

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization



**Report of the NAFO Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)
Intersessional Meeting**

08-10 May 2018
Dartmouth, NS, Canada

NAFO
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada
2018



Report of the NAFO Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) Intersessional Meeting

08-10 May 2018
Dartmouth, NS, Canada

1. Opening by the Chair, Judy Dwyer (Canada)	3
2. Appointment of Rapporteur	3
3. Adoption of Agenda	3
4. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2017), including review of Apparent Infringements	3
5. Measures concerning repeat non-compliance of serious infringements in the NAFO Regulatory Area	4
6. New and pending proposals on enforcement measures: Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM	5
7. NAFO Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Website	7
8. Information Security Management System (ISMS)	7
a. NAFO Secretariat backup tape storage	7
b. Data Classification	7
9. Half-year review of the implementation of new NAFO CEM measures.....	7
10. Review and evaluation of Practices and Procedures	8
11. Review of current IUU list.....	8
12. Review of data reporting requirements in the NAFO CEM	8
13. Bycatches and discards	9
14. Editorial Drafting Group (EDG) of the NAFO CEM.....	10
15. Report and recommendations of STACTIC Observer Program Review Working Group (WG-OPR)..	10
16. Report and advice of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM).....	11
17. Other Business	11
a. MRAG Americas – Catch Estimation Study.....	11
b. Discussion on NAFO CEM Article 37.4.....	11
c. Discussion on garbage and labour conditions onboard vessels	12
18. Time and Place of next meeting	12
19. Adoption of Report	12
20. Adjournment.....	12
Annex 1. Participant List	13
Annex 2. Agenda.....	16



Report of the NAFO Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) Intersessional Meeting

08-10 May 2018
Dartmouth, NS, Canada

1. Opening by the Chair, Judy Dwyer (Canada)

The Chair, Judy Dwyer (Canada), opened the meeting at 10:00 hours on Tuesday, 08 May 2018 at the NAFO Secretariat Headquarters in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada. The Chair welcomed representatives from the following Contracting Parties (CPs) – Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, France (in Respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), Iceland, Japan, Norway, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America (Annex 1).

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

The NAFO Secretariat (Jana Aker) was appointed as rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The following amendments were made to the agenda under agenda item 17 – Other Business:

- a. MRAG Americas – Catch Estimation Study
- b. Discussion on NAFO CEM Article 37.4
- c. Discussion on garbage and labour conditions onboard vessels

The agenda was adopted as presented in Annex 2.

4. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2017), including review of Apparent Infringements

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-02 on 2017 catch, effort and compliance and highlighted the compliance tables found in STACTIC WP 18-01. Several Contracting Parties raised concerns about the submission rates of the logbook (haul by haul) data (Article 28.8.b of the NAFO CEM) noting that the lack of submissions has been flagged by other working groups within NAFO. Contracting Parties highlighted that in the Secretariat's presentation (STACTIC WP 18-02), it would be better to name the Contracting Parties / vessels that have not met the submission requirements in order for STACTIC to have the ability to assess what the specific issues are for those parties who are not meeting the submission requirements. Contracting Parties who have yet to submit the logbook (haul by haul) data noted that they would work on getting the submissions to the NAFO Secretariat.

The European Union highlighted that the compliance presentation from the NAFO Secretariat in STACTIC WP 18-02 resulted in confusion about what the specific compliance issues are within NAFO for the previous year because of the lack of transparency within the presentation itself. In recent years, STACTIC has become more open in its conversations, especially at the Intersessional Meetings, and the compliance presentation from the Secretariat should reflect that openness by highlighting specific vessels / Contracting Parties that were not in compliance with the NAFO CEM. The European Union noted that the report at the STACTIC Intersessional Meeting is meant to be the internal review of compliance and that the purpose of the presentation at the intersessional meeting is to generate discussion within STACTIC on operational problems with the NAFO CEM and potential solutions. It was noted that the inclusion of trends would benefit STACTIC in its task of identifying key compliance issues in NAFO fisheries. Contracting Parties agreed that it would be beneficial if the presentation included the following:

1. A trend analysis for:
 - the level of fishing effort from year to year.

- the uptake of stocks from year to year.
 - the bycatches and discards from year to year.
2. Clarification on the various tables (e.g. making it clear that quotas in Table 2 of STACTIC WP 18-02 include transfers).
 3. Replace the terms “*regulated*” and “*non-regulated*” species with “*species subject to catch limitation (species listed in the Quota table)*” and “*species not subject to catch limitation (species not listed in the Quota table)*”.
 4. Identify Contracting Parties that have failed to comply with obligations in the NAFO CEM as well as which provisions were not complied with (including specific NAFO CEM references)
 5. A review of the port State inspection coverage under Chapter VII (i.e. 15% requirement being met).
 6. A review of the port State inspection coverage under Article 10
 7. Submission rates of types of catch reports (e.g. haul by haul) by Contracting Party
 8. The date that fines were issued (NAFO Secretariat can request this information when it is not submitted).
 9. Draft compliance reports with vessel and/or Contracting Party details be distributed to STACTIC members by 15 April each year.

