

Northwest Atlantic



Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N286

NAFO/FC Doc. 81/IV/4

(Revised)

26 June 1981

FISHERIES COMMISSION

Report of the
SECOND SPECIAL MEETING - MARCH/APRIL 1981

Tuesday, 31 March, 1030 hrs
Wednesday, 1 April, 0925 hrs and 1430 hrs
Thursday, 2 April, 0945 hrs

1. The Second Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO was declared open by the Chairman, Mr. J.B.P. Farnell (EEC). Delegations from all members of the Commission were present with the exception of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, and Romania.
2. Under Agenda Item 2, Appointment of Rapporteur, Mr. C. J. Allen (Canada) was appointed rapporteur.
3. Under Agenda Item 3, Adoption of Agenda, the Provisional Agenda (Appendix I) was adopted without change.
4. Under Agenda Item 4, Admission of Observers, the Chairman welcomed observers from Spain.
5. Under Agenda Item 5, Publicity, it was agreed that the usual practice would be followed whereby the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission and the General Council, together with the Executive Secretary of NAFO, would agree upon a press release at the close of the NAFO meeting.
6. Under Agenda Item 6, Approval of Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting September 1980, the proceedings as contained in NAFO/FC Doc. 80/IX/16 were adopted without change.
7. Under Agenda Item 7, Review of Commission Membership, it was noted that there had been no change in the Commission membership since the Second Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission held in September 1980. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix II.
8. Under Agenda Item 8, Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area - Cod in Div. 3M, and under Agenda Item 9, Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits, the Chairman of the Scientific Council Mr. R. H. Letaconnoux (EEC) pointed out that only four members were present at the last meeting of the Scientific Council and that it was important to have better attendance at such meetings, and asked that all members have delegates at the June Meeting of the Scientific Council.
 - a) Cod in 3M. The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Fisheries Science (STACFIS), Dr. G.H. Winters (Canada) reviewed the 1980 scientific advice for this stock and pointed out that the Scientific Council had recommended a TAC of 8,000 tons in 1980, the eventual TAC being set at 13,000 tons with the final catch for 1980 being 10,000 tons. Historically the catches have generally been below the quotas for this stock. The 1980 assessment was based on Canadian and USSR survey data which indicated a decline in abundance of cod in 3M. Using an analytical model the estimates of fishing mortality have been above the $F_{0.1}$ and F_{max} level despite the catches being below the TAC. In 1981 the $F_{0.1}$ level would yield 5,000 tons and the F_{msy} level would yield 29,000 tons in the long-term. In the 1981 fishery the stock would be heavily dependent on the 1977 year-class and should the Commission decide to rebuild the stock as quickly as possible the Scientific Council recommended the TAC be less than the $F_{0.1}$ level.
 - b) Cod in 3NO. In 1980 the TAC had been 26,000 tons with a catch of 19,000 tons. STACFIS reported that the catch rates had declined greatly from the mid 1960's to 1978 with some slight improvement in 1979 and 1980. In the assessment of this stock STACFIS had examined two general production models utilizing catch and effort data for 1959 to 1980, one indicating an equilibrium maximum sustainable yield of about 125,000 tons and a yield at two-thirds F_{msy} of 22,000 tons in 1981, the other showing a reduced recruitment in the 1970's, with the reasons being a broad ecological change and a very high fishing mortality in the 1960's and 1970's which resulted in enhanced discarding of young fish. An analytical assessment of the stock had also been made using catch data from the commercial fishery. The findings for this stock were more conservative than they had been last year. The $F_{0.1}$ projected yield was now 15,000 tons which if maintained would bring forth a strong year class now aged three.

A reduction of fishing mortality would enhance the stock. It was pointed out that USSR scientists felt it was justified to increase the TAC to 30,000 tons.

The Chairman of the Commission stated that it would be useful to look more closely at the scientific report, with respect to the 3NO cod stock, as the Commission members should be absolutely clear of the difference between the points of view expressed at the February Scientific Council Meeting. There seemed to be a difference as to the explanation for the significant reduction in recruitment, but no difference over the fact that there had been less recruitment from the 1970's. The Chairman of STACFIS stated that the biomass arrived at by the Soviet scientists was almost identical to that arrived at by the other scientists at the STACFIS Meeting. However, the USSR had had different assumptions regarding the rate of rebuilding which would imply a higher fishing mortality rate. A TAC of 30,000 tons would equate to a fishing mortality rate of about .45. The Delegate of the EEC stated that the Commission should hear the argument of the USSR scientists that supported this higher TAC.

The USSR scientists pointed out that since 1971 the USSR had conducted a regular survey of cod in 3NO and had noticed a recent tendency of growth due to the regulatory measures taken by the Commission. Because of possible errors in the methods of assessment the USSR would be in favour of retaining the present level of yield. The volume of the fishery in 1979 and 1980 was insignificant and therefore the USSR believed that some growth in the stock was possible and that the 1979-1980 level should be retained for 1981.

