

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

30 May – 1 June, 2016  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

1) Opening of the meeting.....	2
2) Appointment of rapporteur .....	2
3) Discussion and adoption of the Agenda .....	2
4) NAFO Issues .....	2
a) Issues raised by STACTIC .....	2
i) Data Sharing Between NAFO and NEAFC.....	3
ii) Update from the STACTIC 2016 Intersessional on request to JAGDM to review the Annexes of the NCEM and make some clarifications .....	3
iii) Any new issues raised at May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional.....	3
5) NAFO Information Security Management System (ISMS).....	3
a) ISMS update from the May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional Meeting.....	3
6) Status of other NAFO projects .....	3
a) FLUX Transport Layer update.....	3
7) NEAFC issues.....	4
a) Issues raised by the ERS Working Group .....	4
i) Agree NAF format codes for new NEAFC-ERS data elements (clarified as requested) .....	4
ii) Can a single ‘message identifier’ replace the current system (RN, RD, RT, SQ, TN) without any loss of information currently in use.....	4
iii) Advise on the technical pros and cons of adopting IMO number as primary vessel identifier in ERS systems.....	5
iv) Comment on the success and any limitations discovered in the further mapping exercise between NAF format and UN/CEFACT.....	5
b) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS).....	5
i) Possible Upgrade of NEAFC ISMS to use ISO 27001:2013 .....	5
ii) Work of the Security System Administrators.....	5
iii) Information Security Incident Management (ISMS, Article 13).....	5
iv) Risk Management (ISMS, Article 3) status of the work.....	6
v) Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS Article 7.1) .....	6
8) Status of other NEAFC projects.....	6
9) Management of the North Atlantic Format.....	6
10) Management of the websites.....	6
a) JAGDM .....	6
b) NAF.....	6
i) Update the List of data-elements, codes and definitions to be in line with the proposed changes in STACTIC WP 15/29.....	6
ii) Updating NAF website with codes already in use by Contracting Parties.....	7
11) Any other business .....	7
a) Possible changes to JAGDM’s rules of procedure.....	7
b) JAGDM logo proposal .....	7
12) Report to the Annual Meetings.....	7
13) Date and place of the next meeting .....	7
14) Closure of the meeting .....	7
Annex 1. Participant List .....	8
Annex 2. Agenda .....	9
Annex 3. List of Documents .....	10

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

30 May – 1 June, 2016  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

### 1) Opening of the meeting

The Chair, Lloyd Slaney (Canada), opened the meeting at 09:30 hrs on Tuesday, 31 May 2016 at the NAFO Secretariat Headquarters in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada. Participants were welcomed from Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Iceland and Norway (Annex 1).

The Executive Secretary of NAFO (Fred Kingston) welcomed everyone to the NAFO Headquarters and the Chair encouraged targeted discussions throughout the meeting as the agenda was significant.

### 2) Appointment of rapporteur

The NAFO Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

### 3) Discussion and adoption of the Agenda

The Chair suggested that responding to the two requests received from the NAFO Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) and the NEAFC Ad Hoc Working Groups on ERS (AHWG-ERS) be established as a priority before proceeding with the rest of the agenda. There were no objections. The *adopted* agenda is presented in Annex 2.

The Chair further instructed that during this meeting, the group consider its Rules of Procedure (agenda item 11.a) for further clarification of the group's mandate.

### 4) NAFO Issues

#### a) Issues raised by STACTIC

At the May 2016 NAFO STACTIC Intersessional meeting, STACTIC WP 16/08 was presented which included some of the highlights from the last JAGDM meeting.

An update was provided regarding issues raised by STACTIC regarding JAGDM specifically:

- The formal request from the STACTIC Chair on Data Sharing Between NAFO and NEAFC (JAGDM Document 2016-02-17);  
This item is addressed under agenda item 4.a.i. of this meeting.
- The work on the proposal that was brought forward in JAGDM Document 2016-01-20 (STACTIC WP 15/29) for presentation at the 2016 Annual Meeting of NAFO.  
This item is addressed under agenda item 10.b.i. of this meeting.
- The issues of the IMO numbering requirement in the Annexes of the NAFO CEM (JAGDM Document 2016-02-18).