The NAFO Secretariat requested that any comments for corrections on the Compliance Tables in STACTIC WP 18-01 be submitted by 31 May 2018. The NAFO Secretariat reminded that the Compliance Tables will be circulated to Contracting Parties in June 2018 in accordance with Rule 5.1 of the NAFO Rules of Procedure: Commission.

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-03, which contained the information received from Contracting Parties in accordance with Article 40 of the NAFO CEM and STACTIC WP 18-04, which included a summary of the Apparent Infringements that were issued by inspectors during at-sea inspections. It was noted that the current templates cause confusion as some infringements are repeated in the document and the European Union agreed to draft improved reporting templates for the next STACTIC Intersessional Meeting.

It was **agreed** that:

- **The NAFO Secretariat would circulate the draft compliance tables, with vessel names included, to STACTIC participants by 15 April each year to facilitate review by Contracting Parties in advance of the STACTIC Intersessional Meeting.**
- **The NAFO Secretariat would include the above-mentioned enhancements to the Compliance Review for the next STACTIC Intersessional Meeting.**
- **The European Union would draft new templates for the information presented in STACTIC WP 18-03 and STACTIC WP 18-04 for the next STACTIC Intersessional Meeting.**
- **Contracting Parties would submit any comments or corrections on the Compliance Tables (STACTIC WP 18-01) to the NAFO Secretariat by 31 May 2018.**

5. Measures concerning repeat non-compliance of serious infringements in the NAFO Regulatory Area

The Chair opened this agenda item noting that at the last Annual Meeting of STACTIC, Contracting Parties had agreed to submit information to Canada on their domestic legislation for addressing repeated serious infringements of the NAFO CEM. Canada provided an update on the status of submitted domestic legislation by Contracting Parties and noted that some Contracting Parties have not yet submitted the information. Canada outlined that in reviewing the information that is available, there are some commonalities between Contracting Parties, particularly as it relates to vessels. Canada is considering options for a proposal on a way forward.

Contracting Parties agreed to submit the information to Canada, and Canada agreed that they would continue the review with the aim of having a proposal for the Annual Meeting, noting they may seek clarification from Contracting Parties on some of the domestic legislation information.

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-05 which highlighted that CCAMLR had a Contracting Party IUU vessel list. The European Union clarified that CCAMLR is not the only RFMO that has adopted an IUU listing procedure for Contracting Party vessels. Canada will consider how other RFMOs have addressed the problem in their development of a proposal.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Contracting Parties will submit and/or clarify domestic legislation/authorities/policies to Canada to facilitate their drafting of a proposal for addressing repeat non-compliance with the NAFO CEM.**
- **Canada will continue to review the submissions from Contracting Parties and upon receiving input from all Contracting Parties, will work on a proposal for addressing repeat non-compliance with the NAFO CEM with the aim to present it at the next Annual Meeting.**

6. New and pending proposals on enforcement measures: Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM

The United States of America presented STACTIC WP 18-15 outlining a proposal for changes to the NAFO CEM regarding move-along provisions. The United States highlighted the challenges of applying the move-along provisions for their smaller longline vessels, noting the provision was written mainly in the context of trawlers, which can result in inconsistent or inequitable application to other types of gear used, including longlines. Some Contracting Parties did not agree that multiple strings of lines should be considered as a single set of gear. Canada noted that, from their perspective, it is standard practice to use start and end positions on a single string to define a set and believe it is consistent with the requirement to record for the smallest geographical area for which a quota has been allocated. However, although Canada believes the move-along provisions have been applied consistent with the measures, they agreed to work with other Contracting Parties to clarify how they are applicable to longliners because the terms haul / set / tow are not defined in the NAFO CEM. Denmark (in Respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted that move-along provisions can be difficult for longliners in Division 3M because the geographic area within 3M is quite small and the sets are quite long. The United States thanked Contracting Parties for their feedback on this proposal, noting that they feel it is still important to address the differences between trawl and non-trawl vessels in applying the move-along provisions to ensure minimization of bycatch and equity between the different gear types operating in the NRA. For these reasons, the United States asked to defer any decision on their proposal at this meeting so that they could confer with Contracting Parties about developing alternatives to address their concerns for possible consideration at the next Annual Meeting.