The Observer from Spain pointed out that the USSR and Spanish papers did not coincide with the papers tabled by Canada at the Scientific Meeting. None of the general production models presented were thought to be good enough and therefore the results of the analytical model had been used in assessing the stock. These results however were not felt to be very reliable, and the position presented by Spain had not been refuted by the other parties at the meeting. Another possibility for assessing this stock would be to consider the hypothesis raised by a Canadian scientist of a TAC of 50,000 tons. In response the Chairman of STACFIS pointed out that this hypothesis was only raised in order to clarify a graph included in the Spanish paper NAFO/SCR 81/II/6 which had already been considered by STACFIS. The Chairman of the Commission commented that the Commission should not re-assess the papers presented at the Scientific Meeting. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that the Canadian delegation would have a real difficulty in getting into a debate of scientific advice at this meeting as the Fisheries Commission was not competent to judge which piece of scientific advice was relevant. He assumed that it was generally accepted that both 3NO and 3M cod stocks were depleted and that it remained to be decided whether the stock would remain low or would be allowed to deteriorate even further. The Delegate of Canada further pointed out that he could think of no instance of when the upper range of a proposed TAC had been accepted in which the stock did not later decline. If these stocks had been entirely within Canadian jurisdiction his recommendation would have been to cease a directed fishery. However, it was realized that such a recommendation for some members of this Commission would cause extreme difficulties.

Assuming the Commission would wish to see the consequences of stock rebuilding the Delegate of Canada suggested that the Commission put specific questions to the Scientific Council. The questions proposed by the Delegate of Canada, with respect to both the 3NO and 3M cod stocks, are found in Appendix III.

The Delegate of the Faroe Islands pointed out that this was a useful suggestion and tabled a further question which is found in Note 2 of Appendix III and relates to NAFO/FC Doc 81/III/1. The Chairman of the Scientific Council proposed that the scientists present at the meeting that had been present at the February meeting should meet to try to answer these questions. The Delegate of the EEC noted that the Canadian delegate had earlier suggested a TAC of zero and suggested that perhaps this should be included in the questions as well. The Chairman of the Commission noted that fishing in 3M had already started and that to have a zero TAC for 1981 would not be possible. The Delegate of Canada agreed and pointed out that the zero TAC would have to be for 1982 and beyond and that perhaps a TAC of 50,000 tons for 3NO be included in the questions as well. The Chairman of the Commission then suggested that the scientific group return to the Commission Meeting later with their answers.

c) Capelin in 3NO. The Chairman of STACFIS reviewed the 1980 fishery by pointing out that there had been a TAC of 16,000 tons in Division 3L and that Division 3NO had been closed to capelin fishing in 1980. Two acoustic surveys had been conducted in 1980 by Canada and the USSR. Both found a generally low abundance of mature capelin and it was determined that the spawning mass was low. The Scientific Council therefore recommended that the 3NO closure be maintained for 1981 and that a rate of exploitation of no more than ten percent of the biomass be maintained in 3L with a TAC of 30,000 tons.

The Chairman of the Commission proposed that a decision should be taken on the TAC's for capelin and then on the allocations. The Commission agreed that the TAC for 1981 in 3L would be set at 30,000 tons. The Commission further agreed that there would be no fishing in 3NO in 1981. The Delegate of Canada then proposed that the 3L TAC be reserved entirely for the Canadian fishery. The Commission agreed on this proposal.

9. Under Agenda Item 10, Objection to Management Measures in Division 3M Redfish, the Chairman pointed out that this item concerned a delegation that was not represented at the meeting and discussion should therefore be deferred until the delegate of Bulgaria was present.
10. Under Agenda Item 11, Report of the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures, the Chairman of the Commission pointed out that this group had held a meeting March 30 and that a text containing Conservation and Enforcement Measures had been agreed to and would be circulated later. It should be possible for the Fisheries Commission to agree on this document during the current meeting except for one section on gear definitions, which was to be reviewed further by the delegations, and by the Scientific Council, before final approval at the Annual Meeting in September.
11. Under Agenda Item 12, Report of the Working Group on Enforcement in Division 3M, the Delegate of Canada pointed out that the Chairman of this working group was not present. He believed that there was a commitment from the last Annual Meeting to have a report on 1980 activities presented at this meeting. He suggested that the Secretariat compile what it had on hand from member delegations and that the Fisheries Commission decide what action to take. The Chairman agreed and said that this item would be discussed later.
12. The Commission recessed at 1215 hrs, 31 March and reconvened at 0925 hrs 1 April.
13. Under Agenda Items 8 and 9, Management Measures for Fish Stocks, as to cod, the Chairman of the Commission introduced two Scientific Council papers, produced at the request of the Commission the day before - NAFO/SCR 81/II/11 Addendum for Cod in 3NO and NAFO/SCR 81/II/12 Addendum for Cod in 3M- and asked the Chairman of STACFIS to explain their contents to the Commission. The Chairman of STACFIS explained that STACFIS had calculated recruitment in these documents on the basis of the mean level of recruitment in the period from the late 50's to the mid-70's. For 3NO cod with F_{max} at .30, the estimated longterm sustainable yield would be 108,000 tons at a biomass of 459,000 tons, although both these values were considered very optimistic. In Table 3 another projection at F_{max} noted that the long term sustained catch would be ~80,000 tons with a biomass of ~ 330,000 tons for 3NO. This same table puts the long term sustained catch in 3M at F_{max} at 30,000 tons with a biomass of ~ 140,000 tons. The Chairman of STACFIS pointed out that the estimated levels projected to 1985 should be considered fairly optimistic. The Chairman of the Commission pointed out that so far the question (See Appendix III, question 4(c)) regarding catches at a continuing level of 8,000 tons in Division 3M and 26,000 tons in Division 3NO had not been answered. Following a discussion of the Scientific Council papers, the Delegate of Canada requested that further data be calculated, as the scientists seemed to have taken the most optimistic assumption possible and the Commission should work on more realistic assumptions. The Delegate of Canada further pointed out that if the Commission were willing to set the 3NO cod TAC at 10,000 tons for five years, then Canada would not require these further calculations by the scientists. The Chairman of the Commission pointed out that for decisions on long-term exploitation better figures would be required and that there seemed to be some Delegates that favoured the long term view. On the basis of the present figures it was apparent what the catch would be for the next three years, but not for five years. The Delegate of the EEC pointed out, regarding 3M cod, that whatever strategy would be chosen, the level of the TAC should be below 7,000 tons for 1981, and, if a short term decision were to be taken by the Commission, then this TAC would have to be very small. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that the Scientific Council, in its original advice on these stocks, had made assumptions about recruitment based on the average level of recent years; the assumption made in the present document was twice as optimistic as the original Scientific Council report. As the assumptions had changed drastically, the Delegate of Canada requested new figures be produced, based on the original assumptions, in view of the fact that the 3M figures would not change much. Canada could accept a TAC as small as 10,000 tons in 3NO, but without further calculations it was not possible to get good advice. The Delegate of Canada suggested that perhaps the 3M TAC could be settled straight away and the Commission await the further calculations on 3NO. The Chairman of the Commission noted that two delegates (EEC and Canada) had suggested the Commission discuss the 3M cod based on available advice, and that the EEC had suggested the TAC remain at 8,000 tons as decided at the last Annual Meeting.
14. The Delegate of the Faroe Islands explained the document already circulated by the Faroese Delegation re Management of the Flemish Cap Cod Stock (NAFO/FC Doc 81/III/1). The Delegate of Norway pointed out that the strategy to be decided by the Commission would have different influences on the different members, and that for the last two years the Norwegian operation in the NAFO Regulatory Area had been restricted to two longliners because of their small quotas. Quotas to Norway that would sustain less than two longliners would not be acceptable. The Delegate of Norway further pointed out that a member of the Organization could not be a member of the Fisheries

