

Northwest Atlantic



Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N451

NAFO/FC Doc 81/IX/14.

(Revised)

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1981

Report of the Fisheries Commission

Tuesday, 8 September, 1445 hrs

Wednesday, 9 September, 1530 hrs

Thursday, 10 September, 1100 hrs

Friday, 11 September, 1100 hrs

1. The Third Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (EEC), at 1445 hrs 8 September in the Lord Nelson Hotel, Halifax, Nova Scotia, with the presence of representatives from all Commission members except Romania, Bulgaria, Faroe Islands and Iceland. (See Appendix I)
2. Under Agenda Item 2, Rapporteur, Elizabeth Mundell (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Under Agenda Item 3, Adoption of Agenda, the USSR delegate commented that Item 18 of the Provisional Agenda circulated in NAFO Circular Letter 81/56 dealing with minimum mesh size for groundfish in the Regulatory Area, should refer to regulated groundfish, not all groundfish. The Chairman agreed that that was a correct interpretation. The Chairman also proposed to add under Administration a new item, number 9A, Election of Officers. That was agreed. (See Appendix II)
4. Under Agenda Item 4, Admission of Observers, the Chairman suggested that the Commission should adopt the same procedure regarding the Admission of Observers as that adopted by the General Council earlier that day. He then welcomed as Observers representatives from Spain, the USA and Korea.
5. Under Agenda Item 5, Publicity, it was agreed that the usual practice be followed whereby the Chairmen of the Fisheries Commission, the General Council and the Scientific Council, together with the Executive Secretary, would agree upon a Press Release for issuance at the close of the Meeting.
6. Under Agenda Item 6, Final Approval of the Report of the Second Annual Meeting, FC Doc 80/IX/16 Revised, it was noted that that Report was subject again to final approval because the word "last" had been inserted in the first line of the minutes relating to Item 29(b). The Report of the Second Special Meeting FC Doc 81/IV/4 Revised was approved without comment.
7. Under Agenda Item 7, Approval of the Report of the Third Special Meeting, FC Doc 81/VI/7, the Spanish Representative intervened to protest the Resolution 1/81 passed at that Meeting and requested that it be withdrawn. The Spanish Representative then delivered a statement on that question, which he requested be circulated to all delegations as a NAFO document (FC Doc. 81/IX/13). As there were no further comments the Report of the Third Special Meeting, including the text of Resolution 1/81, was adopted as recorded in FC Doc 81/VI/7.
8. Under Agenda Item 8, Review of Commission Membership, it was noted that there had been no change in the Commission Membership since the last meeting of the Fisheries Commission.
9. Under Agenda Item 9, Review of Rules of Procedure, a discussion took place under Item 9(a) of the Proposal to replace rule 4.1 so that a Draft Provisional Agenda would be sent 100 days before the date fixed for the opening of the meeting. Recalling the earlier debate on this question in the General Council, the Chairman suggested that the Proposal be amended to read 90 rather than 100 days. The Executive Secretary noted that it was not uncommon to have meetings of the Fisheries Commission within 90 days and that therefore insufficient time would be allowed for circulation of a Draft Provisional Agenda. At the suggestion of the Chairman, it was agreed to adopt the present text amended to read 90 days, and to discuss later, if necessary, the question of establishing Rules of Procedure relating to emergency meetings. (See Appendix III)
10. Under Agenda Item 9(b), it was agreed that there would be no change in the status and privileges of Observers in the Fisheries Commission.
11. There was no comment on Agenda Item 10, Status of Proposals, Circular Letter 81/51, which was thus ratified.
12. At the suggestion of the Chairman, it was agreed that Agenda Items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 would be considered by STACTIC. It was agreed further that STACTIC would convene at 0900 hrs Wednesday, 9 September, to elect a Chairman and begin discussion of these Agenda Items.
13. Under Agenda Item 16(a), Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area, Cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman called first for a report by the Chairman of STACFIS, Dr. C. H. Winters (Canada). Dr. Winters noted that the assessment of cod in Division 3M had been provided at the Special Meeting of