The European Union highlighted that their proposals under this agenda item are a result of discussions held and ideas for improvements to the measures suggested at the Inspectors Workshop that was held in October 2017 and invited other Contracting Parties to participate in future workshops. The European Union presented STACTIC WP 18-20 highlighting a clarification in the estimation of bycatches onboard a vessel in Article 6.9 of the NAFO CEM. Contracting Parties raised some concerns on the clarification of “total catch” in this article, and what it would be interpreted as in other Articles and felt that the best way forward would be to add a definition of total catch to Article 1 of the NAFO CEM. The European Union withdrew the proposal and Canada agreed to draft the definition for the next Annual Meeting.

The European Union presented STACTIC WP 18-21, a proposal to require vessels entering the NAFO Regulatory Area with catch onboard to have a stowage plan for that catch that meets the requirements in the NAFO CEM. Contracting Parties agreed with the proposal, and Canada requested to add that the information be available to inspectors. It was agreed to forward STACTIC WP 18-21 (Revised) to the Commission for adoption.

Report of STACTIC,
08-10 May 2018

The European Union presented STACTIC WP 18-22, which proposed amendments to the NAFO CEM to facilitate the collection of DNA samples from fish by inspectors at sea and in port. During the presentation, the European Union noted that there have been issues with misrecording of species, and DNA analysis is a valuable method for verifying species / stocks. The European Union also sought support to harmonize procedures related to sample collection and DNA analysis, in order to reinforce the admissibility of the results of DNA analysis as evidence in court, in particular when non-flag State inspectors are involved. Based on procedures applied within Contracting Parties, STACTIC should promote a project on DNA collection and analysis with the view to establish best practices on:

- a. sampling sizes, sufficient to extrapolate the results to the entire catch;
- b. procedure to take samples;
- c. standards for the analysis of DNA samples in national laboratories;
- d. transmission of results to enable continuity of evidence to be secured to support prosecution (traceability of the samples back to their origin);
- e. use of results from non-flag State Contracting Parties as stand-alone evidence for follow-up by the flag State Contracting Party.

Contracting Parties requested further clarity in the text in the proposal, with the final proposal being presented in STACTIC WP 18-22 Rev.2 and subsequently adopted.

Contracting Parties agreed that Canada and the European Union would work together on the project for consideration at the next Inspectors Workshop scheduled for October 2018 and report back to STACTIC.

Canada presented STACTIC WP 18-26 outlining a proposal for the requirement for product labels to be facing upwards, when product is stowed, to be added to the NAFO CEM to facilitate inspections and noted that there have been issues with vessels placing the product labels downward, and highlighted the challenges for inspectors who conduct inspections in freezer holds when faced with product stored in this manner. The European Union noted that the vessel in question that has been having this issue is doing so because the equipment onboard the vessel does not allow for the labels to be on the tops of the boxes. The European Union requested that they be provided with time to discuss the situation with the vessel operators to see if the issue can be resolved before resorting to creating a revision of the NAFO CEM to address the issue. Contracting Parties agreed to this way forward, and Canada agreed to withdraw the proposal with the possibility of bringing it back at the next Annual Meeting pending the results of the European Union discussions.

Canada presented STACTIC WP 18-27, which outlined proposed amendments to Article 28.5 relating to the stowage of catch and noted that they have experienced challenges in relation to stowage plans during inspections and that this proposal would help resolve some of those issues. Contracting Parties noted that the wording was a bit confusing in terms of the requirement for a “*top and side view*” and requested that Canada come back at the next Annual Meeting with a visual representation of their expectations for Contracting Parties to review and make a decision on the proposed revisions.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Action on STACTIC WP 18-15 was deferred so that the United States could consult with other Contracting Parties to see if their proposal could be modified in a way to address concerns regarding how move-along provisions apply to longline gear.**
- **Canada would draft a definition of total catch, for inclusion in Article 1 of the NAFO CEM, for presentation at the next Annual Meeting.**
- **The proposal outlined in STACTIC WP 18-21 (Revised) be forwarded to the Commission for adoption.**

- **The proposal outlined in STACTIC WP 18-22 (Rev. 2) be forwarded to the Commission for adoption.**
- **Canada and the European Union would work together on the project for consideration at the next Inspectors Workshop scheduled for October 2018 and report back to STACTIC.**
- **Canada would come to the next Annual Meeting with a revision to the proposal outlined in STACTIC WP 18-27, including visual representations on what the proposal is outlining.**

7. NAFO Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Website

The NAFO Secretariat displayed the catch data query tool on the MCS Website that was implemented following a recommendation at the 2017 Annual Meeting. The NAFO Secretariat also presented a demonstration of the Quota Monitoring tool that could be incorporated into the MCS Website. Contracting Parties thanked the NAFO Secretariat for their work and agreed that the Quota Monitoring tool would be a useful addition to the MCS Website.