The working paper presented (STACTIC WP 16/08) provided a suggested way forward on how to address the issues of the IMO numbering requirement in the Annexes of the NAFO CEM. At the May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional meeting, Contracting Parties noted that the current use of the word '*eligible*' in the NAFO CEM was unclear. Canada agreed to provide a proposal at the 2016

Annual Meeting of NAFO to address the issue of clarity so that JAGDM could continue with their suggested way forward in the Annexes of the NAFO CEM.

**i) Data Sharing Between NAFO and NEAFC**

Both Commissions have recently expressed the intention to establish procedures for data sharing, primarily to identify cases in which there is a significant difference between the reports provided on leaving one area and entering into another. One essential step towards this goal is the harmonisation of catch on exit (COX) reports. A specific request for JAGDM to establish as a priority, the completion of advice to describe how to harmonize COX messages between the two organizations was received prior to this meeting from NAFO STACTIC.

JAGDM has reviewed and considered the request and developed a proposal to harmonize COX reports between NAFO and NEAFC (2016-02-27). This proposal will require changes to the NEAFC Scheme. The NAFO COX report includes the data element 'On Board' (OB) which is described as the total quantity by species on board when the vessel exits the Regulatory Area. Currently, NEAFC COX reports do not include the OB data element.

**JAGDM proposes that OB is added, as a mandatory element, to the NEAFC COX report with the description as the total quantity by species on board when the vessel exits the Regulatory Area, which is intended to clarify that all species should be reported and not only the regulated resources to which the CAT reports are limited.**

**ii) Update from the STACTIC 2016 Intersessional on request to JAGDM to review the Annexes of the NCEM and make some clarifications**

It was agreed to discuss this item under agenda item 10.b.i. of this meeting.

**iii) Any new issues raised at the May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional**

There were no new issues raised for JAGDM to consider.

**5) NAFO Information Security Management System (ISMS)**

**a) ISMS update from the May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional Meeting**

There were no new issues raised for JAGDM to consider.

The implementation of the ISMS recommendations continues to proceed. As the implementation continues, the assistance of JAGDM will be sought in the future, as required.

**6) Status of other NAFO projects**

**a) FLUX Transport Layer update**

It was reported that since the last meeting, the NAFO Secretariat continues to work in collaboration with the European Union to receive its catch data on a haul by haul basis via the FLUX Transport Layer. This data is reported to fulfill the obligations in Article 28.8 and described in Annex II.N.

Mr. Matthias Petofalvi visited the NAFO Secretariat from 21–22 March 2016 to assist in the successful installation of the FLUX transportation layer.

Report of JAGDM, 30 May – 1 June, 2016

## 7) NEAFC issues

### a) Issues raised by the ERS Working Group

The Chair of NEAFC Ad Hoc Working Groups on ERS (AHWG-ERS), Gylfi Geirsson asked JAGDM in JAGDM Document 2016-02-21 to:

- Review the descriptions and use of RN, RD, RT, SQ, TN and ‘message unique identifier’ to determine whether or not it is possible for a single Message unique identifier’ replace the sequence number and/or record number and/or trip number in ERS messages, including corrections and cancellations, without any loss of information on fishing activities already required for control and monitoring purposes?
- Offer advice on technical pros and cons of adopting IMO number as primary vessel identifier in ERS systems
- Comment on the success and any limitations discovered in the further mapping exercise between NAF format and UN/CEFACT P1000
- Agree new NAF format codes based on a consolidated list of NAF format codes in use and according to the list attached. Additional information is added on the proposed use in Detailed Catch and Activity (DCA) reports of ‘processing type’ and ‘species size composition’, for which NAF field codes have been requested

#### i) Agree NAF format codes for new NEAFC-ERS data elements (clarified as requested)

The work to adopt the new data elements foreseen in NEAFC-ERS could not be done in the first JAGDM meeting of 2016 therefore Norway was asked to update the document (JAGDM Document 2016-01-28 Rev.).

