-element RR was presented noting that if approved this measure would not be imposed on CPs not wishing to use it.

It was agreed to advise that it should be possible to send more than one species code (RR) in the authorisation and suspension reports. Further it was agreed that only minor changes were needed to Annex II (b.1. and b.2.) and to the examples given in Annex IX.C.1. But the IT system at the NEAFC Secretariat must be updated to handle the new reporting possibility in addition to the old one.

5.b. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

5.b.1. Upgrade to ISO 27001 2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)

The Chair introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-05 on the eventual need to upgrade NEAFC’s ISMS in line with the 2013 version of ISO 27001. NEAFC has an ISMS in line with the ISO 27001:2005 standard being the current until September 2013. NEAFC has no ISO certification so it is up to NEAFC to decide if and when the ISMS shall be changed to be in line with the 2013 version of the standard. It was agreed that the Secretariat will identify the areas of the ISMS that will require upgrading and will report to the group at the next meeting. Iceland volunteered to prepare a presentation of the highlights of the 2013 version relevant to the ISMS to be presented at the next meeting.

It was agreed that with these two presentations the group will be in a better position to decide the best way forward.

5.b.2. The work of the Security System Administrators

The Chair reviewed the nomination of Security System Administrators (SSAs) by the CPs. Iceland, the Russian Federation, DFG/Greenland, and Norway already nominated SSAs. The Chair encouraged the other CPs of NEAFC to nominate their representative as soon as possible.

The NEAFC Secretariat informed that from August it will resume the organisation of a meeting of the SSAs.

5.b.3. Information Security Incident Management (ISMS article 13)

The Chair questioned the participants about any known security incidents. The NEAFC Secretariat informed that a system log was created to monitor and register incidents and the response. No incident was reported. The participants discussed the possibility of making such log available to SSAs.

It was agreed that this issue should be discussed at the SSAs meeting and that a framework for Security Incident Management might be useful.

5.b.4. Risk management (ISMS article 3) status of the work

The NEAFC Secretariat explained that there were no recent developments on the establishment of risk levels for the Secretariat or for NEAFC bodies.

The Secretariat will resume work on the risk assessment from August. PECCOE has risk assessment (data classification) on the agenda for its September meeting. PECMAS, the WG Statistics, the Finance and Administration WG and the Future WG will also have to address this issue in the next meetings. A part of the risk management is also the Access control handling. A new role for Observers that will need access for a limited period must be included in the Guidelines Access Control for the NEAFC website document.

5.b.5. Annual review of the NEAFC inventory (ISMS article 7.1)

The NEAFC Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-11 describing the inventory of hardware and software use. Participants questioned the secretariat on data storage security and business continuity. The total description of the NEAFC inventory will only be presented to the Security System Administrators. The one listed in document JAGDM 2014-02-11 from 16/06/2014 is an updated version of the one from 22/08/2013 that can be distributed to the JAGDM members.

6. NAFO issues

6.a. Recommendations for adopting an ISMS for NAFO

Document JAGDM 2014-02-08, the NAFO Secretariat informed that in the last STACTIC it was instructed to start an evaluation of the relevance for NAFO to have an ISMS. It was agreed that the group should give the NAFO Secretariat some thoughts about why NAFO needs an ISMS. This should be done in a short letter to the NAFO Secretariat to be used for presentation at the STACTIC meeting in the NAFO Annual meeting in September. First the chair should write a draft and sent it to the participants of the JAGDM June meeting for comments with deadline one week. The letter sent to the NAFO Secretariat is Annex 7 of this report. Then STACTIC will revise this ISMS issue and the NAFO CPs will decide the go forward or not. If the decision is to go forward, it is also important to decide some main guidelines for the work. The ISMS of NEAFC is in line with the ISO 27001:2005, the current version of this standard since September 2013 is ISO 27001:2013. If possible it is important to know if NAFO will start the work in line with the ISO 27001:2013, follow another standard or not follow any standard. The Chair conveyed to the NAFO Secretariat the availability of JAGDM as a joint group to help on the preliminary work.

If needed a specialised meeting within JAGDM could take place in 2015 to exclusively address NAFOs ISMS obviously including all the CPs.

7. Management of the North Atlantic Format (NAF)

7.a. Issues raised by a NAF user

As a follow-up of what was already discussed in the previous meeting the Chair introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-06 and summarised the exchange of emails with a NAF user, Mr Mark Oates from "Quick Access Computing" Papua New Guinea.