It was **agreed** that:

- **The Quota Monitoring tool as demonstrated by the NAFO Secretariat be added to the NAFO MCS Website.**

8. Information Security Management System (ISMS)

a. NAFO Secretariat backup tape storage

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-06 highlighting the new data backup process at the NAFO Secretariat.

b. Data Classification

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-07 highlighting a request from the *Ad hoc Virtual NAFO Website Re-design Working Group: Phase II – Data Classification* for STACTIC to review the classification of its working papers in terms of whether they should remain on the secured NAFO Members Pages or if they should be on the public NAFO website. The United States of America highlighted that they were in support of the idea of moving working papers to the public website in the interest of transparency, but several Contracting Parties raised concerns about the sensitive information presented in some of the working papers within STACTIC being made public.

It was **agreed** that:

- **STACTIC working papers should remain on the secured NAFO Members Pages website.**
- **The United States will bring a working paper on the transparency of working papers to STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting.**

9. Half-year review of the implementation of new NAFO CEM measures

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-08 and noted that there have been no issues so far in 2018 with the measures that were adopted at the 2017 Annual Meeting.

Norway presented STACTIC WP 18-25 in response to a recommendation from STACTIC at the 2017 STACTIC Intersessional meeting relating to the PSC1/2 approval process where a vessel with catch onboard is entering port solely for “*use of port services*” and requesting information from NEAFC. Norway noted that NEAFC adopted changes to the scheme at the 2017 Annual Meeting that require flag State confirmation and port State authorization for the “*use of port services*” and that the PSC1/2s that are solely for use of port services are not counted towards the inspection thresholds. Norway recommended that STACTIC should consider making

similar amendments to the NAFO CEM and volunteered to draft a proposal for the Annual Meeting. Contracting Parties thanked Norway for this report and accepted the offer for them to draft a proposal.

The European Union flagged that there is confusion about what information is being requested from inspectors in the sea inspection report template of Annex IV.B Section 6 under "*Vessel quota by stock area*". It was agreed that this matter will be added to the agenda for the next Inspectors Workshop scheduled for October 2018 to seek clarification.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Norway would draft a proposal similar to what NEAFC had adopted at their 2017 Annual meeting (as described in STACTIC WP 18-25) for presentation to STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting.**
- **Annex IV.B of the NAFO CEM be added to the agenda for the fall 2018 Inspectors Workshop.**

10. Review and evaluation of Practices and Procedures

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-09 and noted there have been no updates to the website since the Annual Meeting. Iceland and Denmark (in Respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had agreed to provide presentations under this agenda item, but they were deferred until the next Annual Meeting. Iceland also noted that they would work with the Secretariat to get anonymized data in order to demonstrate their business intelligence software for monitoring, control, and surveillance.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Iceland would present a demonstration of their business intelligence software for monitoring, control, and surveillance at the next Annual Meeting.**
- **Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) would provide a presentation of their quota monitoring system at the next Annual Meeting.**

11. Review of current IUU list

The Secretariat presented the NAFO IUU List Update in STACTIC WP 18-10 and noted that there have been no changes to the IUU list since the last update at the 2017 NAFO Annual Meeting. The NAFO Secretariat also noted that they have added a link to the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) IUU list on the Other RFMOs IUU list page on the NAFO Website.

Norway noted that, according to Lloyds List of Intelligence, the vessel Maine is now called Labiko. This information has been put forward to NEAFC for consideration for updating their IUU list at the 2018 Annual Meeting to include the name change. NAFO will take appropriate action concerning the name of this vessel, if necessary, after the 2018 NEAFC Annual Meeting. The European Union noted that several vessels are no longer in operation but continue to be presented on the IUU list. Clarification was requested from the Executive Secretary on how NAFO notifies the vessels' flag State and whether there was a follow-up process to the initial notice. The NAFO Secretariat agreed to examine the process and advise at the 2018 Annual Meeting on whether improvements are required. Contracting Parties were encouraged to provide evidence, if it exists, justifying the removal of a vessel from the IUU list in a proposal to STACTIC.

12. Review of data reporting requirements in the NAFO CEM

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-11 on a review of the monthly provisional catch reporting requirement in the NAFO CEM Article 28.8.a noting some Contracting Parties report landed amounts while other reports are based on the daily CAT amounts. The provision has been in place since at least 1980, before daily catch reporting was a requirement in NAFO. Because landing figures and daily CAT amounts are not necessarily equivalent, the European Union requested clarification on the concept of provisional monthly catches to determine which kind of figures are required. Should the provisional monthly catch refer to CAT

amounts, Contracting Parties agreed that the measure may no longer be of value and requested that the NAFO Secretariat check with the Scientific Council to ensure that they are not using the data before making any changes in the NAFO CEM.