The document listed all the two letter field code elements that Contracting Parties know are in use and it was developed with the primary purpose to give advice on codes for new data elements foreseen in NEAFC-ERS. The creation of such a list would ensure the requested new codes do not already exist and avoid duplication of definitions for the same codes. The list will also be used to update data on the NAF website with the two-letter field codes already in use and the new ones created for the NEAFC-ERS.

The list was separated into two tables (Annex I and Annex II) with the suggestion that JAGDM focus on the data elements in Annex I currently and designate data elements in Annex II as those that may be addressed at a later stage.

**JAGDM prepared JAGDM Document 2016-02-26 which proposes, for consideration, NAF two-letter field codes for the identified contexts either by identifying a two-letter field code that is already used bilaterally or by creation of a new two-letter field code.**

#### ii) Can a single ‘message identifier’ replace the current system (RN, RD, RT, SQ, TN) without any loss of information currently in use

The possibility of merging the field codes (RN, RD, RT, SQ, TN) into a single ‘message identifier’ was discussed. This option may or may not retain the ‘business’ information in the newly created single message identifier depending on how it was accomplished, from a technical standpoint, the result would be cumbersome and difficult to use either way.

It is the view of JAGDM that the current record identifiers cannot be replaced by a global unique identifier, without losing ‘business’ information (JAGDM Document 2016-02-31). A global unique identifier will not give any identification of missing messages while a sequence number (SQ) does. A trip identifier cannot be replaced by a global identifier if information on the number of trips is required.

The requirement for specific record identifiers changes with the business needs and whether the loss of this business information is important is not a technical decision.

**iii) Advise on the technical pros and cons of adopting IMO number as primary vessel identifier in ERS systems**

The technical pros and cons of adopting the IMO number as the primary identifier of vessels in ERS systems was presented in JAGDM Document 2016-02-22 and JAGDM Document 2016-02-29. Although an IMO number is an internationally unique identifier that is assigned to a physical vessel for its lifetime, there were difficulties discussed with having the IMO number as the primary identifier. Some key challenges identified involve adding complexity in NEAFC and sharing information with others specifically:

- Domestic systems – Generally vessels are identified by International Radio Call Sign (IRCS) which means that messages sent to NEAFC would be different to messages sent to other places.
- Sharing data with other organizations – NEAFC would be unable to effectively share data with other organizations (e.g. NAFO) where IRCS is currently used as the primary identifier.
- Processing vessel registry data – Details of ownership and flag can change but the IMO stays the same for the life of the vessel therefore it would be required to determine which activities the vessel undertook while under which flag and/or ownership.

Having both IRCS and IMO number is beneficial, and both should be available to inspectors, but there were no obvious technical pros to adopting the IMO number as the primary vessel identifier.

**iv) Comment on the success and any limitations discovered in the further mapping exercise between NAF format and UN/CEFACT**

In March 2016, JAGDM was requested to comment on a more detailed mapping of Flux to UN/CEFACT P1000 3 (UN/CEFACT). At that time, it became clear that the comparison of these formats was not an easy task for a variety of reasons, although the use of the international standard was deemed reasonable. The European Union and NEAFC Secretariat therefore volunteered to provide a more detailed mapping for JAGDM which was presented in JAGDM Document 2016-02-04 and JAGDM Document 2016-02-28.

JAGDM reflected on the work done by the NEAFC Secretariat and it can be seen that the structure of XML as used in UN/CEFACT is substantially different from the slash reporting structure of the NAF Format currently used in NEAFC. The XML format has an increased capacity for grouping similar data, because it allows for the nesting of data, where data types can contain other similar data types, or link to other relevant data depending on a specified relationship. This allows the XML format greater capacity, flexibility and clarity than is currently available using the NAF format.

This work successfully demonstrates that all the data currently under discussion for a NEAFC ERS system can be successfully mapped into UN/CEFACT without needing to add to the existing international standard. Although there were no particular limitations noted with the mapping, the group noted that the additional difficulty of changing from a format which is understood to one which is both new and untested in terms of the effort (and therefore cost). It is also harder to estimate the extent of this impact making budgeting and planning more complicated.

