

**DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, OCEANS  
AND THE CANADIAN COAST GUARD**

**Technical Committee for the Standard Development of  
Electronic Logbook Client Applications**

*DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 2<sup>nd</sup> Teleconference meeting  
January 21, 2016*

**PREPARED BY:**

Mark Schuessler and Monique Grabowski, CGSB  
**Committee Secretariat**

**REVIEWED BY:**

Lisa Robichaud on behalf of  
Brent Napier, DFOCCG  
**Committee Chairperson**

## Membership

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Participation</b>
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Cédric Arseneau	Regulator	Quebec	Chair (Acting)
Ecotrust Canada	Amanda Barney	Software	Pacific	Webex
OLRAC SPS International	Amos Barkai	Software	International	Webex
Atlantic Policy Congress of First Nations Chiefs Secretariat	Amy Moulton	First Nations	Maritimes	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Richard Bastien	Regulator	C&A	Webex
Fisheries, Oceans Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard	Beth Hiltz	Regulator	Central and Arctic	Webex
Commercial Industry Caucus (Integrated Groundfish, Pacific Coast)	Bruce Turriss	Fisheries	Pacific	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Catherine Hollahan	Regulator	Newfoundland and Labrador	Webex
Pacific Prawn Fisherman's Association	Dane Chauvel	Fisheries	Pacific	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Gaétan Gauthier	Regulator	Quebec	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Glenn MacKay	Regulator	Maritimes	Webex
Regroupement des Pêcheurs du sud de la Gaspésie	Jean Côté	Fisheries	Quebec	Webex
Clearwater Seafoods	Jim Mosher	Fisheries	Maritimes	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Judy Dwyer		NCR	Webex
Regroupement des Pêcheurs du sud de la Gaspésie	Samuel Roussy	Fisheries	Quebec	Webex
Homarus	Martin Mallet	Fisheries	Maritimes	Webex
Fisheries Council of Canada	Michelle Boudreau	Fisheries	NCR	Webex
FFAW	Johan Joensen	Fisheries	Newfoundland and Labrador	Webex
Joubeh Technologies Inc.	Adam Myles	Software	Maritimes	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Justin Mundy	Regulator	Pacific	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Karen Leslie	Regulator	Pacific	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Lisa Robichaud	Regulator	NCR	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Manon Mallet	Regulator	Gulf	Webex
PEI Fishers Association	Melanie Giffin	Fisheries	Maritimes	Webex
M. C. Wright and Associated Ltd.	Michael C. Wright	Software	Pacific	Webex
M. C. Wright and Associated Ltd	Collin Thommasen	Software	Pacific	Webex

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Participation</b>
M. C. Wright and Associated Ltd	Kevin Cui	Software	Pacific	Webex
ROM Communications	Michael DeGroot	Software	Pacific	Webex
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Natasha Barbour	Regulator	Newfoundland and Labrador	Webex
Canadian General Standards Board	Monique Grabowski	Secretariat	NCR	Webex
Canadian General Standards Board	Mark Schuessler	Secretariat	NCR	Webex

**Unable to attend**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Region</b>	
Fisheries, Oceans Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard	Brent Napier	Regulator	NCR	
Fisheries, Oceans Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard	Jane Wyrzkowski	Regulator	Pacific	
Fisheries, Oceans Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard	Gaëlle Lemay	Regulator	Gulf	
Trackwell	Steingrimur Gunnarsson	Software	International	
Fédération Régionale Acadienne des Pêcheurs Professionnels	Jean Lanteigne	Fisheries	Gulf	
Gulf NS Fishermen's Coalition	Leonard Leblanc	Fisheries	Gulf	
FFAW-Unifor	Jason Spingle	Fisheries	Newfoundland and Labrador	
Thinking Big Technologies	Chris Weeks	Software	Maritimes	
FFAW-Unifor	Keith Sullivan	Fisheries	Newfoundland and Labrador	
Sea Trackers Dockside Monitoring	Ricky Doyle	Fisheries	Maritimes	
SASCO INC	Chuck Ashbaugh	Software	International	
IQMI & Inland Ground Fisherie Trawlers*	Jesse Latham	Fisheries	Pacific	
Sizeable Funding inc	John Blyth	Software Developer		

## **1. Word of welcome; Opening Remarks**

The teleconference meeting began at 12:30 pm (EST) with the meeting Chair (Acting), Cédric Arseneau, of the Department of Fisheries, Oceans Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard (DFO) welcoming members to teleconference, including those participating at late hours in different international time zones.

