



JOINT ADVISORY GROUP ON DATA MANAGEMENT (JAGDM)

13 October 2023 – Virtual

FINAL REPORT

1) Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Chair, Suzana Vodovnik (European Union), opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the virtual meeting of JAGDM. The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Norway, Iceland and the United Kingdom. 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 that had been circulated before the meeting (document JAGDM-2023-03-01) was adopted, with additional item for AOB raised by the NEAFC Secretariat (see item 7).

4) Data Exchange Statistics

JAGDM-2023-03-12, JAGDM-2023-03-13 and JAGDM-2023-03-14.

a. NEAFC

4.1 Before opening the floor for the NEAFC Secretariat to present the NEAFC Exchange Statistics, the Chair explained that in previous meeting (JAGDM 02 2023), it was decided to take a different approach with data exchange statistics and now this would be more focused on issues and fixes, (rather than counting the number of failures, as was the previous practice). The Chair also reminded participants that they had previously been asked to provide any feedback on the analysis from the NEAFC Secretariat, such as on how to follow-up the issues highlighted and any improvements for the statistics.

4.2 The NEAFC Secretariat presented its data exchange statistics overview (document JAGDM 2023-03-12, JAGDM 2023-03-13 and JAGDM 2023-03-14), noting this being the second presentation of a new format, focusing on issues coming up between January and September 2023.

In discussion,

4.3 The Chair asked if the Secretariat had received any feedback for improvements, from the participants, as requested at JAGDM (2) 2023. The NEAFC Secretariat confirmed it had not received any comments to its presentation at JAGDM 02. The Chair asked if anyone had any comments to the presentation from the NEAFC Secretariat or any other suggestion.

4.4 EU reiterated that, when compared to the reporting in the past, this was much more useful document, highlighting mistakes re-occurring. The EU asked if the Secretariat was getting back to the sender regarding errors, such as 'mandatory fields missing' or if the Secretariat assumed that the sender analysed the return messages for follow-up action? The Secretariat explained that this was on a very ad-hoc approach and provided a verbal outline of how issues were followed up. In short, the Secretariat was not mandated or had the capacity to follow-up every message being rejected, but tried to follow up where requested or where many reports were rejected simultaneously. One frequent error is related to characters set and the EU asked the Secretariat if this would be solved in the FLUX system or if it would continue. The Secretariat explained that this issue would not continue in FLUX, as it was a more modern system using a more recent and widely used character set. However, while reporting in NAF this would continue to be a problem. Finally, the EU thought the excel file and the document from the Secretariat being very useful, and noted that the task was on the sender side to act.

4.5 Canada (Natasha) asked if the numbers represented in the table, reflected messages that Contracting Parties may have corrected and resent or if it showed rejected messages regardless of if a new message was sent and accepted afterwards. The NEAFC Secretariat explained this being straight out of the 'error log'. Thus, it would need to use the same caveat every time, that it could not take each error as indication of non-compliance. Thus, the Secretariat was not checking how many messages were subsequently corrected and resent, which was of course the normal process.

4.6 The Secretariat had added an additional warnings table into the review, asked JAGDM if it should continue to include the warnings in its review (reports), as being already followed up by PECMAC, and if the focus should thus only be on the errors. For the EU, complete overview was always a preferred option than partial overview. The question was however if this would be used, noting the effort and time by the Secretariat. Thus, for the EU, if not explicitly requested or needed, it was no need to include it. However, if done for PECMAC and the report was already available, this should be included. For the EU, the aim was to avoid unnecessary workload on the Secretariat.

4.7 **In conclusion, JAGDM noted the analysis and report by the NEAFC Secretariat and agreed the following:**

- **Not to include warnings for future reports;**
- **The 'new' set of data to be reviewed, fully completed;**
- **To increase the frequency review for error logs and;**
- **To include reports to monitor the progress of FLUX reporting, as appropriate.**

b. NAFO

4.9 There were no documents under this agenda item. The NAFO Secretariat updated JAGDM that NAFO was still in a period in which the Vtrack system was not being able to provide any details on exceptions. The NAFO Secretariat only had a limited free allocation for development each year, which had been used for this year. It would be prioritised to fix those issues in the future. Thus, the objective was that the Secretariat would work with its vendor Twoday (previously VISMA), to fix the issue of non-reporting or to include the details of the exceptions, in early January 2024. The NAFO Secretariat hoped to be able to provide more details at the next JAGDM meeting.