**b) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)**

**i) Possible Upgrade of NEAFC ISMS to use ISO 27001:2013**

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

**ii) Work of the Security System Administrators**

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

Report of JAGDM, 30 May – 1 June, 2016

### **iii) Information Security Incident Management (ISMS, Article 13)**

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

### **iv) Risk Management (ISMS, Article 3) status of the work**

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

### **v) Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS Article 7.1)**

The updates to the NEAFC system and inventory (JAGDM Document 2016-02-12) were presented highlighting the updated items in the NEAFC system since the last briefing in May 2015 specifically:

- New Port-State Control Application
- Back-up rotation for Positive Internet was updated
- Change to Article 14 - ISMS Business Continuity Guidelines
- 'Cod' new test server has been added on network
- Migration to new domain for office network services
- Upgrade to a private cloud system for NEAFC webserver
- Office Wireless network upgrade

### **8) Status of other NEAFC projects**

There are no other NEAFC projects to report on at this time.

### **9) Management of the North Atlantic Format**

There were no items to be discussed under this agenda item.

### **10) Management of the websites**

#### **a) JAGDM**

There were no items to be discussed under this agenda item.

#### **b) NAF**

There were no items to be discussed under this agenda item.

#### **i) Update the List of data-elements, codes and definitions to be in line with the proposed changes in STACTIC WP 15/29**

The NAFO CEM prescribes electronic notification and authorization in Article 25 and electronic catch reporting in Article 28. It has become apparent that ambiguous definitions relating to certain data elements, coupled with the lack of some tangible examples, have contributed to inconsistencies in electronic reporting by Contracting Parties.

In 2015, JAGDM tasked representatives from Norway and Canada with reviewing the Annexes to identify data elements requiring improvement and to propose new definitions and examples of the required format. JAGDM Document 2016-01-20 Rev. was developed to provide clarification and advice to amend the pertinent tables in the Annexes with clear definitions and tangible examples of the correct reporting format.

This proposal focuses on some minor but important changes to Annex II D. C, Annex II.E and F. Concentration was placed on the data field codes SQ, DA, TI, RN, RD and RT and wording to encapsulate the process when

vessel reports are forwarded to the NAFO Secretariat via the Flag State FMC. Additional references to other Annexes have been included as well to better understand the proposed changes.

**JAGDM prepared JAGDM Document 2016-01-20 Rev. to provide clarification and advice to amend the pertinent tables in the NAFO CEM Annexes with clear definitions and tangible examples of the correct reporting format.**

**ii) Updating NAF website with codes already in use by Contracting Parties**

This work will be completed by the NAFO Secretariat before both organizations 2016 Annual Meetings.

**11) Any other business**

**a) Possible changes to JAGDM's Rules of Procedure**

This item was moved to the **discussion and adoption of the Agenda**. The Chair instructed the group to consider the Rules of Procedure for guidance and to use the TOR to better prioritize tasks and/or requests received. The Chair focused upon and read section 2: *The Functions of the Advisory Group*. The chair also referenced the Rules of Procedure and encouraged all participants to review this document to re-familiarize themselves with the procedures.

**b) JAGDM logo proposal**

The NAFO Secretariat presented the draft JAGDM logo (JAGDM Document 2016-02-16) with the changes suggested at the last JAGDM meeting incorporated.

**The JAGDM logo (JAGDM Document 2016-02-16) was approved with a small amendment to increase readability of the data image in the background.**

**12) Report to the Annual Meetings**

An update regarding outcomes of this meeting will be provided by Lloyd Slaney, Chair, to the NAFO 38<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in September 2016 and Ellen Fasmer, Vice-Chair, to the NEAFC 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in November 2016.

**13) Date and place of the next meeting**

The location of the next JAGDM meeting was tentatively set for the NEAFC Secretariat Headquarters in London, England. The time of the next meeting will be determined at a later date.

**14) Closure of the meeting**

The meeting adjourned at 16:30 hrs on 1 June 2016. The Chair thanked the NAFO Secretariat for hosting the meeting and the meeting participants for a productive meeting.