The Chair spoke that this meeting was to review the 2.5 version of the draft Electronic Logs Book project (e-logs) standard. This would entail reviewing the technical content of what should, and should not, be in the e-logs client software with a view to address these items.

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves by stating their name and organization by region and stakeholder category of interest.

It was noted to use the WebEx to write out questions on the teleconference for the benefit of reading them and to mute the line when possible to lower interference. He also noted that the presentation would be in English, however, the duration of the call would be extended to address questions in French.

The Chair reviewed the agenda on the WebEx. (Annex 1). The agenda was approved as there were no comments.

The Chair said that a revised version of the minutes from July 2015 had recently been sent out. There were no changes to the minutes requested by the members at this meeting. It was requested by Lisa Robichaud that if there are any further comments, please send them to her attention by February 4<sup>th</sup>. The minutes will be considered approved after that date. The minutes were tentatively approved for February 5<sup>th</sup> pending any further changes by the members (Annex 2).

The Chair began to reference the slides on the WebEx presentation (Annex 3).

The Chair spoke about the timelines that have been revised since the last meeting. It was noted that the previous timeline in July 2015 was very aggressive. In light of the numerous and very good comments received on the drafts, seeking innovative ways to address and resolve the comments pushed the project timeline back a bit. It also accounted for the 60 day public review period of the documentation which was sent to all members to distribute to their stakeholders.

Version 2.5 of the draft standard was done as quickly as possible incorporating consideration of these comments. Most of the comments were incorporated into the 2.5 version. It is hoped by the Chair that all members had have an opportunity to review version 2.5, including the document that provided a comparison between version 0.1 (July 2015) and version 2.5 (December 2015). Lisa Robichaud referred members to the December 18, 2015 letter outlining the objectives and goal to keep to the proposed timeline to have the recommendations on the draft finalized by February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Lisa reported that within DFO, activities underway included the validation of data, the development of fact sheets to indicate DFO's requirements

including specific data transmission and translation requirements. DFO is also preparing to develop a qualification program.

The Chair began to review slide three of the webex presentation. There was discussion that the forms for specific fisheries are slightly different across regions and fisheries and the software so this would explain why some criteria are requirements and some are optional.

***ACTION: The Chair confirmed that the Webex presentation will be sent to the members (Annex 3).***

The Chair reviewed slide 4 and slide 5 of the webex presentation. He said that he would quickly review the comparison between versions 0.1 and 2.5 drafts and explain the changes with further clarifications. He stated that further changes to the standard would be expected as its development evolved. The side by side draft comparison was put on the Webex (Annex 3).

The Chair reviewed page 1. Cédric Arseneau noted that the standard is a DFO document and that clarification was added about the purpose of the standard and explaining that the standard will evolve over time and that transparency will be a key component.

Melanie Giffin asked about Section 61 of the Act and the need to “transmit” in multiple formats. The term “submit” was suggested to replace “transmitted” for consistency in language. The term “communicated” was also suggested on the webex. The term “submitted” was approved.

Another member requested clarification on the term “integrity” (section 2.4).

### **Standard – Version 2.5 comparison to Version 0.1**

This document was reviewed by the members (Annex 4).

### **Section 1 Introduction**

The Chair reviewed section 1. There were no other comments on this section other than the comment above regarding the comment on the term “submit”.

