JOINT ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA MANAGEMENT (JAGDM)
March 17, 2020 – NEAFC Secretariat, Virtual meeting

REPORT

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1   The NEAFC Secretary, Darius Campbell opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the fully virtual meeting of JAGDM. He explained that the Chair had resigned his post in the Icelandic administration and the Vice-Chair was also unable to chair the meeting. Given the exceptional circumstances, including the coronavirus outbreak, this left JAGDM without a Chair for this particular meeting; the Secretary offered to chair, if no objections. Participants were content that the Secretary could chair this meeting as an exception, and there were no objections from Contracting Parties.

1.2   The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of Faroes and Greenland), the European Union (EU), the Russian Federation and Norway. The NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats were also present.

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 document JAGDM 2020-01-15 on messages and reports (VMS Stats) received by the NAFO Secretariat. This is a general overview of volume of data being submitted by NAFO Contracting Parties in 2019 and total messages stored for the past 10 years.

4.2   JAGDM noted the report without further discussion.

b. NEAFC

4.3   The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-04 NEAFC VMS Statistics in 2019. The document showed the number of messages and reports accepted by type in 2019 and reports cancelled by type of report in 2019. There were well over 475 thousand messages and reports stored in the NEAFC MCS database in 2019.

4.4   JAGDM noted the report without further discussion.

4.5   The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-05 – NEAFC Data Exchange Statistics 2019: Analysis of Return Messages. This document was designed to give better understanding of how the system was performing overall. Through pie charts of position, catch and activity and registry messages.

4.6   JAGDM noted the report without further discussion.

4.7   Finally, the NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-06 VMS Annual Activity. The document was a summary of annual activity, showing number of vessels sending POS by month and vessel sending catch and activity report by month, in 2019.

4.8   JAGDM noted the report following some clarifications.

5.   NEAFC issues

a. Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations

5.1   The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-09 – Technical Implications of Implementing 2019 NEAFC Recommendations. This document is a standing item on the JAGDM agenda and in 2019 there were two recommendations listed below:

- Recommendation 12:2020 to amend the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement in order to make lists of notified and authorised vessels publicly available on the NEAFC website;
- Recommendation 19:2020 to amend the Internal Registration Numbers (IR) Format in NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement.

5.2   In discussion, the Chair informed participants that the list of notified and authorised vessels was now publicly available on the NEAFC website. The NAFO Secretariat believed this was a work in progress in NAFO. The NEAFC Secretariat volunteered to share experience with NAFO as needed.

5.3   JAGDM noted the report.

i.   Update to ISMS-minor adjustments following Rec. 22:2020

5.4   The NEAFC Secretariat informed participants on some minor adjustments to the ISMS Article 7.2 amendments under Recommendation 22:2020. The Secretariat explained Recommendation 22:2020 as adopted had included some minor errors in the version with tracked changes submitted to the Annual Meeting of NEAFC and thus the Secretariat used text from the original proposal adopted by JAGDM in document 2019-02-07 to correct these minor errors (as well as logging the relevant details in its files).

5.5   JAGDM noted the information and that this now meant the ISMS had accordingly been corrected on the website.

b. Issues Raised by PECMAC

i.   Confirming PSC Species

5.6   This is a standing item on the JAGDM agenda for an update on any additions needed to the list of fish species on the PSC system and Annex V of the NEAFC Scheme.

5.7   JAGDM noted that there were no requests from Contracting Parties in 2019 to add species.

ii.   Business Continuity Plan for FLUX network

5.8   The Chair presented document JAGDM 2020-01-12 – Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for FLUX Network. This had been preceded by a detailed presentation by European Commission on its FLUX TL system (see below). The presentation and subsequent discussion covered many of the elements of the paper on procedures to ensure resilience and avoiding loss of messages. The remaining issues for discussion were whether the BCP adequately described the procedure to deal with down time, including looking forward to Version 2 of ERS, as well as whether it adequately describing the fall back procedure.

5.9   In discussion,
Contracting Parties noted some small changes to the BCP text to improve it. However such changes were not considered time critical since the BCP was already adequately implemented in the ISMS Article 14.2.2.