No further follow-up is required.

7.b. Issue raised by Norway concerning the use of the two-letter code DS (Directed Species) in the NAFO CEM

The Chair, as Norway representative, introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-07 describing the recent approval by NAFO of an "authorisation" message (AUT) where the data-element "directed species" (DS) raised implementation problems since the Observer Report(OBR) already has a "directed species" (DS) data-element with a different content. Document JAGDM 2014-02-07 also proposed a solution to the issue. This solution was not fully supported by the group.

The participants agreed that it is important that the description of data-elements in the Annexes of the NAFO CEM is detailed and unique enough to easily be used in IT systems. The AUT data-element DS includes a geographic area in addition to the species and this area is several combinations of known geographical areas. This is a new definition of content of an existing, still used, two-letter code. A duplicated use of code and unclear details will create implementation problems and a technical solution must be found.

It was agreed that there are different technical possibilities to solve the issue. The two-letter code name DS in the AUT report must be changed to avoid misunderstanding and the combinations of areas must be described better. The area description may be done more clearly in the existing Annexes of the NAFO CEM. A possibility is to include the use of a new coding of geographic polygons or combinations thereof, as some CPs already use a new list of polygon codes having some NAFO area combination codes already defined.

EU documents illustrating this coding of geographical polygons can be found Info 1 and 2 under this agenda point.

It was agreed that there is the need to develop a table with geographic polygons reflecting the definitions of NAFO's quota tables.

7.c. CCAMLR follow-up on NAF developments

The NAFO Secretariat introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-09 where CCAMLR Secretariat manifested the interest of following-up the development of NAF.

It was agreed that CCAMLR would be referred as a NAF user in the NAF website and that the Chair would send a letter to invite the CCAMLR Secretariat to attend future JAGDM meetings. The letter is Annex 5 of this report.

It was agreed that the Chair will inform formally other RFMOs, namely SEAFO, ICCAT, IOTC, WCPFC and SPRFMO, about the work of JAGDM as a joint advisory group. The letters are Annex 6 of this report.

8. Management of the websites

8.a. JAGDM

The Chair summarised the recent developments and proposed an exercise of mapping of all the codes used by NAF. EU volunteered to distribute existing code listing (see agenda item 9) and invited other CPs to complement description or add codes as required.

It was agreed to add a NAF tab to the JAGDM website. It was also agreed that on the next JAGDM meeting it would be discussed the best way forward on this matter.

8.b. NAF

The Chair introduced document JAGDM 2014-02-10 containing the improved NAF history drafted by herself as the historical document from the NAF website with track changes. Some text improvements were agreed having the document on the screen, and a rev 1 of the document is uploaded. It was agreed that further additional improvements to the text would be exchanged by email and also addressed on the next JAGDM meeting.

9. Any other business**9.a. State of play of standardisation project of data exchange in fisheries**

The EU representative did a presentation describing the procedures and content of the Project number 1000 of the UN/CEFACT aiming to standardise fisheries data exchange. Participants discussed different aspects of such a project including shortcomings and recent developments. The EU noted the importance of standardisation especially in the future ERS context. The EU invited participants and CPs to cooperate in the project. The EU volunteered to present project developments during the next JAGDM meeting.

Additional information was made available by the EU and is available as meeting documents Info 1 to 4.

10. Report to the Annual Meetings

The Chair will present the summary of the reports from both JAGDM meetings to the Annual Meeting of NAFO in September and NEAFC in November.

11. Date and place of next meeting

The Chair noted that depending on developments in NAFO's ISMS or possible issues raised by PECCOE or STACTIC in their autumn meetings there could be the need to call for a meeting in the first quarter of 2015 with the date and place to be agreed.

Independently of the possibility of have a meeting in the first quarter it was agreed that the group should meet in June 2015 in Canada

12. Closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked the participants for the fruitful meeting and wished all a safe journey home.

The Chair closed the meeting at 16H00 on the 18 June 2014.

Annex 1. List of Participants

Chair Fasmer, Ellen (Last chair of NEAFC AGDC acting until the chair of JAGDM is elected.)