4.10 JAGDM noted the update by the NAFO Secretariat.

5) NEAFC Issues

a) Master Data Register (MDR) Code List review

5.1 There were no documents under this agenda item. Before opening the floor for the NEAFC Secretariat, the Chair explained that this was an agenda item already discussed in the last meeting, where it was agreed to continue the discussion at JAGDM's next meetings. The Chair further reflected on the background and what had been agreed and noted by JAGDM 2 2023, regarding any changes to the code lists.

5.2 The NEAFC Secretariat gave a verbal update on its review of this information. Thus, the Secretariat was taking it as a principle prior to the launch of fishing activity reporting in FLUX within NEAFC, that NEAFC was going to use the same tables as EU on their MDR, for harmonisation purposes. Subsequently, when changes occurred to the international lists, or other NEAFC lists were updated by the adoption of recommendations, this would go through protocols agreed by JAGDM which will be fully finalised next year. I.e., the fully international lists, which usually are updated once or twice a year, will be updated (on a schedule to be finalised next year), however changes required by NEAFC recommendations may have to be updated more quickly. Changes would be rolled out to the various organisations which were using the MDR, obviously the EU and then other Parties as they come on board during the transition period.

To put the size of the task in some context, the Secretariat had briefly looked into the number of changes in 2023 to the international lists (the LOCODE, the ASFIS and territories list of Countries), where the Secretariat noted approximately 300 changes on the LOCODE list 385 changes to the ASFIS list, the territories list was unchanged. Not all of these changes would directly related to NEAFC, however this would need to be taken into consideration when finalising the frequency of harmonisation with international lists as a good number of changes needed to be rolled out. For the Secretariat, the agreed protocol was that everyone would be informed about the changes made, as 'approval' implied in the agreement to harmonise with international lists in the first place. Finally, it was specifically noted that the ASFIS list removes codes, updates codes and scientific names etc (not only adds them), which is somewhat more complicated to update. However, this would be discussed further in 2024 on how this would be done.

In discussion,

5.3 JAGDM agreed that the NEAFC code list should be aligned with the EU code list, prior to the launch of the fishing activity reporting in FLUX. Regarding the frequency in reviewing and aligning with the international lists, this should be done twice a year (spring and autumn), as a starting point.

b) FLUX update from EU

5.4 The EU informed JAGDM about its updates for FLUX fishing activity (FLUX ERS), and as all Parties were aware, the EU had sent a letter in September to the Chair of the AHWG ERS-Implementation announcing its readiness. Furthermore, the Chair of the AHWG ERS-Implementation sent a letter to the ERS Working Group on 20 September 2023, asking Contracting Parties to confirm that a advise could be given to the Commission that the technical preparations to implement the new ERS data exchange system based on the UN/FLUX standard have been completed, setting the system into production on the 15 January 2024, and thus triggering the start date of the transition period

etc. The deadline for comments were on the 12 October (the day before this JAGDM meeting), and to the EU knowledge a positive confirmation was received from all Contracting Parties, except so far no comments from one. The EU hoped to receive confirmation from all Parties to be able to go live on the 15 January 2024. The EU would go one MS after another, in rather short period, meaning one or two MS in a day.

In discussion,

5.5 JAGDM noted that, as things stand, FLUX Fishing Activity Reporting could go live on 15 January 2024.

c) Issues Raised by PECMAC

JAGDM-2023-03-03, JAGDM-2023-03-04, JAGDM-2023-03-05, JAGDM-2023-03-06, JAGDM-2023-03-09 and JAGDM-2023-03-11.

5.6 The Chair informed JAGDM that there had been no PECMAC meeting this Autumn, and all correspondence regarding this agenda item had been done via e-mail communication. Noting the deadline for PECMAC HoDs to comment on the suggested way forward by the NEAFC Secretariat on Article 13 Transshipment Authorisation and circulation procedures (as described in JAGDM-2023-03-11), was 10 October 2023, the Chair asked the Secretariat about any update in this regard. The Secretariat confirmed that it had not received any negative feedback from Contracting Parties bound by the new Article 13, and positive feedback was received from the EU that endorsed the proposal. As the Secretariat did not hear otherwise, it would be going ahead with the authorisation template and circulation procedures as outlined in document JAGDM-2023-03-11.