> **JAGDM agreed that the NEAFC Secretariat could draft some minor improvements to the BCP text, taking on board its comments. JAGDM would keep the document under review and come back to it at future meetings to see if the changes met a threshold to formally propose an amendment of the ISMS.**

c. Issues Referred to JAGDM by ERS IMP WG

i.   Issues of Business Rules on Duplicates for a final proposal

5.10   The Chair presented document JAGDM 2020-01-11 – Duplicates in NEAFC ERS System. A discussion on how to implement duplicate checking in NEAFC ERS has been ongoing through NEAFC ERS WG and JAGDM since October 2018. Now, following further consideration by the ERS-IMP on

proposed additions to Version 2 of ERS FLUX, the issue has now been returned to JAGDM for consideration on the next steps/a proposal in order to build a robust set of business rules to identify duplicates.

5.11   In discussion,
It was clarified that individual TL messages (envelopes) were given unique identifier numbers ("operation number"). This avoided duplication of TL messages, however it did not mean the contents of the TL Message did not contain duplication as only the envelope not the contents were checked by the FLUX Transportation Layer. It was also noted that the text in the JAGDM document on "a basic two level identifier check as the duplicate check" was from earlier documentation and not applicable. The EU also clarified that within the EU duplicated identifiers of FLUX ERS business messages were rejected (by business rules) and that FA reports with duplicated identifier were ignored (only the first report is kept). It was further agreed that any duplication tests would need to be set up as business rules for the contents of the messages (such as catch data) rather than at the FLUX TL level.

> **JAGDM agreed** that the business rules for the content of the ERS messages should be returned to ERS-IMP with the conclusion that the TL layer would not do the duplicate check on message content. JAGDM requested the NEAFC Secretariat to prepare a draft analysis paper (with support of any Contracting Party willing to do so) to come up with a more concrete proposal for business rules on duplicates, in particular on catch reporting.

ii.   FLUX TL

5.12   The EU presented document JAGDM 2020-01-17 FLUX TL – EU Presentation, providing information on FLUX TL. The detailed presentation would be circulated to participants.

5.13   In discussion,
The European Union explained that the system was able to detect when the recipient party was receiving messages, but resent messages after a downtime would not follow the same order as they were sent to the forwarding node. Only after the time out period (i.e. after more than 72 hours of downtime) would the sender know if a message had failed. The EU would also develop a feature which would allow the sender to receive messages if his messages had not been delivered. Such e-mail alert systems needed human intervention rather than machine to machine communication, but thousands of such e-mails being sent should be avoided. It was considered more helpful to have e-mails to alert if a server or application was running rather than on individual message failures.

5.14   The Chair then presented document JAGDM 2020-01-03 on Version 2 of the ERS FLUX System: Transport Layer retries – time out and sequencing. He noted the system had been set up to deal with the NEAFC Secretariat's normal office hours. The 72 hour time out for delivery of messages (TODT) was aimed at avoiding lost messages.

5.15   In discussion,
It was clarified that the expectation was that the ERS Version 1 would be initially implemented for European Union fisheries activities reporting, with other Parties following on at some point during the transition period, by which time a Version 2 should be agreed.

5.16   On Specific questions raised in the paper:

Further information would be useful:

1.   *On how EU Member States have dealt with delivery failures at the EU Central node?*

A European Union business continuity plan covered this issue allowing the recipient to request data from the sender in case of a failure. A longer TODT as in NEAFC had also been offered although Member States preferred a smaller TODT and an email exchange instead.

2.   *On the possibility of automated server monitoring between NEAFC systems and Contracting Party FMCs?*

Already covered above; the European Union was not convinced of the feasibility of such a solution or indeed whether it was necessary with the reconfigurable resend mechanisms in place.

3.   *On the timeout and retry situation in FLUX-TL to better understand the function and the consequences of changing the TODT value for a later version of the ERS?*

Since the system was configurable per node by node basis, or per data flow and destination, it was considered that as experience was developed the system could be adjusted to needs.

4.   *On the routines needed at the Contracting Parties to ensure that no data get lost after a downtime (expected or not expected).*

In discussion, JAGDM noted the earlier conclusion that sequencing was not likely to be addressed by the FLUX TL but by the business system on message content.