NAFO Secretariat

Kendall, Matt

NEAFC Secretariat

Neves, João

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Gaardlykke, Meinhard

Kruse, Martin

Lund, Mads

European Union

Callewaert, Francky – EC

Eliassen, Jorgen – Denmark

Iceland

Sighvatsdóttir, Elín

Norway

Fasmer, Ellen

Russia

Volkov, Viktor

Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Appointment of the rapporteur
3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
4. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair
5. NEAFC issues
 - a) Issues raised by PECCOE
 - i. Possibility to use “none” and more than one gear type in the mandatory data-element “vessel gear” (GE) of the notification (Annex II.a.1 of the Scheme)
 - ii. Possibility to use more than one regulated species in an authorisation and suspension without having to amend the Scheme. The data- element “regulated resource” (RR) of the authorisation and suspension are Annex II.b.1 and Annex II.b.2 of the Scheme).
 - b) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)
 - i. Upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)
 - i. The work of the Security systems administrators
 - ii. Information Security Incident Management (ISMS article 13)
 - iii. Risk management (ISMS article 3) status of the work
 - iv. Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS article 7.1)
6. NAFO issues
 - a) Recommendations for adopting an ISMS for NAFO
7. Management of the North Atlantic Format
 - a) Issues raised by a NAF user
 - b) Issue raised by Norway concerning the use of the two-letter code DS (Directed Species) in the NAFO CEM.
 - c) CCAMLR follow-up on NAF developments
8. Management of the websites
 - a) JAGDM
 - b) NAF
9. Any other business
10. Report to the Annual Meetings
11. Date and place of the next meeting
12. Closure of the meeting

Annex 3. Draft List of Documents

Document	Agenda Item	Document title
JAGDM 2014-02-00	1	Draft list of documents
JAGDM 2014-02-01	3	Draft Agenda
JAGDM 2014-02-02	-	Draft list of participants
JAGDM 2014-02-03	5.a.i	Description of the interim solution (SCH letter 13/27
JAGDM 2014-02-04	5.a.ii	Document PE 2014-01-24 (The Russian proposal that is the reason for PECCOE to ask JAGDM for advice.
JAGDM 2014-02-05	5.b.i	When and how to upgrade the NEAFC ISMS to be in line with the ISO 27001:2013 version.
JAGDM 2014-02-06	7.a	Questions from a NAF user (JAGDM 2014-01) Copy of emails sent and received on behalf of JAGDM.
JAGDM 2014-02-07	7.b	Norway request-NAF coding problem
JAGDM 2014-02-08	6.a	Information Security and Management System (ISMS) from Static Meeting
JAGDM 2014-02-09	7.c	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) on May 19th, 2014
JAGDM 2014-02-10	8.b	Proposed changes to the history page of www.naf-format.org
JAGDM 2014-02-11	5.b.v	NEAFC Inventory
Info.1		FMZ and Fishing Stocks Geodata v2.2 dataset
Info.2		FMZ available for NAFO
Info.3		NAF 2 FLUX Vessel Position 1p1 mapping
Info.4		Mapping ERS NO RFMO short (3)
Info.5		FLUX VMS IG v02
Info.6		FLUX P1000-7 Vessel Position domain v1-0-0

Annex 4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair (Agenda Item: 4)

As agreed in the JAGDM 2014-02 meeting this e-mail was sent to the presidents of NEAFC and NAFO, hoping to solve the problems with the election of chair and Vice-Chair of JAGDM.

In the Terms of Reference for JAGDM it is stated that the Chair and Vice-Chair shall be elected from among the participants of the group. But a delegate of JAGDM needs a mandate from "home" to be able to step forward to take a chair election. Hopefully this e-mail will result in somebody getting the mandate needed to commit themselves to these roles that is so important for the function of the group.

Copies were sent to: Sylvie Lapointe (Chair of Fisheries Commission NAFO), Gene S. Martin (Chair of STACTIC NAFO), Fred Kingston (Executive Secretary of NAFO), Stefan Asmundsson (Secretary of NEAFC), Gylfi Geirsson (Chair of PECCOE NEAFC).