### **Section 2.1 to 2.5 Standard Principles**

The Chair reviewed section 2.1 to 2.5. There was discussion about the important principle of the capacity of the fishermen to harvest and track information must not be impeded by the software.

A few new members joined at this point due to prior technical difficulty.

## **Section 3 Electronic Logbook System XML Structure**

### **Section 3.1 XML Nodes**

The Chair reviewed section 3.1. Cédric Arseneau noted that there was clarification of the text on XML. It was noted that there is still a need to submit data to DFO in XML from the software but the software can be in other formats as long as it is secure.

Bruce Turriss asked if examples of XML structure could be viewed and if there would be a test area provided. Cédric Arseneau said that the SSD and definitions were previously sent but they can be recirculated to everyone.

***ACTION: Send XML Structure, SSD and definitions to all members***

### **Section 3.2 Data Elements**

The Chair reviewed section 3.2. There was discussion regarding clarification about regions, gear, and forms that will vary. There was reference to optional fields for some regions and required fields in other regions. A member commented that there may be a need for exceptions to optional and required fields. Under “additional rules” a member pointed out that the fisher should not be able to modify the trip number.

***ACTION: Create a new data element category without interaction with the fisher.***

### **Section 3.3 Data Dictionary**

The Chair reviewed section 3.3. There were no comments on the data dictionary.

### **Section 3.4 Forms**

The Chair reviewed section 3.4. Cédric Arseneau noted that he hopes to circulate the final forms as soon as completed. It is hoped the software will handle different forms in different regions and anticipates to make all elements available on the DFO website.

Bruce Turriss said there may be cases in the fisheries that fishers want to collect more data and detailed information intended for their own use, than what is sent to DFO, regarding product form, catch used by plants, distribution, and traceability. This would be an up sale of the software. He asked if this was still the case. Cédric Arseneau confirmed that this was okay. There was discussion about the need to limit the number of versions of an application. Bruce Turriss commented on the need to make quick changes to maintain efficiency without interruptions to the fishing activities, as well as providing improvement of the data collection of the software. An example was given of the 450 updates generated in a year, however, none of them were interrupting the flow of data. It was discussed that there is a need to have a test environment in a beta site in order to be able to make adjustments, if needed. Cédric Arseneau stated that DFO wants to provide flexibility to the user that does not impact on the transmission of the data

Bruce Turriss asked if limits on number of versions would be applied to XML data required in the forms by DFO or if this were to apply to new versions of the software. With respect to the versions of forms, Cédric Arseneau said DFO would limit number of changes to their forms. For example, since July there was not a lot of changes to modify to the forms of the data to DFO. With respect to the versions of software, he said one of the reasons for limiting changes

was to keep the costs down for fishers as the costs to update the software would be passed on to them.

It was confirmed that DFO will establish a test environment for beta.

Cédric Arseneau and Lisa Robichaud agreed that further clarifications are needed to this section.

Amos Barkai said that batching changes into an annual update allows for batch control and this was common practice in Europe to keep costs down, minimizing frequency and planning changes. He noted that another way was to create “test data” like test trips, or have a real trip with a test report to confirm the validity of the data as well. A few members agreed to have further discussion on the test environment.

Cédric Arseneau said that there will be future discussion about test environments so the test environment will be limited in the discussion today.

***ACTION: Revise last paragraph of Section 3.4 by clarifying “of the forms” on the second line as follows: “...limit the number of new versions of the forms generated...”***

### **Section 3.5 XSD 9 and 3.6 Data Groups**

The Chair reviewed section 3.5 and 3.6 which didn't have changes.

### **Section 3.7 XML File names and 3.8 Character Sets**

The Chair reviewed section 3.7. He noted the XML changed a bit . Michael DeGroot asked about the title for data efficiency.

### **Section 4 Local Data Recording**

The Chair briefly reviewed section 4 which didn't have any changes. There were no comments.