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-12 highlighting the recommendations for STACTIC from the Catch Data Advisory Group (CDAG). The Secretariat explained that on the first recommendation, the group was asking STACTIC to review the 60-day requirement for submitting haul by haul data in accordance with Article 28.8.b, with the goal of reducing the timeframe down from 60 days. Contracting Parties noted that before there could be a reduction in the timeline of the submission requirement, there needs to be an analysis on why the 60-day requirement is not being met by some Contracting Parties. Contracting Parties agreed that a review of haul by haul reporting should be added to the agenda for the next Annual Meeting with a view to examine and address potential causes of untimely reporting or non-reporting of this data, appropriate timeframe for reporting this data, the feasibility of including catch information by haul in the daily CAT, the availability of this data to NAFO Inspectors, recommendation 5 from the latest WG-BDS meeting report, and any other issues related to haul by haul reporting.

On the second recommendation, the Secretariat explained that the Catch Estimation Methodology (outlined in Annex 1 of COM Doc. 17-08) relies on port inspection data, and that having that data presented by division in the reports would be beneficial in applying the method. The European Union noted that the CAT messages already request the catch of the previous day to be reported by division.

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-13 highlighting an outdated weekly reporting requirement in the NAFO CEM following a recommendation from the 2017 Annual Meeting. The NAFO Secretariat noted the requirement is in relation to the Observer Scheme, and the Chair noted that the Observer Program Review Working Group could address this issue.

It was **agreed** that:

- **A review of the reporting of haul by haul data be added to the agenda for the next Annual Meeting with a view to examine and address potential causes of untimely reporting or non-reporting of this data, appropriate timeframe for reporting this data, the feasibility of including catch information by haul in the daily CAT, the availability of this data to NAFO inspectors, recommendation 5 from the WG-BDS meeting report, and any other issues related to haul by haul reporting.**
- **The NAFO Secretariat would ask the Scientific Council what it expects from the provisional monthly catch reporting data under NAFO CEM Article 28.8.a (landing figures or CAT amounts) and report back to STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting.**

13. Bycatches and discards

The Chair introduced COM Doc. 17-23 which tasked STACTIC and the *Ad Hoc Working Group on Bycatches, Discards and Selectivity (WG-BDS)* to examine the feasibility of introducing policies to minimize or eliminate discards in NAFO. In COM Doc. 17-23, STACTIC was specifically requested to review domestic legislation in relation to this task, and Contracting Parties were requested to submit this information prior to this meeting. The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-14 and noted that submissions were received from Canada, the European Union, Faroe Islands, Greenland, Iceland, Japan and Norway, and the Chair encouraged other Contracting Parties to submit this information. In addition to this, STACTIC was requested to identify current discard obligations in the NAFO CEM, and the European Union presented STACTIC WP 18-23 in response to this request.

Contracting Parties discussed their domestic discarding and landing provisions and their potential applicability in NAFO, but Contracting Parties noted that the current task outlined in COM Doc. 17-23 was to present a plan for how the points outlined in the document are going to be addressed. The Chair tasked a smaller working group to meet within the margins of STACTIC to develop that plan and they presented it in STACTIC WP 18-28 (Revised). The timelines presented in the working paper will be reviewed and finalized at the next Annual

Meeting. STACTIC will coordinate its plan with the WG-BDS. During the discussion of this plan, it was noted that STACTIC will propose edits to the Bycatch and Discards Action Plan (COM Doc. 17-26) in advance of the next Annual meeting to reflect these recommendations and will present it to the Commission for their review.

It was **agreed** that:

- **STACTIC would coordinate its plan with the WG-BDS.**
- **The plan presented in STACTIC WP 18-28 (Revised) be updated to include timelines at the next Annual Meeting and forwarded to the Commission for adoption.**
- **STACTIC will propose edits to the Bycatch and Discards Action Plan (COM Doc. 17-26) in advance of the next Annual meeting to reflect these recommendations and will present it to the Commission for their review.**

14. Editorial Drafting Group (EDG) of the NAFO CEM

The NAFO Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 18-16 that highlighted a small editorial change to Article 38.5 that may be required to be reviewed by the EDG. Contracting Parties agreed that the Secretariat could make the editorial change rather than forward the issue to the EDG.

The working paper also highlighted that some definitions in the NAFO Convention differed from those in the NAFO CEM, and the Secretariat sought guidance on this issue. Contracting Parties noted that the definitions in the NAFO CEM are meant for use within the NAFO CEM, and that as long as the definitions in the NAFO CEM are not any less restrictive to those in the NAFO Convention, it should not be an issue that the definitions differ.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Contracting Parties would reflect on the differences in the definitions between the NAFO CEM and the NAFO Convention and report back at the next Annual Meeting if any concerns are noted.**

15. Report and recommendations of the STACTIC Observer Program Review Working Group (WG-OPR)

The Chair of the WG-OPR (Judy Dwyer, Canada) reported that the working group continues to work on the revision of Article 30 and currently have seven draft annexes associated with the revision of the Article. The Chair highlighted STACTIC WP 18-24, which was a paper submitted by the European Union to provide a summary on the status of the Working Group and highlight the two main outstanding issues within the group, which are coverage levels and whether the annexes should be legally binding. The Chair tasked a smaller group within the working group to develop potential criteria that could be used to apply a derogation from a 100% observer coverage requirement. The smaller group will discuss possible criteria for derogation and consider other factors such as whether coverage should be applied on a vessel or fleet basis. The working group will exchange email and continue to meet via WebEx to address these outstanding issues.