Fra: Ellen E. Fasmer

Sendt: 31. juli 2014 13:09

Til: 'Johan-H.Williams@nfd.dep.no'; 'jhw@nfd.dep.no'; 'veronika.veits@ec.europa.eu'

Kopi: 'sylvie.lapointe@dfo-mpo.gc.ca'; 'gene.s.martin@noaa.gov'; 'fkingston@nafo.int'; Stefan Asmundsson; Gylfi GEIRSSON

Emne: Election of Chair of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)

Dear Presidents of NEAFC and NAFO

Johan H. Williams

Veronika Veits

As you will know, the Annual meetings of NEAFC and NAFO last year both adopted the establishment of a Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM) to be the successor of the NEAFC Advisory Group for Data Communication (AGDC). I was the last Chair of AGDC.

Following the establishment of JAGDM, I was informally approached by some people regarding the possibility of being the Chair of JAGDM. I made it clear that this was not something I could do. I had already chaired AGDC for some time, and other professional commitments would make it difficult for me to take the role of JAGDM Chair.

However, I volunteered to serve as the interim Chair of JAGDM from 1 January 2014 when the group's establishment would become formally effective until the first JAGDM meeting in March 2014. This to ensure continuity and make it possible for the NEAFC and NAFO Secretariats to have a representative of the Contracting Parties to work with in preparing the first meeting of the new group.

The initial JAGDM meeting was in Halifax in March and went well, but the delegates were unable to elect a Chair. There seemed to have been a lack of consultation before the meeting, both within and among the Contracting Parties, regarding who should and could take the role of Chair and Vice-Chair. I accepted to continue as interim Chair until the second meeting, but appealed to the participants to be prepared to have an election then. I was therefore confident that this issue would be resolved at the June meeting of JAGDM. Unfortunately still no candidates were identified, and the election of Chair and Vice-Chair of JAGDM could not take place. I am still the interim Chair of JAGDM.

I am writing to you to ask you please to consult between the two of you, and with your respective Contracting Parties, to ensure that candidates are identified for the positions of JAGDM Chair and Vice-Chair well in advance of the next meeting of the group. I realise that the joint nature of JAGDM makes this a slightly more complicated issue than regarding groups that are simply NEAFC groups or NAFO groups. However, for JAGDM to function properly it needs to have a Chair and Vice-Chair. It is certainly not a good reflection on the cooperation between the two organisations if it continues to be a problem to find candidates for the chairing that can get authorisation to commit themselves to these roles.

Report of the JAGDM
17-18 June 2014

As I said at the outset, it is not possible for me to continue in the role of Chair. I have nevertheless been doing my best to serve as an interim Chair and will represent the group in the Annual meetings of NEAFC and NAFO this year to present the reports from the two JAGDM meetings, but I am sure you will understand that this is not a situation I can continue with.

I trust that the result of your joint efforts will be that candidates for JAGDM Chair and Vice-Chair will be identified soon. This will hopefully make it possible for such candidates to start working with the two Secretariats to prepare for the next meeting of JAGDM. I can assist in such preparations, as appropriate.

Best regards

Interim Chair of JAGDM
Ellen E. Fasmer

Directorate of Fisheries

Phone: +47 974 29 681

Phone reception from abroad: +47 800 30 179, fax: +47 55 23 80 90

PB 185 Sentrum, 5804 Bergen, Norway

ellen.fasmer@fiskeridir.no

www.fiskeridir.no

Annex 5. Commission for Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) follow-up on NAF development (Agenda Item: 7c)

The NAF secretariat received e-mails in May 2014 from Tim Jones IT manager CCMLAR. The organization is using the North Atlantic Format and want to register interest in this format and be listed as a user in the webpage.

Mail sent 22 August

CCAMLR as NAF user and JAGDM participant

To IT Manager Tim Jones
CCAMLR

Thank you for contacting. Please be informed that the **Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)** since January 2014 has the responsibility for the NAF web page. This group has in its *Terms of Reference* the responsibility to act as the repository for the formats used by NEAFC and NAFO. (www.jagdm.org).

JAGDM had a meeting 17 – 18 June and agreed that it would be correct and useful to have CCAMLR listed as a NAF user on the <http://www.naf-format.org>

The group also has the following in its **Terms of reference** “*The Advisory Group may, as appropriate, invite other RFMOs, and/or intergovernmental organizations to nominate persons with relevant expertise to be participants in the Advisory Group.*”

Please be informed that the Advisory Group decided in their June meeting that CCAMLR will get invitations to the upcoming JAGDM meetings. CCAMLR is welcome to nominate meeting participants if you think that is appropriate and possible to manage.