### **Section 5 Data Group Closure**

#### **Section 5.1 Objectives of data group closure**

The Chair introduced section 5.1 which generated a lot of discussion. There was discussion about the data not being closed but only that the fishers could not change the data past a certain point. There was discussion about the data not being instantly sent but completed so there should be some type of data lock. It was suggested that fleets should be provided the option on how to transmit the data.

Bruce Turris asked why this was drafted into the standard as he didn't understand why changes just couldn't be logged into the data. It was noted that having to call DFO to change the data would be an awkward process, costly, time-consuming and would have different sets of data. The log system is easily programmed and keeps the data the same.

Cédric Arseneau noted that this was due to the legal implementation of the software to be similar to the paper log books. He said there needed to be a point that the fisher made a

'commitment to the data' just like the paper log book. Consider the standard practice of "logging changes" was offered as a possible solution.

There was discussion about 'at-shore' data correction being likely needed often. Cédric Arseneau asked for others to comment. There was further discussion that every time a correction is needed, even after trip, the log updates the numbers.

### **Section 5.2 Operating rules related to data closure**

There was discussion about extra fields to hold 'corrected' data but this was not considered as it would lead to a lot of redundant fields.

Michelle Boudreau discussed that changes would need to be logged and then resubmitted once a connection is made.

There was a question about if the text should say instant connection. Cédric Arseneau confirmed no, it is just a connection. He said the goal is to close the fishing trip in the application and lock it until it is transmitted. It could be that a separate entry is made of a change and that it is not transmitted so that two transmissions are needed for a change.

Amos Barkai supported the need for two correction reports as they don't want any discrepancies in the data. Any phone logs would have the data not reflected properly. This also has legal ambiguity and implications.

Cédric Arseneau noted there could be chain of custody tools as well but he understands the need to work on this section further. Bruce Turriss encouraged further review of this section as it is currently not written well. It was recommended to forward ideas to Lisa and Gaetan.

***ACTION: Need to further develop the correction process.***

It was noted that updating the same record is done in software all the time and it is not technically difficult. Justin Henry noted that the committee could consult IT for chain of custody ITSG 33 Standards.

Bruce Turriss suggested to create an E-Log key for both fishers and for 3<sup>rd</sup> party developers as well, so that they can be identified in the chain of custody. Cédric Arseneau noted this was a good idea.



## **Section 6 Default Values**

The Chair discussed section 6 which was only default values and just reworded.

Lisa Robichaud noted that fishers need to be accountable for the data in the system.

## **Section 7 Language**

The Chair discussed section 7. If a software company knows that all its users are unilingual, and it must prove this, then unilingual software is permitted. If the other official language is required later, DFO will reassess. It was noted that nothing excludes other languages other than French and English but the XML data is only sent in these two languages. It was commented that additional languages may create a qualification issue, however, the door is still left open.

## **Section 8 Data Access**

The Chair reviewed Section 8 on data access. There were no comments.

## **Section 9 Interference**

The Chair reviewed Section 9 on interference. Cédric Arseneau noted this was difficult to replicate. There were no comments.

## **Section 10 Coordinates**

The Chair reviewed Section 10 on coordinates. There was discussion about if the data need to have a GPS modules for gathering information but that it remains a requirement for the fisher to be able to manually enter location coordinates. There was a discussion about the location data having an override that the data can be fixed if there is an error. It was suggested by Johan Joensen to change the attributes <M> to 'manually entered' so that it is not confused with "modification". There were no further comments.

## **Section 11 Start of Trip**

The Chair reviewed Section 11 Start of Trip

Jean Côté remarked that this section is confusing. For example, in his case, for lobster the trip can only go once a day. He said there would be more errors in the data if there are more than one 'trip' that can be opened.

Dane Chanel said this was not always reasonable as fishers may not be able to connect to the internet until the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> trip. Cédric Arseneau noted that this should only just be a warning message, that it won't block the data from being entered. The warning message is not submitted or transmitted. Lisa Robichaud added that it doesn't stop someone from starting a new trip entry. DFO to review the wording to clarify the language further. Members were encouraged to submit their comments.