5.7 The NEAFC Secretariat presented the issues raised by PECMAC. This included i) Review of 'New' and 'Transition' Scheme Annexes considering recommendation 11:2023 (Transshipments); ii) Template for reporting Transshipment Authorisation and; iii) System for presenting and circulating transshipment authorisations via the website.

In discussion,

5.8 JAGDM **noted** the template and the procedure for presenting and circulating transshipment authorisations via the website. This new procedure requires some changes to the Information Security Management System, beyond those agreed at JAGDM 02 and these were discussed under agenda item 5d.

5.9 Regarding Review of Annexes of the New and Transition Schemes following the changes to Article 13.1b of the Scheme (document JAGDM 2023-03-03), the Secretariat explained that PECMAC had asked JAGDM to review the Annexes to see if any changes were required to the Annexes detailing the content of the relevant reports for at sea transshipment and port of landing (TRA and POR). It further explained it had identified five possible aspects of the Annexes for update or clarification. This included issues on: A reference to the RA in the Transitions Scheme; Footnote in the Transition Scheme making coordinates optional for receiving vessels when reporting transshipments; A difference between the 'New' and 'Transition' Scheme for coordinates required in POR reports; Clarification of the different types of coordinates relevant to transshipments reports and; Reference to Transshipment Authorisation (if relevant) in XVb PSC 2 Forms.

5.10 After further discussion, JAGDM **agreed** that the Chair of JAGDM would write to the Chair of PECMAC, noting that JAGDM had agreed to propose to the 2023 Annual Meeting of NEAFC the following:

- Editorial change to Annex VIII 4) Transhipments in the Transition Scheme, thus removing the reference to the RA in the 'Quantity on-loaded or off-loaded' data field;
- Removal of 'footnote 2' in the same Annex mentioned above, making the coordinates mandatory for reports sent by the receiving vessel and;
- The advice regarding POR reports in the transition scheme was that coordinates should continue to be optional (which in practice they are already).

5.11 JAGDM also **agreed** to include in the letter to the PECMAC Chair the advice that there is now some inconsistency in the type (source) of coordinates required for reportable activities outside the RA (where VMS is not present), specifically that prior notification of entry requires POS at time of transmission and transhipment requires exact coordinates at the end of activity. EU did not find this difference to be relevant however, JAGDM advises that PECMAC consider if there is any relevance in the differing source of the coordinates for control purposes noting additionally, that this point would likely have a longer timeline to resolution than the points reflected in the proposal. Finally, the reference to Transhipment authorisation in PSC 2 forms should also be flagged to PECMAC as an item for further clarification.

d) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)

5.9 The NEAFC Secretariat presented further update to data classification and website content access tables, required with the implementation of recommendation 11:2023 (i.e., at sea Transhipment Authorisation) (JAGDM-2023-03-07 and JAGDM-2023-03-08). Thus, this included new roles and permissions for users in the main Article 11 Access Control table; new footnote [11] the same table and; changes to Article 11 Annex 1 (General Principles) and the 'subscribing users' (document JAGDM 2023-03-08) to include a reference to Active Cooperation non-Contracting Parties, in addition to Contracting Parties.

In discussion,

5.10 **JAGDM agreed to adopt the suggested changes as presented by the NEAFC Secretariat. These changes were required by the new process for handling Transhipment Authorisations on the website which was discussed in agenda item 5.c. This updated version to the ISMS would be tabled to the NEAFC Annual Meeting in November 2023, as part of a package, including the data classification and access control for the EPSC catches export function, and objections as discussed at JAGDM 1 & 2 2023.**

5.11 The NEAFC Secretariat informed JAGDM that there had been no Security System Administrators (SSA) meeting to report from. However, the Secretariat hoped to have a meeting before end of 2023 and to provide feedback to the spring meeting of JAGDM, as there was still progress hoping to be made.