Best regards

For JAGDM
Ellen E. Fasmer
Interim chair

Annex 6. New Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)

To Secretariats of:

SEAFO
ICCAT
IOTC
WCPFC
SPRFMO

Friday 22 August 2014

North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
22 Berners Street
London W1T 3DY Tel: + 44 0 207 631 0016
Fax: + 44 0 207 149 9950 info@neafc.org www.neafc.org

Re: New Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)

Please be informed that in 2013 NEAFC and NAFO decided to form a **Joint Advisory Group on Data Management**. This group started its work in January 2014 and has the web page www.jagdm.org. It is the successor to the NEAFC *Advisory Group on Data Communication (AGDC)*.

For the purposes of JAGDM, “data management” refers to the design of relevant frameworks and any technical issues related to the generating, storing, transmitting and use of fisheries related data, including data processing, protocols, standards and data security and confidentiality.

According to the *Terms of Reference* the Advisory Group shall consider and evaluate developments in, and issues related to, data management in relation to NEAFC, NAFO and to the extent practical other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs).

The Advisory Group will have at least one meeting each year, and if needed also work electronically to elaborate on issues between meetings.

The Advisory Group shall contribute to a close cooperation regarding data management among the Secretariats of NEAFC and NAFO, and, as appropriate, their cooperation with the Secretariats of other RFMOs.

If your organisation wants to take part in the work of this technical experts Advisory Group, have questions relevant for the Advisory Group to elaborate on, or just have questions according to this new group, please contact the NEAFC or NAFO Secretariats.

Best regards

For JAGDM
Ellen E. Fasmer (Interim chair)

Annex 7. Recommendation for adopting an ISMS for NAFO (Agenda Item: 6a)**Mail sent 22 August**

To the NAFO Secretariat

Bergen 22 August 2014

From JAGDM

At its June 2014 meeting, JAGDM was asked to give advice to the NAFO Secretariat concerning why NAFO needs an Information Security Management System (ISMS).

When the IT-system of NAFO first was developed many years ago, security and confidentiality aspects were addressed by an annex in the CEM. This covered the needs at that time. However, the handling of IT-information in NAFO is no longer limited to sending data between Contracting Parties and the NAFO Secretariat using secure lines and storing data in the computer at the office of the Secretariat.

Moreover, the NAFO website raises further concerns. People with several needs and wishes may want to access and have information presented on the website, and in some cases may also want to input data into the system.

Without an overview and some formalization of the total information handling within NAFO, it is not possible for the Contracting Parties to know what the security and confidentiality policy of the organization is. Currently the NAFO Secretariat has followed its own policies without any guidelines, other than the Annex II.B of the CEM. Although the NAFO Secretariat tries to follow industry standards, it is not clear whether these standards would be acceptable to all Contracting Parties, particularly those that might have different standards in their own countries. This raises risks that certain confidential data may be accessed incorrectly and the organization get negative reactions.

NAFO does not need to have an ISMS in line with a standard such as NEAFC has done. However if NAFO is going to have an overview and formalize its information security it is beneficial if it is done in line with a standard, specially taking into consideration that NAFO has many Contracting parties that might have very different systems in their own countries.

Data stored on the NAFO IT-system largely contains copies of data also stored by the Contracting Parties so new copies of data could be submitted if ever needed. However the Port State data is different. The only copy of this data is only stored on the Secretariat's servers.

In a modern IT-world it is very important to be sure that one has a system that is secure enough to give the organization the decided level of business continuity.

Data has to be classified correctly and from that handled according to the risks identified.

Having an ISMS will not necessarily give the organization a higher or lower level of security, but it makes it possible for the Contracting Parties to know what the status is and from that decide if changes are needed. There will be guidelines for many situations that are meant to help the employees to take the correct decisions.

Preparing the ISMS for NEAFC has been a lot of work and if NAFO is planning an ISMS there has to be people in the Secretariat doing the information-finding job. It is important that one starts with an assessment of the current situation.

Report of the JAGDM
17-18 June 2014

If NAFO wishes to use an international standard we recommend that NAFO follow the same ISO standard as NEAFC uses. This will help harmonization between the two organizations. If so NAFO should most likely use the latest ISO 27001:2013 standard that NEAFC will be updating their ISMS to presently.

Best regards

For JAGDM
Ellen E. Fasmer
Interim chair