## **Section 12 Data Transmission**

The Chair reviewed Section 12 data transmission.

**ACTION:** Revise third paragraph by replacing “XML files shall be transmitted to DFO...” with “Data group shall be transmitted as XML file to DFO...”

Bruce Turris asked if regional hail or other trip information needed by regions will be accommodated in the national system. Cédric Arseneau said this could be included as a specific need of implementation. He requested further information from the regions. He thinks the regions have provided all the fields but if there are changes, please contact him about the data fields. He noted that there shouldn't be any duplication with other DFO systems.

It was asked if at the other systems for fish-harvesters could be in the software, for instance. Cédric Arseneau said that it was possible to have other data collected in the software and not sent to DFO. Michael DeGroot said the information is not necessarily in the XML file but in a database of information in the application.

The Chair reviewed Section 12.1 Obtaining an ELOG Key. There was discussion if this will coincide with the National Online Licensing System (NOLS) and can this be connected. Cédric Arseneau noted that the goal is to have the use of GC Key will assist with only one username password for users but will have access to both NOELS and elog.

The Chair reviewed Section 12.2 Web Service. There was a question from OLRACSPS about the web application being open to vendors yet. It was discussed it isn't open yet for security reasons but it is anticipated soon.

The Chair reviewed Section 12.3 Transmission register. Michael DeGroot noted that more data going through the system means more byte charges if satellite transmission is used. He suggested the section on confirmation information going back to the client could be a number confirmation rather than a lot of data (ie date and time). It was also noted that it might not have to be right away to get all the data, but could come with a less expensive data connection. DFO looking to have more discussion to further develop this section. The purpose is to confirm the number and results.

The Chair reviewed Section 12.4 Archives. It was noted that in the Archives of the XML, as this is part of the chain of custody of the data, it might be required to ensure the XML file is the same as received to be proven in a court of law. It was asked by Jean Côté if this can be on an external server and other than XML file. Cédric Arseneau confirmed that an external server was feasible.

Michael DeGroot then asked about the timeframe of retention, can files be deleted for example after seven years? or perhaps never. He noted that hard-drives typically have a life expectancy of five years. Currently, it seems as though, according to the standard, that they will never be deleted. Lisa Robichaud spoke that this would follow DFO's record retention policy which will be included.

The Chair reviewed Section 12.5 Transmission frequency. Amos Barkai stated that the frequency of transmission would also need to be defined. He stated the need to distinguish frequency of transmission versus frequency of collection of information. Need to define the resolution. The closing process is very important for this reason. Support would be needed to log in information to keep track of errors. The correction process needs more development.

Bruce Turris asked when they will have access to the 'fact sheets'.

There was also a discussion about errors.

### **Section 13 ELOG application updates**

The Chair reviewed Section 13, ELOG client application update. The committee to be kept informed of the qualification process under development. It was questioned why there is a need to have a qualification program beyond the test environment? The question was raised whether DFO could certify the service providers instead of the software (like, for example, at-sea fisheries observer companies). The global orientation is not to re-qualify each time there are changes. Changes that affect data needs to be re-qualified. More discussion followed. It was stated that the archive system should be able to handle updates. Comments on this section were encouraged. The objective is to have the principles of the standard applied.

### **Section 14 Security**

The Chair reviewed Section 14 Security. He stated that this section would be further developed.

### **Section 15 DFO instructions**

The Chair reviewed Section 15, DFO instructions. There were no comments.

### **Section 16 Security**

The Chair reviewed Section 16, Security. He welcomed comments.

### **Section 17 Technical Support**

The Chair reviewed Section 17, Technical support. The second paragraph was discussed in terms of "quickly" may not be achieved due to a lengthy qualification process may cause further delays.