Commission without fishing in the Area and that if Norway could not fish then it could not remain a member of the Commission. A lower 3M quota in 1981 than in 1980 would not be acceptable for Norway. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that the provisional report of the Scientific Council (NAFO/SCS/Doc 81/II/2) stated that the Council "noted that the present low level of spawning biomass may be such as to impair potential recruitment". This should be interpreted to mean that the spawning stock was so low that whatever TAC was agreed upon there would still be problems. A TAC of 8,000 tons, which was above the Fmax level of 6,700, would not be a good place to begin a rebuilding program if the spawning stock was that bad. A discussion ensued regarding the relative merits of using passive gear, such as longlines and gill nets, in this fishery. The Chairman of the Scientific Council stated that it would be difficult to give useful guidance at this time on the broad issue of the effect on the stock of different gear types. The Chairman of the Commission suggested that further discussion of this item be postponed.

15. Under Agenda Item 11, Report of the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures, the Report (NAFO/FC Doc 80/IX/15) revised on 31st March was presented by the Chairman of the Working Group, the Executive Secretary. This document was agreed to with some modifications, and the Executive Secretary was asked to prepare a final draft for consideration later in the meeting. It was agreed that the proposed Gear Definition section be submitted to the Scientific Council at its next meeting for advice. The Delegate of Cuba, without a formal proposal, requested a change in the text in Part III A.7, but due to the difficulty of the questions raised it was agreed that the text should not be changed, but that in due time the Cuban Delegation could propose a new draft. It was further agreed that the Chairman of the Working Group would redraft Part I 3(a) for consideration later in the meeting.
16. The meeting recessed at 1245 hrs and reconvened at 1430 hrs.
17. Considering Agenda Items 8 and 9, Management Measures for Fish Stocks, as to cod, the Chairman of the Commission reported that the scientists had resubmitted the documents NAFO/SCR 81/II/11 Addendum for Cod in 3NO and NAFO/SCR 81/II/12 Addendum for Cod in 3M with complete answers to the questions raised.
18. Cod in Division 3M. The Chairman of the Commission pointed out that the paper for 3M contained two new options that covered a point raised earlier by the Delegate of the Faroe Islands dealing with a TAC of 13,000 tons. Referring to Option 6 and Option 7 of the paper, the Chairman of the Commission pointed out that if either of these options were taken a decrease in the biomass would occur in 1982 with some recovery thereafter. Options 1 through 5 assumed a TAC of 8,000 tons, or less, in 1981 with varying amounts thereafter producing a gradual increase in the biomass up to 1986. A 1981 TAC of 13,000 tons would cause a subsequent fall in the biomass in 1982 and would put into question the rate of recruitment and consequent rate of recovery thereafter. The Delegate of Portugal stated that his delegation would rather have a long-term, rather than a short-term, rebuilding of the stock and that even though a TAC of 13,000 tons was higher than recommended by the Scientific Council, the rebuilding of the stock would still occur and therefore their proposal for a TAC of 13,000 tons still stood.