March 1981 and since then no new data had become available on which to base any new advice. He therefore proposed that assessment of that stock be deferred until early 1982. The Delegate of Canada suggested that the Fisheries Commission attempt to take a decision in the context of the scientific advice currently available. He noted that it was always possible to have another meeting to study that stock if the scientific advice were to change significantly. He further noted that even if a decision could not be made for the whole of 1982, it was at least necessary to make a decision for the first half of that year. The Delegate of the EEC suggested that any radical change in the scientific advice on this stock would be unlikely. He therefore stated that the Fisheries Commission should proceed to plan a long term management strategy on the basis of existing advice. The Delegate of Cuba agreed with Canada in that the Commission should be prepared to discuss that stock at another meeting if the scientific advice were to change dramatically. Following a short break, the Delegate of Canada acknowledged that it would probably be necessary to be pragmatic and realistic concerning 3M cod. He noted that that stock had already been discussed at length at previous meetings, and added that although fishing mortality of $F_{0.1}$ level would allow for a TAC of 5,000 M.T., this would undoubtedly prove unacceptable to Commission members. On the contrary, he went on, it would probably be impossible to set a 3M cod TAC at a level lower than approximately 12,000 M.T. He therefore formally proposed that the 1982 TAC for 3M cod remain close to the 1981 level and further that the TAC stay at that level until the biomass reached half the level required for the long term sustainable catch at F_{max} or, in other words, until the biomass of 3M cod approximately doubled in size. He cited in making that proposal the decision taken by the Fisheries Commission in its Second Special Meeting concerning cod in Division 3NO. The Delegate of Canada then specified that the 3M cod TAC should be set at 12,405 M.T. and that members should retain the allocations of 1981, with 50 M.T. for Others.

The Delegate of the EEC expressed his support of the general approach proposed by Canada, including the proposal to have a long-term management plan for Div. 3M cod as for cod in Div. 3NO. In his opinion, however, scientific advice should be taken more seriously; consequently he proposed that a lower TAC should be established, and that allocations be reduced for all members on a pro rata basis.

At that point in the debate, the Chairman reminded the members that the Faroese Delegation had not yet arrived and that it would be unwise to continue discussion much further on a stock in which the Faroese Delegation had such a considerable interest. Before discussion on that item closed, however, there were a few brief interventions. The Delegate of Norway supported the Canadian proposal, and, alluding to Norway's particular requirements for allocations from that stock discussed at previous meetings, he also supported the proposal to make the same allocations to members as in 1981. The Delegate of Portugal expressed his support for the statements made by Canada and Norway. The Delegate of Poland supported the Canadian proposal. The Observer from Spain sought clarification as to whether the Canadian proposal involved a special reservation for Spain or whether Spain's allocation would fall into the Others category. The Chairman responded that the subject under discussion at that point was TAC's, not allocations, but that the proposed TAC of 12,405 M.T. would be allotted among Parties to the NAFO Convention and there would therefore not be a special reservation for Spain. The Observer from Spain requested assurances that the question of allocations would be discussed later. The Chairman satisfied Spain on this point. It was then agreed to defer further discussion of the item until the arrival of the Faroese Delegation.

14. Under Agenda Item 16(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, the Chairman of STACFIS stated that the scientific advice was to retain a TAC for the stock of 20,000 M.T. That was agreed without comment.
15. Under Agenda Item 16(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the Chairman of STACFIS, pointed out that that was mainly a by-catch stock, that no new scientific data were available and recommended that the TAC should remain at 2000 M.T. That was agreed without comment.
16. Under Agenda Item 17, Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Delegate of Canada made a procedural suggestion that those stocks be the subject of informal multi-lateral consultations with the Canadian Delegation before being discussed in the Fisheries Commission. The Chairman concurred in that suggestion.
17. Under Agenda Item 18, Minimum mesh size for groundfish in the Regulatory Area, the Chairman cited the documentary references on that subject, as listed in the Agenda, and drew from those references the conclusion that the scientific evidence was too incomplete to permit advice on this problem. The Delegate of Cuba suggested that the Scientific Council be asked to clarify this issue. The Chairman replied that it was unlikely that the Scientific Council could consider this problem during its current session. The Chairman of STACFIS proposed that the Scientific Council try, during its current session, to identify the precise deficiency of the data base and to have the results of that study available for the June 1982 meeting. The Chairman proposed that discussion of that item be postponed until the next annual meeting. The Delegate of Canada elaborated on the reasons for the inclusion of that item in the Agenda of the annual meeting. He pointed out that Canada had, as of July 1, 1981, introduced regulations requiring a minimum mesh size of 130 mm, irrespective of material, within the Canadian zone. Canada had therefore thought that NAFO might wish to adopt a similar regulation in order to ensure consistency of conservation efforts on both sides of the 200 mile limit. He also pointed out that different mesh size regulations would have practical implications. Canada would not press the issue, however, if other members did not share her concern about the practical difficulties.