## **Annex 1. Participant List**

### **CHAIR**

Slaney, Lloyd, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Conservation & Protection, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre 80 East White Hills Rd., P.O. Box 5667, St. John's, NL A1C 5X1  
Email: Lloyd.Slaney@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

### **CANADA**

Barbour, Natasha. Business and Technology Coordinator, VMS, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, 80 East White Hills, PO Box 5667, St John's, Newfoundland and Labrador A1C 5X1  
Tel.: +1 709-772-5788 – Email: natasha.barbour@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

### **DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)**

Rossing Lund, Mads. Special Advisor, Greenland Fisheries Licence Control Authority  
Tel.: +299 345373 – Email: marl@nanoq.gl

Gaardlykke, Meinhard. Adviser, Faroe Islands Fisheries Inspection, Yviri við Strond 3, P. O. Box 1238, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands  
Tel.: +29 831 1065 –E-mail: mg@vorn.fo

### **EUROPEAN UNION**

Kloppenborg, Ben. Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Head of Unit MARE D4 - Integrated Fisheries Data Management  
Phone: +32-229.87540 – E-mail: ben.kloppenborg@ec.europa.eu

### **ICELAND**

Magnússon, Leifur. Fiskistofa, the Directorate of Fisheries, Dalshrauni 1, 220 Hafnarfjörður, Iceland  
Tel: +354 569 7900 – Email: leifurm@fiskistofa.is

### **NORWAY**

Fasmer, Ellen E. Senior Adviser IT-Department, Directorate of Fisheries, Strandgaten 229, Postboks 185 Sentrum, 5804 Bergen, Norway  
Tel.: +47 974 29 681 – Email: ellen.fasmer@fiskeridir.no

### **NEAFC SECRETARIAT**

22 Berners Street, London W1T 3DY, Tel.: + 44 (0) 20 7631 0016  
Lewsley, Rachel. IT & Web Production Officer, Email: rachel@neafc.org

### **NAFO SECRETARIAT**

2 Morris Drive, Suite 100, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Tel.: +1 902 468-5590  
Kingston, Fred. Executive Secretary, Email: fkingston@nafo.int  
Federizon, Ricardo. Senior Fisheries Commission Coordination, Email: rfederizon@nafo.int  
Kendall, Matthew. IT Manager, Email: mkendall@nafo.int  
LeFort, Lisa. Executive Assistant to the Executive Secretary, Email: llefort@nafo.int  
Aten, Travis. NAFO Intern 2016  
Okochi, Yumi. NAFO Intern 2016



## Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Discussion and adoption of the Agenda
4. NAFO issues
  - a) Issues raised by STACTIC
    - i) Data Sharing Between NAFO and NEAFC
    - ii) Update from the STACTIC 2016 Intersessional on request to JAGDM to review the Annexes of the NCEM and make some clarifications
    - iii) Any new issues raised at May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional
5. NAFO Information Security Management System (ISMS)
  - a) ISMS update from the May 2016 STACTIC Intersessional Meeting
6. Status of other NAFO projects
  - a) FLUX Transport Layer update
7. NEAFC issues
  - a) Issues raised by the ERS Working Group
    - i) Agree NAF format codes for new NEAFC-ERS data elements (clarified as requested)
    - ii) Can a single 'message identifier' replace the current system (RN, RD, RT, SQ, TN) without any loss of information currently in use
    - iii) Advise on the technical pros and cons of adopting IMO number as primary vessel identifier in ERS systems
    - iv) Comment on the success and any limitations discovered in the further mapping exercise between NAF format and UN/CEFACT
  - b) NEAFC Information Security Management System (ISMS)
    - i) Possible Upgrade of NEAFC ISMS to use ISO 27001:2013
    - ii) Work of the Security System Administrators
    - iii) Information Security Incident Management (ISMS, Article 13)
    - iv) Risk Management (ISMS, Article 3) status of the work
    - v) Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory (ISMS Article 7.1)
8. Status of other NEAFC projects
9. Management of the North Atlantic Format
10. Management of the websites
  - a) JAGDM
  - b) NAF
    - i) Update the List of data-elements, codes and definitions to be in line with the proposed changes in STACTIC WP 15/29
    - ii) Updating NAF website with codes already in use by Contracting Parties
11. Any other business
  - a) Possible changes to JAGDM's rules of procedure
  - b) JAGDM logo proposal
12. Report to the Annual Meetings
13. Date and place of the next meeting
14. Closure of the meeting