The Chair presented the latest version of Article 30 in WG-OPR Draft Article 30 -Version 8Revised2 and noted that there is consensus from the members of the Working Group on the text in the current draft, but that some Contracting Parties not participating in the Working Group may want to provide comments. It was agreed that Contracting Parties would provide any comments on the latest draft of Article 30 to the NAFO Secretariat by 25 May 2018.

It was **agreed** that:

- **The WG-OPR would convene a series of WebEx meetings before the next Annual Meeting to discuss the coverage levels and the annexes for the revision of Article 30.**
- **Contracting Parties would provide any comments to the latest draft of Article 30 (WG-OPR Draft Article 30 -Version 8Revised2) to the NAFO Secretariat by 25 May 2018.**

- **The WG-OPR would continue to work toward the goal of having a full revision of the NAFO Observer Program to present to STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting.**

16. Report and advice of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)

The vice Chair of JAGDM (Natasha Barbour, Canada) presented STACTIC WP 18-17 outlining the meeting highlights from the last meeting of JAGDM that took place in March 2018. The highlights included discussions on data exchange statistics, the review of the proposed changes for the OBR report in the NAFO CEM, a review of the NAFO MCS website and a review of the NAFO CEM annexes. The group also discussed the JAGDM reflections paper following some operational concerns with the joint group. The Chair of the WG-OPR noted that the advice from JAGDM on the OBR message would be discussed at a future WG-OPR WebEx meeting.

The vice-Chair of JAGDM also presented STACTIC WP 18-18, which outlined a proposal from JAGDM to clarify the VMS data format requirements as outlined in Annex I.E of the NAFO CEM. Contracting Parties thanked JAGDM for the proposal and agreed to forward it to the Commission for adoption. The mandatory requirement for speed and course of an EXI VMS message, even though the latitude and longitude are optional, was also raised by the JAGDM vice Chair for discussion.

It was **agreed** that:

- **The proposal from JAGDM outlined in STACTIC WP 18-18 be forwarded to the Commission for adoption.**

17. Other Business

a. MRAG Americas – Catch Estimation Study

The Chair introduced Graeme Parkes and Jill Swasey from MRAG Americas who have been contracted to complete the NAFO Catch Estimates Study that was adopted at the 2017 Annual Meeting (COM Doc. 17-25). MRAG gave a presentation on the background and an outline of the study and asked STACTIC participants to meet with them, if time allows, throughout the week to conduct interviews and gather relevant information and contacts.

b. Discussion on NAFO CEM Article 37.4

Iceland flagged a recent citation of a serious apparent infringement that occurred in the NAFO Regulatory Area and questioned why Contracting Parties were not informed of the AI following Article 37.4. Iceland noted that this vessel approached a port in the NEAFC area, and although port inspectors were informed through informal means, could easily have been unaware of the AI prior to inspection. The Secretariat noted that the CEM currently obliges them to distribute information on apparent infringements only to Contracting Parties operating within the Scheme under Chapter VI of the NAFO CEM. Contracting Parties agreed on the importance of sharing information on apparent infringements issued at sea with port inspection authorities, and Canada agreed to draft a proposal to address this at the next Annual Meeting.

The European Union offered to develop a proposal to enable Contracting Parties without inspection presence access to further information on the NAFO MCS Website for presentation at the next Annual Meeting.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Canada would draft a proposal to revise Article 37.4 in the NAFO CEM to facilitate the sharing of information on apparent infringements issued at sea with other Contracting Parties for the next Annual Meeting.**
- **The European Union offered to develop a proposal to enable Contracting Parties without inspection presence access to further information on the NAFO MCS Website for presentation at the next Annual Meeting.**

c. Discussion on garbage and labour conditions onboard vessels

The European Union sought to initiate a discussion on how garbage is handled onboard vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area, and whether it is possible for a measure to be included in the NAFO CEM to address the issue. Contracting Parties noted that there are requirements under MARPOL, specifically Annex V, and that some have domestic legislation that is applied to either incinerate garbage onboard or land all garbage in port. The NAFO Secretariat noted that under the revised Convention, there is a commitment to safeguard the marine environment and take due account of the need to reduce pollution and waste, so it could be within the scope of the Convention to add something in the NAFO CEM on garbage disposal requirements. The Chair asked Contracting Parties to reflect on the issue of garbage disposal at sea and the extent to which their domestic laws can address the issue. The NAFO Secretariat agreed to check whether other RFMOs consider the application of MARPOL requirements for further discussion at the next Annual Meeting. All materials, including information pertaining to domestic practices, should be forwarded to the Secretariat so that it can be posted to the STACTIC SharePoint site.