The Delegate of the Faroe Islands proposed that the preliminary allocations for 1981, totalling 8,000 tons, be retained with additional allocations to countries using selective gear types as follows:

Faroes	1,125 tons
Norway	465 tons
Portugal	700 tons

These additional allocations would raise the TAC to 10,290 tons. The Delegate of the EEC pointed out that special consideration had already been given to these three countries when setting the interim quotas at the Annual Meeting in September, and the EEC would find it difficult to once again give this kind of special treatment to these countries. He therefore proposed that the preliminary TAC of 8,000 tons be accepted as allocated, but with an increased share to Norway of 465 tons bringing the TAC to 8,465. The Delegate of Portugal stated that, when the Portuguese proposal had been made, it had been on the assumption that the Commission was dealing only with the TAC, not the allocations, and therefore amended his proposal to include that the TAC be 13,000 tons with the same allocations as in 1980. A discussion between Commission members followed concerning the relative merits of special allocations by gear types. The Delegate of the USSR pointed out that the Commission would be departing from common practice if allocations were to be made by gear type, and that if the Commission felt that particular gear types were preferable to others, this should be discussed at the Scientific Council. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that Canada would wish a TAC that would allow stock rebuilding so that Canada could re-enter the fishery in the future, and stated that if the Commission approved a TAC higher than the preliminary TAC of 8,000 tons there would be serious consequences for the stock. The Delegate of the Faroe Islands pointed out that his proposal was intended only for 1981 and was not to be used as a precedent for future allocations. Regarding the Faroe Islands proposal, the Delegate of Canada suggested that a statement be added to the proposal making it clear that with the additional allocations to Faroe Islands, Norway and Portugal

their total allocations would not increase further until the proportionate allocations to all members reached the 1979 level. The Delegate of Norway expressed acceptance of all three proposals as they all indicated a willingness to deal with the problem faced by Norway. The Delegate of Portugal disagreed with the Faroe Islands proposal as Portugal would receive a smaller quota than the Faroe Islands when Portugal had always had the highest catches in 3M. The Delegate of the EEC repeated his disagreement with the proposal as the provisional allocations had already taken into account the special requests of the Faroe Islands.

19. Cod in Division 3NO. The Chairman of the Commission reviewed document NAFO/SCR 81/II/11 Addendum and pointed out that under Options 1, 3 and 4 of Table 4 the biomass would increase and under Option 2 the biomass would decline sharply. The Observer from Spain pointed out that in order to maintain an economic exploitation of the fishery a rational TAC should be chosen. The Delegate of Canada noted that Canada was prepared to discuss a TAC in the range of 10,000 tons to 26,000 tons and pointed out that with a TAC of 10,000 tons stock rebuilding would occur within five years, whereas a TAC of 24,000 tons would indicate an eight year rebuilding exercise. The Observer from Spain agreed that all members wished to see a rebuilding of this stock and the discussion was concerned with how long this should take. A lengthy discussion took place regarding the short term vs. long term benefits to be derived from this stock. Finally, the Delegate of Canada proposed, with reluctance, that the TAC be maintained at the 1980 level of 26,000 tons with the same allocations as in 1980 and that the TAC remain at this level until the biomass reached half the level required for the long term sustainable catch at F_{max} . This would include 9,000 tons reserved for Spain on the understanding that Spain would comply with all relevant Commission regulations, including participation in the Scientific Observer Scheme. The Commission agreed with this proposal.
20. Further consideration of Cod in Division 3M. The Chairman of the Commission noted that there were three proposals regarding the TAC and allocations for this stock:
- 1) A proposal by Portugal that the TAC be 13,000 tons, with the same allocation as in 1980;
 - 2) A proposal by the EEC that the TAC be 8,465 tons, with the same allocations as decided at the last Annual Meeting, except that Norway would get an additional 465 tons;
 - 3) A proposal by the Faroe Islands that the TAC be 10,290 tons with the same allocations as decided at the last Annual Meeting with the addition of 1,125 tons to Faroe Islands, 465 tons to Norway, and 700 tons to Portugal.

The Delegate of the Faroe Islands noted that his proposal was not clear to some delegates and therefore proposed to amend it by adding the following:

- 1) The extra allocations made to the Faroe Islands, Norway, and Portugal for 1981 would be conditional upon the proportion of their catches taken by passive gear to remain equal to that taken in 1980;
- 2) These additional allocations to the Faroe Islands, Norway, and Portugal should remain at this level as long as the TAC did not exceed 13,000 tons. Implicit in this amendment was the assumption that when the TAC did reach 13,000 tons then the allocation proportions would revert to those of 1979:

The Delegate of the EEC pointed out that in the Faroe Islands' proposal the introduction of special treatment for passive fishing gear was inappropriate for setting a TAC as there was no evidence at this stage that this gear type would assist in conservation of the stocks, and that if the Faroe Islands considered this type of special treatment worthwhile they should ask the Scientific Council to study the matter. The Commission could then look at the results of such studies. The EEC Delegate therefore urged that the Faroe Islands proposal be rejected. Regarding the proposal by Portugal, the Delegate of the EEC pointed out that the Scientific Council had recommended caution in setting a TAC for this stock which had since been interpreted to mean a 5,000 ton TAC; therefore the Portuguese proposal would be unacceptable and he urged that it too be rejected.

The Delegate of Canada disagreed with a TAC of 13,000 and pointed out that the yield of the stock at F_{max} would only be 6,700 tons. The Delegate of Canada proposed as a compromise that the TAC be set at 10,000 tons in 1981 with the following allocations - Canada 100 tons, Cuba 295 tons, EEC 1,470 tons, Faroe Islands 2,470 tons, Norway 1,200 tons, Poland 305 tons, Portugal 2,985, USSR 780 tons, Others 50 tons and a reserve for Spain of 345 tons. The Faroe Islands, Norway and Portugal should maintain these allocations until the TAC reached 13,000 tons and the 10,000 ton TAC in 1981 should be maintained in 1982 unless the biomass had increased by at least 10%. When the TAC reached 13,000 tons allocations would revert to the 1979 proportions.