6) NAFO issues

a) Technical implications of the implementation of recommendations

6.1 The NAFO Secretariat provided update to two working papers from STACTIC, that had been adopted by the Commission during the 2023 Annual Meeting and would be implemented within NAFO Vtrack system starting January 2024. The first, involved JAGDM advice to STACTIC, concerning the COX message. Thus, Article 28(6) was amended on catch reporting to require the use CAT

messages to report daily catches, including for the day in which the vessel exits the RA, instead of COX reports, and to adjust the naming of the data element with field code 'OB' in Annex II.F.6 such that was aligned with the naming in Annex II.D. The second paper that was provided by STACTIC to the Commission involved proposal to increase the limitation of the maximum allowed characters for six data elements, Vessel Name, Port Name, Vessel Owner, Vessel Charterer, Vessel Tonnage Unit and Port Name.

6.2 JAGDM noted the update from the NAFO Secretariat.

b) Issues raised by STACTIC

6.3 The NAFO Secretariat noted that there were no issues raised by STACTIC to JAGDM for this meeting.

c) Update on NAFO Projects

The NAFO Secretariat updated JAGDM that it had started development on Electronic Port State system, that imitates the NEAFC EPSC system. However, this development had only just started.

7) Any Other Business

Document JAGDM-2023-03-10 and JAGDM 2023-03-15

7.1 The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2023-03-10 Objections template, explaining that the Working Group of Future Development of NEAFC had expressed desire at its January meeting to have greater transparency within NEAFC over objections to Recommendations. The Secretariat was tasked with coming up with some system for making this information public. Objection template had been developed, where it was foreseen that a Party objecting to a recommendation would fill in basic data fields that had previously been provided, with new data field 'Reasons for Objection' added. The Template would be added to the Recommendation information on the public NEAFC website. The Secretariat noted that the first JAGDM meeting in 2023, based on the outcome of the Working Group of Future Development report, agreed a proposal to make a objection to a Recommendation public to be added to the data classification. This would be proposed to the Annual Meeting by JAGDM in November 2023. In short, the template was seen to standardise the information submitted for objection. Thus, in the future may need to be introduced into the ISMS, depending on detailed guidance from WGFD. However, if the data classification is adopted this year, the intention was to at least publish some basic data about the fact of the objection this year, on the NEAFC website.

7.2 JAGDM noted the template presented by the Secretariat and the additional information on the updated process for handling objections.

7.3 The NEAFC Secretariat presented document JAGDM 2023-03-15 Correction to Annex I B) – Regulated Resources Deep-Sea Species. It explained that the 2022 Annual Meeting adopted Recommendation 9:2023, to add six additional deep-sea chimaera species to the NEAFC Scheme Annex Ib. However, the original proposal was adopted without the necessary FAO codes or information about ICES Areas. This had been raised at JAGDM 01 2023. Now this has been discussed at WG Stats and PECMAS, where a new code for Portuguese rabbitfish had been added to the ASFIS list. Thus, changes to the annex would include changing the code HYD for Portuguese rabbitfish to KXA and the common name for Harriotta raleighana (HCR) from Narrownose chimaera to Pacific longnose chimaera. The Secretariat suggested few options for JAGDM to ensure that the correct list

of Regulated Resources appeared in the Scheme Annex. This included:

- Propose the table in the paper as a Scheme change to the Annual Meeting;
- Write to PECMAC Chair and ask that this be added to a list of editorial changes to the Scheme or;
- That this could be circulated as a correction via a Scheme letter by the Secretariat.

In discussion,

7.4 For the EU, treating this as a correction seemed to be the correct way to handle this, rather than a Scheme change. Norway agreed with EU. EU also proposed checking to ensure that all the Annex I species are listed in conformity with ASFIS.

7.5 **JAGDM agreed that these issues should be treated as a correction and should be circulated as a correction via Scheme letter by the Secretariat. This would be reported to the Annual Meeting 2023 by the Chair of JAGDM.**

8) Report to the NEAFC Annual Meeting

The JAGDM Chair would report to the NEAFC Annual Meeting from JAGDM 2023 meetings. Whether this will be in person or not will be finalised shortly.

9) Date and Place of the Next Meeting

Date and place of the next meeting was planned virtually on 23 February 2024.

10) Closure of the Meeting

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for an efficient JAGDM meeting.