**Annex 3. List of Documents**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document title</b>
JAGDM 2016-02-00	1	List of documents
JAGDM 2016-02-01	3	Agenda
JAGDM 2016-02-02	-	List of participants
JAGDM 2016-02-03	7.a.ii	A Draft Mapping of NAF Record Identification Codes to UN/CEFACT Record identification codes
JAGDM 2016-02-04	7.a.iv	Notes on the More Detailed Mapping between UN/CEFACT and NAF Format
JAGDM 2016-02-05	7.a.iv	FLUX ERS Code List v0.5
JAGDM 2016-02-06	7.a.iv	EU FLUX Fishing Activity Implementation
JAGDM 2016-02-07 (Revised)	7.a.iv	NAF to UN/CEFACT List Format
JAGDM 2016-02-08	7.b.i	Possible Upgrade of NEAFC ISMS to use ISO 27001:2013
JAGDM 2016-02-09	7.b.ii	Report on the NEAFC Security System Administrators Meeting
JAGDM 2016-02-10	7.b.iii	Possible Definition of IT Security Incident: Discussion Paper from NEAFC Secretariat (rev2)
JAGDM 2016-02-11	7.b.iv	Information Security Risk Assessment Update
JAGDM 2016-02-12	7.b.v	Updated List of Inventory Updates
JAGDM 2016-02-13	7.a.iv	Sample Comparison Norway NAF to ERS UN/CEFACT
JAGDM 2016-02-14	7.a.ii	NEAFC Message Identification End to End
JAGDM 2016-02-15	7.b.v	Annual Review of the NEAFC Inventory
JAGDM 2016-02-16	11.b	Final Draft Logo
JAGDM 2016-02-17	4.a.i	Letter from the STACTIC Chair on Data Sharing
JAGDM 2016-02-18	4.a.iii	IMO Update from STACTIC Intersessional Meeting
JAGDM 2016-02-19	7.b.v	NEAFC Network Diagram
JAGDM 2016-02-20	7.a.iv	DCA report sent from NOR to XEU with CREWS and UN/CEFACT
JAGDM 2016-02-21	7.a	Letter from AHWG ERS Chair
JAGDM 2016-02-22	7.a.iii	NEAFC Adopting IMO Numbers
JAGDM 2016-02-23	7.a.iv	NEAFC NAF Codes vs UN/CEFACT
JAGDM 2016-02-24	7.a.iv	NEAFC Mapping Current Catch Messages to UN/CEFACT
JAGDM 2016-02-25	7.a.iv	NOR Mapping Current ERS Messages to UN/CEFACT
JAGDM 2016-02-26	7.a.i	Response to AHWG ERS on Two Letter Codes
JAGDM 2016-02-27	4.a.i	Proposal to Harmonize COX Reports
JAGDM 2016-02-28	7.a.iv	Response to AHWG ERS on Mapping
JAGDM 2016-02-29	7.a.iii	Response on IMO Numbering
JAGDM 2016-02-30	7.a.iv	NAF to UN/CEFACT Header Comparison
JAGDM 2016-02-31	7.a.ii	Response to AHWG ERS on Unique Identifiers
JAGDM 2016-01-20 (Revised)	10.b.i	JAGDM Proposal to Harmonize Data Definitions in NAFO Scheme with Definitions
JAGDM 2016-01-21 (Rev. 2)	10.b.i	JAGDM Proposal to Harmonise Data Definitions in NEAFC Scheme with Definitions
JAGDM 2016-01-28 (Revised)	7.a.i	NAF Codes in Use: Update from Norway