After further discussion, the Chairman of the Commission recommended that the four proposals be voted on. The Canadian and Faroe Islands proposals were not carried. The Commission subsequently agreed by 5 votes to 3, with the EEC proposal that the 1981 TAC be 8,465 tons with the same allocations as in 1980 but with an additional 465 tons allocated to Norway.

21. The meeting recessed at 1815 hrs and reconvened at 0940 hrs, 2 April.

22. Under Agenda Item 10, Objection to Management Measures in Division 3M (Redfish), the Chairman of the Commission noted that there was still no delegate present from Bulgaria. It would therefore be difficult to discuss this agenda item during this meeting. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that this item had been placed on the agenda at the request of Canada and referred to the letter sent to the NAFO Secretariat by Bulgaria objecting to the 3M Redfish allocation made at the last Annual Meeting. It was felt that this opportunity should have been taken to discuss this objection and it was hoped that this would give Bulgaria a chance to amplify its objection; however, since the delegate of Bulgaria was not present the matter was rather academic.

23. Under Agenda Item 11, Report of the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures in the Regulatory Area, The Chairman of the Working Group introduced the revised document (NAFO/FC Doc. 81/IV/2), the text of the draft Conservation and Enforcement Regulations in the Regulatory Area, which took into account the decisions of the Commission at its previous session on 1 April. The Chairman of the Working Group also pointed out a number of minor items which still needed attention. After these had been considered and a number of modifications approved, the entire text was approved by the Commission. Schedule V was also approved on the understanding that it would show also a drawing of the 60mm mesh measuring gauge.

The Chairman of the Working Group presented then the Report of the Working Group (NAFO/FC Doc.81/IV/3) which was adopted with a small amendment to the closing sentence.

It was agreed that revisions were needed to some of the STACTIC forms and that this matter would be referred to the next STACTIC meeting to be held before or during the Annual Meeting.

24. Under Agenda Item 12, Report of the Working Group on 3M Enforcement, the Chairman of the Commission noted that this Working Group had not been able to meet during the Special Meeting but that two documents had been prepared, one by Canada (See Appendix IV), the other by the USSR (See Appendix V), on surveillance activities in 3M during 1980. The Delegate of Canada recalled that the report of this Working Group presented at the last Annual Meeting had recommended expansion of the enforcement program for 1981 and that the Commission had adopted a proposal from the Chairman at that meeting for 3M Enforcement matters to be taken up under STACTIC in future. The Delegate of Canada voiced disappointment that only two responses had been received following this recommendation and reaffirmed the continuing concern of Canada with the enforcement effort in 3M. He stated that he anticipated levels of 3M enforcement activity by Canada for 1981 similar to 1980. The Delegate of the USSR pointed out that at the present time a USSR inspection vessel was operating in the NAFO Regulatory Area and another one would be operating later in the year. However, the USSR had no detailed reports to present at this time.

The Delegate of the EEC stated that it was likely that an EEC vessel would be in the zone at a later date during 1981, which would be notified in due time to the Executive Secretary. The Delegate of Cuba mentioned that a Cuban inspector would be participating on board a Canadian patrol vessel for training purposes in Division 3M next week. The Delegate of Japan stated that Japan was also planning to send an inspection vessel next year to 3M and would send the details to the Executive Secretary as soon as possible. The Delegate of Portugal stated that Portugal was prepared to send an inspector to the Regulatory Area for about three weeks in the summer months. The Delegate of Canada mentioned how encouraging it was to have such a positive response but still felt that Commission members should go further in order to produce a really effective scheme. He further pointed out that 3M enforcement had been expensive for Canada. Ad hoc patrols could detect some vessel violations but not large fleet violations. Canada would be interested in promoting more activity and better deployment of resources and therefore would offer, once again, to place on board Canadian patrol vessels inspectors of other member countries for training in NAFO inspection techniques. The Delegate of Canada suggested that STACTIC take up this item as a continuing item in the future to which the Commission agreed.

25. Under Agenda Items 8 and 9, Management Measures for Fish Stocks, the tables of allocations for cod in 3M and 3NO and capelin 3LNO were considered by the Commission and approved after amendments to the footnotes. Regarding the special reservations for Spain, Footnote 1 was modified to read "reserved for Spain on the understanding that Spain will act in conformity with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations, and will participate in the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme". The Observer from Spain pointed out that although Spain is not a member of NAFO and is therefore not bound by the regulations, Spain is complying voluntarily and will participate as much as possible. With reference to allocations of cod in Division 3M, the Delegate of Portugal made the following statement:

"During the discussions of the proposals presented by various delegations for the establishment of the TAC for the 3M cod stock the Portuguese delegation expressed a position contained in its proposal to keep the TAC at the level of 1980 - 13,000 metric tons - and made it clear that it was not prepared to accept a quota less than 3,500 metric tons.

Under those conditions, although it does not have particular reserves to present for the conservation measures for the rebuilding of the stock involved in the proposal that has been approved, but considering that its fishing fleet which traditionally operates in the area, due to the reduction of the quota, will face enormous difficulties to operate economically therefore resulting more and more economical and social difficulties, we inform the Commission that the Portuguese Delegation has to reserve its position pending a decision of the Portuguese Government concerning the quota proposed to Portugal."

