JOINT ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA MANAGEMENT (JAGDM)
Wednesday 11 September 2019, 11:00 – 14:00 UTC

Virtual Meeting/delegates welcomed to attend at the NEAFC Secretariat

REPORT

1   Opening of the Meeting

The Chair, Leifur Magnusson (Iceland), opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to this meeting.

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

2   Appointment of the Rapporteur

The NEAFC Secretariat was appointed as rapporteur

3   Discussion and Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was adopted with no changes.

It was noted that the agenda included points referred to JAGDM by PECMAC and its sub-groups such as the ERS-IMP working group.

4   NEAFC Issues

a.   Technical Implications of the Implementation of Recommendations

This was a standing item and not discussed at the meeting.

b.   Issues Raised by PECMAC

i.   Advice on the handling of vessels reporting IMO & and External Registration in Notification and Authorisation Messages

The Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2019-02-03, which was a proposal from Norway adopted by PECMAC 1 2019 to make a lists of NEAFC notified and authorised vessels publicly available on the NEAFC website. In this context, the PECMAC Chair had written to the JAGDM Chair (JAGDM 2019-02-04) requesting related advice and any necessary updates to be made to the NEAFC Information Security Management System.

The first element of the discussion was on a request for advice (JAGDM 2019-02-05) on business rules for handling IMO numbers in the NEAFC data base. The Secretariat explained that the current confusion in filling in IM (IMO number) and XR (external registration number) data fields meant 14% of the vessel identification data in the notification and authorisation system had errors. The document set out a series of questions with the aim to elicit suggestions on how to improve the data.

In discussion the following points were made:

- Current checks only required an IM or XR field, but were unable to detect the wrong data being entered or tonnage being reported as zero.
- While it was generally considered that 14% was too high an error rate, ultimately the decision on the acceptability of particular error rates should be made at a higher level with JAGDM offering the technical solutions. One party highlighted its view on the urgency of getting the data out into the public rather than making sure every detail was correct.
- It was agreed that the accuracy/correction of the data was a responsibility for the Contracting Parties
- Various checks, such as consistency between tonnage of vessels in the notifications and authorisations, format of IMO numbers, cross- checks to the Global Record etc were feasible but would have varying development costs.

JAGDM Conclusions were:

a) The system should return an error code (NAK 102 – *Data value or size out of range*) if data in an invalid IMO format was provided by the Contracting Party
b) If practicable/affordable the system should check XR or IM against tonnage; if tonnage merits an IMO number and none is provided then this should be an error (NAK 104 – *Mandatory data missing*) return. [The Secretariat was requested to see whether NAK 102 and 104 should be used and how this would affect the error rates]
c) For future development, Authorisation messages could be compared with the vessel's Notification message and checked that they match on IMO number.
d) For future development and if practicable, the system should check if the IMO number is unique in the data base or has changed for that vessel.
e) If IMO number is changed to be mandatory in the Authorisation message the footnote referring the regulation has to be included as in the Notification message.

The Secretariat suggested it could get estimates for the cost of doing b - d to see if this was feasible in this year or future budget years, unless PECMAC were to decide this was priority. It should be noted however that solution a) above did not address the 14% error issue.

JAGDM Agreed that that in putting forward the issue to PECMAC/the Annual Meeting there should be an explicit decision as to whether to implement data checks or not; i.e. to live with a 14% error rate or not.

The Secretariat presented JAGDM 2019-02-08 on proposed wording on disclaimers and data protection for the NEAFC website related to the publication of vessel lists. This included a Contracting Party contact list for stakeholders to contact if there were errors found in the data.

JAGDM agreed the text proposed in JAGDM 2019-02-08 with some minor amendments.

ii. Review of data element format change to allow for EU Community Fleet Register (CFR) numbers to be accurately reported in Notification (NOT) and Authorisation (AUT) messages

The Secretariat explained that the Internal Registration Numbers (IR) format in the Scheme no longer worked for many EU CFR numbers. This meant they were not being reported accurately in NOT and AUT messages; the plans to publish the vessel details meant that this needed to be addressed so the NEAFC system would store the identifier more accurately. The proposed change to the Scheme Annex IX C1 (document JAGDM 2019-02-06) addressed this.

NAFO explained that it also received CFR numbers from European Union FMCs, so would also need to look into this issue as well.

JAGDM agreed document JAGDM 2019-02-06 (un-amended) should be provided with advice to PECMAC for adoption as a Scheme change. **The document should also be sent to NAFO STACTIC for information.**

iii. ISMS Changes to 7.2 (Data Classification) required by publication of vessel lists

The Secretariat presented JAGDM 2019-02-07 on the Information Security Management System changes that would be required if publishing vessel data on the public pages of the NEAFC website.

JAGDM agreed the changes proposed to the ISMS with some minor amendments to the document. In response to the query from PECMAC, it was agreed no elements of the current NOT/AUT vessel data was unsuitable for publication.

iv. How the FLUX –TL Handles system retries

This item was not discussed due to lack of time.

v. TODT Offset Value for the NEAFC VMS Implementation Document

The Secretariat introduced an information paper (JAGDM 2019-02-10) on a 24-hour maximum TODT offset value, for FLUX VMS implementation, indicating its view that longer time outs risked too much data being held and forwarded later.

In discussion, various options and solutions were offered to go beyond a 24-hour TODT. These included the need for a further buffer given the non-availability of NEAFC Secretariat staff outside office hours. It was explained that the transport layer would handle the queueing of messages and that the EU was working on a solution to test if a receiving node was receiving or not. One solution was to avoid exponential retries and instead have less frequent retries as time from failure increased. This would lead to less of a flurry of new messages as the receiving system went back up. This would be in the next version of the FLUX-TL.

Norway set out its continuing concerns with the lack of correct sequencing of data in the FLUX ERS system should there be a longer down time. Noting this discussion was only on VMS and, the EU confirming that the TODT could be configured differently at the sending node for each specific data flow and destination, a TODT longer than 24 hours might be agreed for VMS.

The European Union suggested a 36 hour TODT for the FLUX VMS as an initial setting with amendment possible based on experience.

JAGDM came to no conclusion on the TODT, but noted that the next meeting of JAGDM(03) could return to this on 10 October.

vi.   Business Continuity Plan for FLUX network
This item was not discussed due to lack of time.

5   Any Other Business

6   Report to the Annual Meeting

Proposal for adding species to the Annex V list (PE 2019-01-29 JAGDM Proposal to Add Species) was agreed by PECMAC in April and will be presented to the Annual Meeting by PECMAC Chair. The JAGDM proposal for a Scheme Change to increase the max. characters for Gear Codes will be discussed by PECMAC again in September. No further action is required for these proposals in this meeting.

7   Date and Place of the Next Meeting

Date and place of the next meeting is to be decided.

8   Closure of the Meeting

The Chair closed the meeting and wished all participants a safe Journey home.