The Delegate of the USSR stated that Soviet selectivity studies had shown that there was no scientific basis for the Canadian requirement of a 130 mm minimum mesh size in the Canadian zone and that a similar regulation should not be introduced in the Regulatory Area. He offered to make the results of the Soviet studies available to the Scientific Council.

The Delegate of Cuba sympathized with the Canadian approach but expressed his concern about the economic implications of this measure for the Cuban fleet. He therefore supported the position of the USSR. He also thought that SCR Doc 81/IX/87 should be given full consideration during that same session by the Scientific Council and that no decision on the matter should be taken before that.

The Delegate of the EEC stated that the logical procedure would be to let the Scientific Council consider the question, and then refer it to STACTIC.

After some further discussion, the Chairman instructed STACTIC to add Item 18 to its agenda, in order to establish whether that issue needed to be discussed further in the Scientific Council or the Commission.

18. Under Agenda Item 19, Review of the International Scientific Observer Program, (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised, Section 14, pages 2 and 3), it was noted that Canada had volunteered to present a report on that program but that that report was not yet available. It was therefore agreed to defer discussion on that item.
19. Under Agenda Item 20, Conservation and Enforcement Measures for NAFO, it was noted that certain enforcement measures had been adopted and were set out in FC Doc 81/IX/8. The Chairman directed the attention of the members to Part II, Sect. A of the latter Document, which indicated that Definitions of Gear were to be added at a later date. He informed the members that the definitions were to be found in SCS Doc 81/IX/21 and that the combination of this Document and FC Doc 81/IX/8 would provide a complete text on that subject. The Executive Secretary added that progress toward the translation of these scientific definitions into regulations was not complete and that another meeting of the Working Group on that problem would be necessary. The Chairman replied that he hoped the Working Group would be able to meet on Wednesday, 9 September. The Executive Secretary would try and convene the meeting.
20. The Chairman then suggested that the Fisheries Commission recess until the following day in order to allow STACTIC to begin its deliberations. It was agreed that intergovernmental consultations on over-lapping stocks would begin at 1100 hrs September 9.

The Fisheries Commission recessed at 1700 hrs of September 8 and reconvened at 1530 hrs Wednesday, 9 September 1981.

21. The Meeting began with further consideration of Agenda Item 16(a), Management Measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area, Cod in Div. 3M. The Chairman initiated discussion by summarizing the two proposals concerning that stock: A Canadian proposal to fix a TAC of 12,405 M.T. with allocations to NAFO members remaining at the 1981 level, and an EEC proposal for a lower TAC reflecting the scientific advice, with pro rata reductions of allocations to NAFO members.

The Delegate of the EEC commented first on the item, expressing his request that the TAC for cod in Div. 3M be brought more into line with the scientific advice. He added, however, that after further consideration he would be willing to support the Canadian proposal. He qualified that support by confirming that the proposed TAC of 12,405 M.T. should be clearly understood as a maximum figure which, depending on the scientific advice, could be reduced in future. The Delegate of the EEC thereupon withdrew his proposal of the previous day. Following a request by the Delegate of the Faroe Islands for a reiteration of the Canadian proposal, the Observer from Spain asked whether the current discussion related to the TAC for cod in Div. 3M or to allocations of that stock. The Chairman clarified that the Canadian proposal involved both the TAC and allocations and expressed his understanding that it made no allowance for a special reservation for Spain. The Delegate of Canada confirmed the withdrawal of the special reservation for Spain. He also expressed his support for the EEC view that the TAC of 12,405 M.T. was very much a maximum figure which would remain in effect until there was a significant change in the scientific advice on the stock.