The Delegate of Canada pointed out that this statement could raise the possibility of an objection under the NAFO regulations and if it were raised then other members might object and conservation in 3M would then be in disarray. The Delegate of Portugal pointed out that his statement spoke about "reservations", not about "objections", and that for the moment his position was to reserve a final decision. The Delegate of Canada stated that, if any objection were raised to the allocation of 3M cod within the 60-day period, the Chairman of the Commission was hereby put on notice that Canada would automatically request a special meeting to be hosted by Canada.

26. Under Agenda Item 13, Time and Place of Next Meeting, the Chairman of the Commission informed the members that the next meeting would be held September 8-11, 1981 in Halifax.
27. Under Agenda Item 14, Other Business, the Delegate of Canada expressed a continuing concern for the state of the 3M cod stock and informed the Commission that Canada would be preparing for the next meeting a proposal for a longer term management plan for this stock to assist in its rebuilding, a proposal that might include specific enforcement measures.
28. The Delegate of Canada also pointed out that at the next meeting the Canadian delegation would be making a proposal to change the rules of procedure of the Commission in order to allow for the circulation of a draft provisional agenda 100 days in advance of the meeting, with the provisional agenda to be circulated sixty days before the meeting.
29. Under Agenda Item 15, Press Statement, the Commission was reminded that a suitable statement would be prepared as agreed to under Item 5, Publicity. (See NAFO/GC Doc. 81/IV/I Revised)
30. The Commission adjourned at 1220 hours, 2 April 1981.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
SECOND SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
FISHERIES COMMISSION - 31 MARCH-2 APRIL 1981

Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES:

1. Opening by the Chairman, Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (EEC)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

ADMINISTRATION:

6. Approval of Proceedings of the Annual Meeting 1980 (FC Doc. 80/IX/16)
7. Review of Commission Membership

CONSERVATION:

8. Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area - Cod in Div. 3M
9. Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits
 - (a) Cod in Div. 3NO
 - (b) Capelin in Div. 3LNO
10. Objection to Management Measures on Div. 3M Redfish
11. Report of the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures
12. Report of the Working Group on Enforcement in Div. 3M

CLOSING PROCEDURES:

13. Time and Place of Next Meeting
14. Other Business
15. Press Statement
16. Adjournment

Second Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission

Halifax, Canada, 31 March-2 April 1981

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Chairman of the Fisheries Commission: Mr. J. B. P. Farnell, Directorate General
for Fisheries, Commission of the European
Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049
Brussels, Belgium.

CANADA

Head of Delegation: Dr. A. W. May, Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries,
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa,
Ontario K1A 0E6

Mr. M. Ahrens, Secretary-Treasurer, Maritime Fishermen's Union, P. O. Box 506,
Richibouctou, N.B.

Mr. C. J. Allen, International Fisheries Relations Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and
Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Mr. B. Applebaum, Director, International Fisheries Relations Branch, 235 Queen
St., Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. D. G. Barrett, Supervisor-Offshore Surveillance, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's,
Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5X1

Mr. J. S. Beckett, Resource Services Directorate, Dept. Fisheries and Oceans,
240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Mr. A. R. Billard, Executive Director, Eastern Fishermen's Fed., P. O. Box 384
St. "M", Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2P8

Mr. David R. Bollivar, Manager, Fleet Services and Strategy, National Sea Products,
P. O. Box 2130, Scotia Square, Duke St., Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. D. M. Brown, Intergovernmental Affairs Officer, Government of Newfoundland,
Ground Floor, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7

Mr. R. Cashin, NAFO Commissioner, N.F.F.A.W.U., P. O. Box 5158, St. John's,
Newfoundland

Mr. F. Davis, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova
Scotia B3J 2S7

Mr. E. B. Dunne, A/Director-General, Nfld. Region, Fisheries & Oceans, P. O.
Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. M. M. Goldberg, Legal Adviser, Legal Services, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans,
240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Mr. C. L. Jones, Quota Management Coordinator, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans,
P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N.S. B3J 2S7

Mr. J. L. Lavoie, Direction de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique, Dept. of
Fisheries, 2700 Rue Einstein, Ste. Foy, Quebec G1P 3W8

Mr. A. A. Longard, Director, Marine Resources, N.S. Dept. of Fisheries, Box
2223, Halifax, N. S. B3J 3C4

Mr. E. Martel, Counsellor, Canadian Embassy, Dept. of External Affairs, Western
European Division, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. R. Moore, Assistant Deputy Minister, Quebec Dept. of Fisheries, 200 A Chemin
Ste. Foy, 12th Floor, Quebec, P.Q.