The European Union also requested a discussion on what Contracting Parties are currently doing from a fishery context to address situations where the working conditions onboard vessels are not suitable. Contracting Parties explained that some address these situations through the provisions in their national legislation, some their national labour boards, and some through the coast guards, etc. The Chair encouraged Contracting Parties to reflect on this issue and continue discussions at the Annual Meeting.

It was **agreed** that:

- **Contracting Parties would reflect on the issue of garbage disposal at sea and the extent to which their domestic laws can address the issue.**
- **The NAFO Secretariat would check whether other RFMOs consider the application of MARPOL requirements for further discussion at the next Annual Meeting.**
- **All materials, including information pertaining to domestic practices, would be forwarded to the Secretariat so that it can be posted to the STACTIC SharePoint site.**
- **Contracting Parties would reflect on the issue of labour conditions and continue discussions at the Annual Meeting.**

18. Time and Place of next meeting

The next STACTIC meeting will be held in Tallinn, Estonia from 17-21 September 2018.

19. Adoption of Report

The report was adopted on 10 May 2018, prior to the adjournment of the meeting.

20. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 14:25 hours on 10 May 2018. The Chair thanked the NAFO Secretariat for hosting the meeting and for their support during the meeting. She also thanked the meeting participants for their cooperation and input. The participants likewise expressed their thanks and appreciation to the Chair for her leadership.

Annex 1. Participant List

CHAIR

Dwyer, Judy. Director, Enforcement, Conservation and Protection, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Tel: +1 613 993-3371 – Email: judy.dwyer@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

CANADA

Barbour, Natasha. A/Program Lead, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, 80 East White Hills, St. John's, NL A1C5X1
Tel: +1 709 772-5788 – Email: Natasha.barbour@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Hurley, Mike. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, 80 East White Hills, St. John's, NL A1C5X1
Tel: + 1 709 227-9344 – Email: mike.hurley@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Kavanagh-Penney, Amy. Senior Compliance Officer, Conservation and Protection, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, 80 East White Hills, St. John's, NL A1C5X1
Email: Amy.kavanagh-penney@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Milburn, Derrick. Senior Advisor, International Fisheries Management and Bilateral Relations, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6
Tel: +1 613 993-7967 – Email: Derrick.Milburn@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Slaney, Lloyd. Conservation and Protection, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, 80 East White Hills, St. John's, NL A1C5X1
Email: Lloyd.Slaney@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)

Gaardlykke, Meinhard. Adviser, The Faroe Islands Fisheries Inspection, Yviri við Strond 3, P. O. Box 1238, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
Tel: +298 31 1065 – Mobile: +298 29 1006 – Email: meinhardg@vorn.fo

Jacobsen, Petur Meinhard. Advisor, The Faroe Islands Fisheries Inspection, Yviri við Strond 3, P. O. Box 1238, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands.
Tel.: +29 831 1065 – Mobile: +29 829 1001 – Email: mailto:peturmj@vorn.fo

Jørgensen, Claus Christian. Consultant. Greenland Fisheries License Control Authority P.O. Box 501. 3900 Nuuk, Greenland.
Email: clcj@nanoq.gl

Nedergaard, Mads Trolle. Head of Department, Greenland Fisheries License Control Authority, Postbox 501, DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
Tel.: +299 55 3347 – Email: mads@nanoq.gl

EUROPEAN UNION

Chamizo Catalan, Carlos. Head of Fisheries Inspection Division, Secretariat General de Pesca Maritima, Subdireccion de Control Inspeccion, Ministerio Agricultura y Pesca, Alimentacion y Medio Ambiente, Velázquez, 144, 28006 Madrid, Spain
Tel: +34 347 1949 – Email: cchamizo@mapama.es

Jury, Justine. Fisheries Inspector, European Commission, DG MARE D.4: Fisheries Control and Inspections
Tel: +32 (2) 29 86929 – Email: Justine.JURY@ec.europa.eu

Quelch, Glenn, European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA), Avenida Garcia Barbon 4, Vigo, Spain, ES-36201
Tel: + 34 699 634-337 Email: glenn.quelch@efca.europa.eu

Report of STACTIC,
08-10 May 2018

Spezzani, Aronne. European Commission, DG-MARE, Rue Joseph II, 99, B-1049, Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 295 9629 – Email: aronne.spezzani@ec.europa.eu

FRANCE (IN RESPECT OF ST. PIERRE ET MIQUELON)