22. The Delegate of Japan intervened to express his anxiety about the atmosphere in NAFO which seemed to have assumed a rather confrontational nature with member countries on the one hand versus non-member countries on the other. He added that the proposed reduction in the TAC for cod in Div. 3M was in the order of 300 M.T., a tiny amount which would have little effect on the stock one way or the other. He asked whether it would not be possible to work toward a more conciliatory atmosphere.

The Chairman responded that the Japanese point was well taken, that it was necessary to operate in NAFO within a political as well as a biological environment. The Delegate of Canada addressed himself to the Japanese statement by affirming that the Canadian proposal was by no means intended to provoke confrontation. He pointed out that the 1982 allocations to members were to remain at 1981 levels and that non-members could always join NAFO and receive allocations. He noted that Spain, for instance, was not willing to join NAFO or to abide by its regulations. The Canadian proposal, he added, was

dedicated to the necessity of conservation efforts and to the principle of equitable treatment for all members.

The Chairman then stated that the most important issue for the Fisheries Commission was not the question of some 300 M.T. of cod in Div. 3M but the fact that the proposed TAC for that stock was 12,405 M.T. even though the scientific advice clearly suggested a much lower TAC, around 5,000 M.T. The Observer from Spain noted the inconsistency of the NAFO position, which admitted observers but ignored the interests of those observers. The Chairman countered that on the contrary NAFO had been careful for the past three years to recognize the interests of Spain by fixing a special reservation for that country.

The Delegate of the EEC expressed the view that a consensus seemed to be emerging in support of the proposed TAC for cod in Div. 3M. He added that the discussions would naturally be reopened if any new members were to join NAFO and that the NAFO Convention provided for such an eventuality. The Observer from Spain asserted that NAFO did indeed seem to be engaged in a confrontation in that certain accusation against Spain had resulted in withdrawal of its special reservation.

23. Upon a request from the Chairman for more direct progress toward a decision on the item, the Delegate of the Faroe Islands put forward his view that the Canadian proposal was the only politically viable solution to that delicate question. Regarding the special reservation for Spain, the Delegate of the Faroe Islands hoped that Spain would join NAFO and thus eliminate the problem. Thus the Canadian proposal was adopted.
24. Under Agenda Item 16(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, the Chairman invited proposals on allocations of that stock, a TAC of 20,000 M.T. having been agreed to the previous day. The Delegate of the EEC proposed that the allocations be based on the 1981 allocations. That was agreed.
25. Under Agenda Item 16(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, it was agreed that the already agreed TAC of 2,000 M.T. should be distributed on the basis of the 1981 allocations.
26. Under Agenda Item 17, Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Chairman cited the FC Working Paper 81/IX/8 which represented the outcome of the intergovernmental consultations that morning on overlapping stocks. He invited the Delegate of Canada to introduce the paper.

Since none of the information in the paper was new to any of the Delegations, the Delegate of Canada reiterated only briefly each of the proposals for the various stocks. The Chairman suggested that the allocation proposal be considered stock by stock and invited comments or alternate proposals.

27. On Agenda Item 17(a), Cod in Div. 3NO, the Observer from Spain indicated that he had the same comment to make as he had made before on 3M cod, that is, that Spain had hoped for a special reservation. There were no other comments on the Canadian proposal for the stock, and it was therefore agreed.
28. Under Agenda Item 17(b), Redfish in Div. 3LN, the Delegate of the EEC expressed his disappointment that the Canadian proposal had not been revised on the basis of the discussion on that stock during the intergovernmental consultations in which the EEC had requested a quota of 350 tons. He therefore repeated his proposal which he stressed was carefully calculated to increase the EEC allocation of that stock within the agreed TAC with a minimal effect on other Contracting Parties. The proposed allocations were as follows: Canada 9850 tons, Cuba 2200 tons, EEC 350 tons, USSR 10,750 tons, CDR 850 tons, Portugal 850 tons, Other 150 tons.

