Joint Advisory Group on Data Management

17-18 June 2014 - London

REPORT

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 CCALMR 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.