### **Section 21 Recommendations**

The Chair reviewed Section 21, Recommendations for ELOG client application developers. Best practices were discussed. Amos Barkai stated that he was pleased with the responses to the comments in the development of this standard. Other than the issues being addressed, there was interest to better understand the timeline of the project. It was remarked that the qualification process will take time, however, it will not stop the development of the standard. In the implementation phase, it was recognized that some fleets will be implemented quicker than others. The development of the standard would continue and work will be undertaken with some specific fleets regarding implementation. Amos Barkai enquired about the timeline for data reporting.

Two targets:

- 1) Data field validation for certain vessel fleets;
  - 2) Web service accessibility for testing environment (to be completed asap).
- Need validation for security to third party. DFO working towards having something ready for the 2017 season, and hoping to have the testing platform ready shortly.

The Chair thanks Amos Barkai for his collaboration and contributions from an international perspective in the development of this standard.

The Chair recapped major issues discussed:

- 1) Correction process for data submitted needs further development;
- 2) Qualification process needs further development;
- 3) Requirements to have test environment ready as quickly as possible in order to work through the implementation phase.

**A roundtable followed:**

- Members were encouraged to provide further comments on the draft standard.
- There was a discussion regarding the what the impact would be in the field before the next season
- Tackle the issues by February/March 2016 and start the qualification process asap
- Could have pilot projects as implementation even if the standard and qualification process is still undergoing development
- DFO stated that there may be a need to have implementation for specific fleets but it was not expected to be implemented for the whole nation. Comments would need to be taken into consideration on a fleet-by-fleet basis.
- Foresee the standard finalized but the qualification process not ready yet.
- Request for further stakeholder consultation before implementation
- Major issues need to be further developed (correction process, set up testing environment, including third party provider
- Apply the principle to allow for flexibility
- Standard looks at a simple relationship, where data is transmitted directly from fish harvesters to DFO. However, it should also consider complex relationships where data may flow through a hub before it reaches DFO.
- Concerns expressed on the need to reach the grass roots as a need to obtain adequate representation
- Need input from small boat fleets
- User pushback
- Recommendation that DFO would be well served to have customer relation and meet with the grass root groups.
- DFO to consider reaching out and meeting with these groups (e.g. Pacific and Atlantic regions)
- Consultation needed with end user, technological challenges faced, including use of collection of data where there is no connection or dial up.

Karen Leslie, DFO Pacific, acknowledged all the work done by DFO, adding that comments to version 2.3 still stand regarding the standard development and its implementation. She was open to provide lessons learned from DFO Pacific's experience on e-logs.

### **Next Steps**

The Chair commented that the version 2.5 would be further reworked with the comments received. There would be a follow up regarding the correction process. He encouraged members to provide comments on the draft standard. Lisa Robichaud reiterated the need to keep to the proposed timeline as outlined in the letter to members dated December 18, 2015.

*Secretary's Note: Draft standard is available for public consultation on the DFO website.*

Glenn Mackay, DFO, Maritimes, expressed interest to obtain costing information from DFO Pacific Region and its successes in implementation. Such information sharing would be helpful to have for the fishers, as well as information on transmission with VMS for cellular transmissions.

Beth Hiltz, DFO Central and Arctic, was supportive of this initiative and stressed the need to meet the principle of affordability.

The Chair announced that he would be moving on to another assignment. He thanked everyone for their valuable contributions and welcome Lisa Robichaud as Project Lead. Lisa Robichaud thanked Cédric Arseneau for his tireless dedication to achieve success for this DFO initiative.

The meeting was adjourned.

The conference call continued in French. The Francophone members recapped the discussions, namely: industry engagement, implementation, pilot projects, correction process, (impact on data collection, need synchronize the information, maintain integrity of data) alignment of the forms with fact sheets, and the development of a qualification process.

Annex 1 – Draft Agenda, January 21, 2016

Annex 2 – Revised Draft Meeting Minutes, July 14-16, 2015

Annex 3 – WebEx Presentation, January 21, 2016

Annex 4 – Comparison Standard Version 0.1 (July 2015) to Version 2.5 (December 2015)