Granger, Arnaud. Head of Office of Maritime Affairs, 1 rue Gloanec, B. P. 4206, 97500 Saint-Pierre et Miquelon
Tel: +508-41-15-36 – Email: arnaud-j.granger@equipement-agriculture.gouv.fr

ICELAND

Asgeirsson, Hrannar Mar. Directorate of Fisheries, Surveillance Department, Fiskistofa, Dalshrauni 1, 220
Hafnarfjordur, Iceland
Email: hrannar@fiskistofa.is

Ingason, Björgólfur H. Chief controller, Landhelgisgæsla Íslands, Icelandic Coast Guard, Reykjavík, Iceland
Tel: +354 545 2111 – Email: bjorgolfur@lhg.is

JAPAN

MIWA, Takeshi. Associate Director, International Affairs Division, Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan.
Email: takeshi_miwa090@maff.go.jp

SHIMOTASHIRO, Kunitaka. Technical Officer, Fisheries Management Division, Fisheries Agency, Government of
Japan.
Email: kunitaka_shimotas940@maff.go.jp

YOSHIOKA, Akiko. Assistant Manager, Japan Overseas Fishing Association
Email: yoshioka@jdsta.or.jp

NORWAY

Ognedal, Hilde. Senior Legal Adviser, Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, Sentrum, 5804 Bergen
Tel: +47 92 08 95 16 – Email: Hilde.Ognedal@fiskeridir.no

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Tairov, Temur. Representative of the Federal Agency for Fisheries of the Russian Federation in Canada,
47 Windstone Close, Bedford, Nova Scotia, B4A4L4
Tel: +1 902 405 0655 – Email: temurtairov@mail.ru

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cyr, Kathryn. Lt. Commander, Office of Law Enforcement, First Coast Guard District, United States Coast Guard
USA – Email: Kathryn.r.cyr@uscg.mil

Heckwolf, Joseph. Attorney. National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration, (NOAA), 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930 USA
Tel: +1 978 281-9241 – Email: joseph.heckwolf@noaa.gov

Henry, Michael. Assistant Special Agent in Charge, Office of Law Enforcement, District 1- New England, Boston
Field Office, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
USA
Tel: + 1 978 490-4774– Email: Michael.henry@noaa.gov

Jaburek, Shannah. Fishery Management Specialist, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Greater Atlantic Regional
Fisheries Office, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
(NOAA) 55 Great Republic Drive Gloucester, MA 01930, USA.
Tel: +1 978 282 8456 – Email: shannah.jaburek@noaa.gov



Martin, Gene. Chief, Northeast Section, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, (NOAA),
55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930 USA
Tel: + 1 978 281 9242- Email: gene.s.martin@noaa.gov

Mencher, Elizabethann. International Policy Advisor, Office of International Affairs and Seafood Inspection,
National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, (NOAA), 1315 East-
West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910, USA
Tel: +1 301 427 8362 - Email: elizabethann.mencher@noaa.gov

Ray, Jeffrey. Deputy Special Agent in Charge. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, National Marine Fisheries
Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, (NOAA), 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester,
MA 01930 USA
Tel.: +1978-281-9205 - Email: Jeffrey.Ray@noaa.gov

NAFO SECRETARIAT

2 Morris Drive, Suite 100, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada - Tel: +1 902 468-5590

Kingston, Fred. Executive Secretary.	Email: fkington@nafo.int
Federizon, Ricardo. Senior Fisheries Management Coordinator	Email: rfederizon@nafo.int
Aker, Jana. Fisheries Information Administrator	Email: jaker@nafo.int
Kendall, Matthew. IT Manager	Email: mkendall@nafo.int
Laycock, D.J. Database Developer/Programmer Analyst	Email: dlaycock@nafo.int
Glindtvad, Sebastian. NAFO Intern	Email: glindtvad@gmail.com

Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chair, Judy Dwyer (Canada)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2017), including review of Apparent Infringements
5. Measures concerning repeat non-compliance of serious infringements in the NAFO Regulatory Area
6. New and pending proposals on enforcement measures: Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM
7. NAFO Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Website
8. Information Security Management System (ISMS)
 - a. NAFO Secretariat backup tape storage
 - b. Data Classification
9. Half-year review of the implementation of new NAFO CEM measures
10. Review and evaluation of Practices and Procedures
11. Review of current IUU list
12. Review of data reporting requirements in the NAFO CEM
13. Bycatches and discards
14. Editorial Drafting Group (EDG) of the NAFO CEM
15. Report and recommendations of the STACTIC Observer Program Review Working Group (WG-OPR)
16. Report and advice of the Joint Advisory Group on Data Management (JAGDM)
17. Other Business
 - a. MRAG Americas – Catch estimation Study
 - b. Discussion on NAFO CEM Article 37.4
 - c. Discussion on garbage and labour conditions onboard vessels
18. Time and place of next meeting
19. Adoption of Report
20. Adjournment