5.17   **As above in the duplicate check on message content, JAGDM referred the issue of sequencing back to ERS-IMP for consideration on technical solutions related to message content rather than at the FLUX TL (envelope) layer.**

d. NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

i.   Upgrade to ISO 27001:2013 version (ISMS article 4 last paragraph)

5.18   The Chair presented document JAGDM 2020-01-08 ISO 27001:2013 Upgrade – Policy Documentation. This paper was for information only, informing JAGDM of the process following the 2019 gap audit in regards to the 2013 ISO standard for information and security management. The Chair reminded participants that NEAFC aims were to be cognisant of the ISO 27001:2013 standard, and meet its standards where relevant, rather than being certified under the standard.

> As agreed at JAGDM 2019-03, external consultants were providing a suite of policies for the NEAFC ISMS aimed at bringing the NEAFC standard up to ISO 27001:2013 where relevant. The list of policies and the ongoing process of review was explained.

JAGDM noted the update.

ii.   Risk management (ISMS article 3) status of the work

5.19   The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-13 NEAFC Risk management (ISMS article 3) update on work. The Secretariat presented the current information security risk matrix with the relevant risk management actions. One risk that needed further treatment related to password security, in particular on password complexity. JAGDM provided advice in this regard.

> **JAGDM agreed that the NEAFC Secretariat should continue its work to upgrade password requirements for the NEAFC websites.**

iii.   Amendments to ISMS Article 7.2 – PSC public pages

5.20   The NEAFC Secretariat presented Document JAGDM 2020-01-07 NEAFC ISMS Changes – Update of the ISMS tables referring to information in the PSC Public Pages.

> **JAGDM agreed to adopt the document.**

e. Archiving: NEAFC operational data archiving policy

5.21   The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-14 NEAFC Operational Data Archiving Policy. Last year JAGDM considered a paper from the NEAFC Secretariat, setting out the Secretariats plan on how to archive operational data. JAGDM agreed to consider a paper from the Secretariat with more information on the historical operational data needs. In continuing this work, the NEAFC Secretariat considered more information was needed from the Contracting Parties on their specific needs on historical data. The paper included a draft questionnaire to send to Contracting Parties for comment by JAGDM.

> **JAGDM agreed that the Secretariat should finalise the questionnaire and send to NEAFC Contracting Parties.**

6.   NAFO issues
a.   Technical implications of Recommendations
No update.

b.   ISMS for NAFO
No update.

c.   Items Requested by STACTIC

6.1   The NAFO Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2020-01-16 Content adjustment to COX Report. This document was for information, informing JAGDM on the process in NAFO when vessels were sending catch on exit (COX) reports with no RJ (Rejected) field for discards included. The Annual

Meeting of NAFO adopted amendment to the COX message to include RJ as a new mandatory field in the messages.

6.2   In discussion, Norway asked if the message will be rejected (NAK) if this mandatory field, is not reported as 0 quantity when there is no data to report. (The vessel has used a CAT to report the catch and the discarded catch). The NAFO Secretariat explained the process to include zero discards in messages. Given this was a transition phase during 2020 NAFO measures, the VMS system will for some time include this as an optional field.

JAGDM noted the document.

7.   Any other business

7.1   JAGDM 2020-01-10 List of JAGDM outputs in 2019. This paper was a standing item paper informing JAGDM of last year's outputs for information only.

7.2   Election of Chair and Vice-Chair.
The NEAFC Secretariat had been informed that the Vice-Chair Natasha Barbour was willing to stand again which was welcomed by JAGDM. No nominations were forthcoming for a Chair.

JAGDM requested the Secretariats to follow a written procedure with Contracting Parties to nominate a new Chair for JAGDM.

JAGDM duly re-elected Natasha as Vice-Chair with acclamation.

8.   Report to the Annual Meeting.

8.1   No discussion under this agenda item.

9.   Date and place of the next meeting

9.1   Date and place of the next meeting is to be decided in due course.

10.   Closure of the meeting.

10.1   The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their very positive and effective participation in the Virtual meeting. He wished them all good health in the difficult period ahead.