Mr. A. D. Moores, Harbour Grace, Newfoundland

Dr. W. M. Murphy, NAFO Commissioner, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, N. S. B0T 1K0

Mr. L. S. Parsons, Director General, Atlantic Operations Directorate, Dept. of
Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Ms. D. E. Pethick, International Fisheries Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. A. T. Pinhorn, Research & Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. R. J. Prier, Chief, Conservation and Protection Branch, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S. B3J 2S7
Mr. G. Rendell, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5182, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5V5
Mr. L. G. Riche, Vice-President, Fishery Products Limited, P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. G. Slade, Nfld. Department of Fisheries, 5th Floor, Atlantic Place, St. John's, Newfoundland AOA 2E0
Mr. R. C. Stirling, Executive Director, SPANS, P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Mr. G. R. Traverse, Head, Offshore Management, Conservation and Protection Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. R. Wells, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. R. D. Wilton, V/P Independent Fish Producers Association, P. O. Box 5469, ENPS, St. John's, Newfoundland
Dr. G. H. Winters, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

CUBA

Head of Delegation: Dr. J. A. Varea
Puerto Pesquero
Ensenada de Potes y Atares
Habana, Cuba

Mr. N. M. Gomez, Pickford and Black, P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, N. S. B3J 2X1

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Head of Delegation: Mr. M. Marcussen
Directorate General for Fisheries
Commission of the European Communities
200 Rue de la Loi
1049 Brussels, Belgium

Mr. P. Bangma, Agricultural Attache, Permanent Representative of the Netherlands, Kunstlaan 46, Brussels, Belgium
Mr. J. B. P. Farnell, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 120 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium
Mr. M. Leigh, Administrator, Commission of the European Communities, 120 Rue de la Loi, Brussels 1049, Belgium
Mr. R. H. Letaconnoux, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches Maritimes BP 1049, F-44037 Nantes-Cedex, France
Mr. A. Reich, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstrasse 1, D-5300, Bonn 1, Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. B. Salva, Administrateur des Affaires Maritimes, Direction Generale de la Marine Marchande, Direction des Peches Maritimes, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700, Paris, France
Mr. T. Smith, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London, England SW1P 2AE
Mr. J. Westerduin, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Directorate of Fisheries, P.V.D. Bosch Str. 4, The Hague, Holland

FAROE ISLANDS

Head of Delegation: Mr. O. Olsen, Minister of Fisheries, Faroese Government, Tinganes, DK 3800, Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Mr. K. Hoydal, Fiskirannsoknarstovan, DK 3800 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
Mr. A. Olafsson, Director, Faroese Government, Tinganes, DK 3800 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: Mr. K. Seki, Embassy of Japan, 255 Sussex Drive, Ottawa,
Ontario, CANADA K1N 9E6

Mr. J. Fujita, Fishery Agency, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan
Mr. K. Ito, P. O. Box 696, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia Canada, B2Y 3Y9
Mr. K. Manto, Japan Fisheries Association, Suite 900, Royal Bank Building,
5161 George Street, Halifax, N. S. Canada B3J 1M7
Mr. K. Kirimura, Nichiro Fisheries Ltd., 1-12-1, Yurakucho, Chiyodaku, Tokyo,
Japan
Mr. Y. Santo, Nippon Suisan Kaisha Ltd., 16 Toronto Dominion Bank Bldg., 1791
Barrington St., Halifax, N. S. Canada B3J 3L1

NORWAY

Head of Delegation: Mr. H. Rasmussen, Director General, Directorate of Fisheries,
P. O. Box 185, 5001 Bergen, Norway

Mr. F. Bergesen, Fisheries Attache, Embassy of Norway, 2720 34th St. N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20008 USA

POLAND

Head of Delegation: Mr. W. Kalinowski, Fisheries Central Board, Odrowaza 1,
71-420 Szczecin, Poland

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation: Mr. J. Miranda Mendes, Av. 24 De Julho 80-4°,
Lisbon, Portugal

Mr. J. G. Boavida, Direcçao Geral do Desenuolvimento, E Coordenacao das Pescas,
Av 24 Julho 80/2°, Lisbon, Portugal
Commander M. Cunha, P. O. Box 5249, St. Jo-n's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5W1
Mr A. S. Gaspar, Avenida 24 De Julho 80, 1200 Lisbon, Portugal
Dr. M. LimaDias, Instituto de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400
Mr. H.F.P. Pontes, General Secretary of ADAPLA, Praca Duque da Terceira 24-1,
1200 Lisbon, Portugal
Mr. A. A. Rodrigues, President, Shipowners Association, Avenida Infante Santo,
23-5°B, 7300-Lisbon, Portugal
Mr. C. M. Rodrigues, Avenida Infante Santo N23 5-B, 1300 Lisbon, Portugal

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Head of Delegation: Mr. A. A. Volkov, Commissioner, 2074 Robie Street,
Apt. 2002-2203, Halifax, N. S.

Mr. B. L. Blazhko, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR
Mr. A. K. Chumakov, Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography
(PINRO), 6 Knipovich Street, Murmansk, USSR
Mr. V. Kletnoy, Assistant Representative of the USSR in Canada on Fisheries,
2076 Robie St., Halifax, N. S. B3K 5L3
Mr. Y. B. Riazantsev, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and
Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow B-140, 107140, USSR

OBSERVERS

SPAIN

Mr. A. Collado, Embassy of Spain, 350 Sparks St., #802, Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8
S. Correa Meirawa, Muelle de la Palloza 74 La Coruua, Spain
Mr. J. J. Duran, Commercial Counsellor, Embassy of Spain, Suite 201, Slater Street,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
Mr. M. G. Larraneta, Instituto Investigaciones Pesqueras, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo,
Spain
Dr. E. C. Lopez-Veiga, Puerto Pesquero, Vigo Pontevedra, Spain
Mr. A. Martin-Mateo, ARGUIBA, P. O. Box 621, Pasajes San Pedro, Guipuzcoa,
Spain
Mr. J. Prat, Deputy Director General, International Fisheries, 1, Ruiz de
Alarcon, Madrid 14, Spain

SECRETARIAT

Mr. W. H. Champion, Administrative Assistant, NAFO
Mr. F. D. Keating, Finance and Publications Clerk-Steno, NAFO
Mrs. B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary, NAFO
Mrs. F. E. Perry, Documents and Mailing Clerk, NAFO
Mrs. M. C. Guedes, Junior Secretary, NAFO

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Ms. S. Kierczak, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 8th Floor West,
240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 0E6

to the Report of the
Second Special Meeting of
the Fisheries Commission

Questions Proposed by the Canadian Delegation
to the Scientific Council with Respect
to Cod in Division 3M and Divisions 3NO

1. What is the long term sustainable catch at F_{\max} ?
2. What is the biomass associated with this long term sustainable catch?
3. What was the biomass in 1980?
4. How long would it take to achieve the F_{\max} biomass (referred to in question 1 above) at catches at:
 - a) the $F_{0.1}$ level in 1981 and beyond,
 - b) the F_{\max} level in 1981 and beyond,
 - c) at a continuing level of 8,000 tonnes in division 3M and 26,000 tonnes in divisions 3NO?

Note 1: The above was later extended to include for 3NO only continuing catches with no directed fishery and also at the level of a TAC of 50,000 tonnes.

Note 2: The Scientific Council was requested by the Faroese Delegation to comment on the effect of "improved exploitation pattern" (age of entry).

to the Report of the
Second Special Meeting of
the Fisheries Commission

Report for the Working Group on Division 3M Enforcement:

Surveillance Activity by Canada during the Calendar Year 1980 in Division 3M

- (1) Total sea days in Division (3M) Jan. 1/80 - Dec. 31/80.
 - (a) By-Canada - 42 days
- (2) Total inspections conducted in Division (3M) Jan. 1/80 - Dec. 31/80.
 - (a) By-Canada - 45 inspections
- (3) Infringements reported in Division (3M) Jan. 1/80 - Dec. 31/80.
 - (a) By-Canadian Patrols - 7 (4 small mesh, 1 illegal chafer, 1 double cod-end, 1 failing to record discards).
- (4) Vessel sightings in Division (3M) Jan. 1/80 - Dec. 31/80.
 - (a) By-Canada - 361

Among the above sightings are vessels of non-member countries, including Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela.
- (5) From the 45 boardings conducted by Canada in 1980 a total of 7 Captains were cited for violating the NAFO Regulations. Violations by vessels follow:
 - 2 Cuban - small mesh gear
 - 1 USSR - illegal chafer
 - 1 Portuguese - double cod-end
 - 1 Portuguese - small mesh gear
 - 1 USSR - small mesh gear
 - 1 Faroes - failing to record discards

Boardings of member state vessels as follows:

Cuba	- 3
Faroes	- 3
German Democratic Republic	- 1
Japan	- 2
Norway	- 1
Portugal	- 12
Spain	9 (non-member at this point in time)
USSR	<u>10</u>
TOTAL	41

In addition to the above boardings the following non-member vessels were boarded:

	<u>Boardings</u>
Mexico -	2 (at sea) 1 (in port)
Panama -	<u>1</u> (in port)
TOTAL	4

The Mexican vessels were boarded while they were fishing within Division 3M.

Mexican registered trawler Santa Paula was boarded on 1 May 1980. No fishing log book was being kept for the Flemish Cap fishery, but the Captain estimated his 3M catch to be:

Cod	- 50 MT
Redfish	- 38 MT

The other Mexican trawler Santa Matilde was boarded on 4 May 1980. The Captain of this trawler estimated his catch in 3M to be:

Cod	- .25 MT
Redfish	- 5 MT

On 3 July 1980, a Mexican registered trawler "ALPES" was boarded in port at St. John's. This boarding revealed a 3M catch of 30 MT of cod. One Venezuelan pair trawler was boarded while in port in St. John's on 24 January 1980.

NOTE: The following is a summary of the number of different vessels of non-member nations and the number of times they were sighted in 3M during the year 1980.

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u># VESSELS</u>	<u># SIGHTINGS</u>	<u>DATES</u>
Mexico	2	7	April 19th/21/21, May 1/1/3/4
Panama	5	6	Feb 23, Mar 27, 27 Aug. 15, 15, 16
Venezuela	2	2	Jan. 14, 14

The above are confirmed on computer print-out for sightings in 3M during 1980 with the vessels identified by country, side number and date sighted.

to the Report of the
Second Special Meeting of
the Fisheries Commission

Report for the Working Group on Division 3M Enforcement:

Surveillance Activity by USSR during the Calendar Year 1980 in Division 3M

The USSR Fishery Conservation and Enforcement Service presented data on international and national control in a letter to the NAFO Executive Secretary dated August 27, 1980. The letter covered Soviet inspections between January 1 and August 15, 1980. No Soviet inspection vessel operated in the Regulatory Area between September and December.

Summary data on the results of USSR activities under the International Enforcement Scheme in NAFO area for 1980 (Sheets 1, 2A, 2B) were sent to NAFO Secretariat with a letter dated February 16, 1981.

At present there is the Soviet inspection vessel "Zurbagan" operating which has been in NAFO area since February. In late May-early June it will be replaced by the other inspection vessel "Umbrina". There was a cable sent to the NAFO Secretariat from the Ministry of Fisheries, USSR, dated November 12, 1980 with respective information concerning the activity of these vessels.