The Delegate of the USSR protested strongly against the EEC proposal. The Delegate of Cuba also indicated his inability to support the proposal on the grounds that it would be dangerous to introduce into the Fisheries Commission the principles underlying the EEC proposal. The Delegate of the EEC replied that his proposal was based on the degree of participation by the EEC in the fishery in the recent past. Between 1973 and 1976, he went on, the EEC participation had amounted to 1.41% of the TAC for the stock and the actual EEC request derived from this figure. The request was justified by the fact that a study of the participation of certain other parties revealed that their shares of the TAC were much greater than their catches as a proportion of the total TAC. In addition the EEC proposal was so modest that agreement to it would constitute no hardship for the other parties affected while it would at the same time provide an adequate basis for re-entry into the fishery next year by the EEC fishermen. There was then further discussion on the principle of proportionate participation and the absolute effects of lower TACs by the Delegates of the USSR and the EEC. As no general agreement seemed forthcoming, the Chairman postponed further discussion on the item.

29. Under Agenda Item 17(c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the Canadian proposal was agreed.

30. Under Agenda Item 17(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the Delegate of the EEC expressed disappointment that its allocation of 430 M.T. was rather less than the application of the 1981 proportions would provide given the increase in the TAC for that stock. He therefore proposed an allocation of 440 M.T. The Delegate of Canada acknowledged that an increase in the TAC should result in increases in allocations to Contracting Parties but denied that the increases should invariably be precisely on a pro rata basis. He described the Canadian fishery on that stock as a major one, on which Canadian communities were highly dependent and which had been severely restrained in past years. He claimed that Canadian fishermen were entitled to benefit more than others by the improvement in the condition of the stock. He stated that the increased Canadian allocation of 22,470 tons would still constrain Canadian fishermen, while an allocation of 430 tons would not constrain EEC fishermen.

The Delegate of the EEC responded that EEC fishermen had also made sacrifices to protect yellowtail flounder in division 3LNO. The Delegates of the EEC and Canada then discussed in greater detail the degree to which their respective fisheries of that stock had been constrained. The consideration of that stock closed without a decision with the statement by the Delegate of Canada that the 30 ton increase in the EEC allocation over that of 1981 was sufficient to satisfy the principle that increases in allocations should follow an increase in the TAC. Discussion on the item was then postponed.

31. Under Agenda Item 17(e), Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the Canadian proposal was agreed.

32. Under Agenda Item 17(f), Capelin in Div. 3LNO, the Delegate of the USSR cited the provisional report of the Scientific Council of June 1981 (pp. 29-30) and proposed that a final decision on that stock be deferred to early 1982. The Chairman asserted that a decision should be taken now on the basis of existing scientific advice and added that any decision could always be reconsidered if the scientific advice changed significantly. The Delegate of the USSR confirmed that he was at this stage neither requesting a Special Meeting on Capelin in Div. 3LNO nor suggesting that forthcoming scientific advice could be much changed from the existing advice. He simply wished to have recorded the possibility that the decision on that stock might have to be reconsidered later. Further discussion followed on the timing of meetings of the Fisheries Commission, the Scientific Council and Special Meetings. The Canadian proposal on capelin in divisions 3LNO was then agreed on the understanding that discussion on future meetings of the Fisheries Commission would continue under another agenda item.

33. Under Agenda Item 17(g), Squid (*Lolax*) in Subareas 3+4, the Observer from Spain made the same comment on that stock proposal as on the proposals for cod in divisions 3M and 3NO. He stated his inability to agree with the denial of the Spanish interests in these three stocks and his wish to have this on record. The Chairman reminded the participants of the change in the distribution of the quotas for Squid (*Lolax*) in Subareas 3+4 and noted that the amount of 2,250 tons formerly reserved for Spain was to be shared by Canada and the EEC. The Delegate of the EEC pointed out that some confusion might result from the absence of figures against Canada and the EEC. That did not signify that those two parties had no allocations but only that the exact sharing arrangement was to be determined later by Canada and the EEC. He proposed a footnote similar to the statement setting out that arrangement in EC Doc 80/1X/16, paragraph 30(f). The Delegate of Canada concurred with the idea of a footnote, but suggested that the Delegations of Canada and the EEC consult on the language of the footnote and present it later to the Fisheries Commission for approval. That was agreed and the proposed allocation was adopted subject to final settlement of the drafting point raised.

34. The Chairman then observed that alternate proposals remained on only two stocks - Redfish in Div. 3LN and Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO. He proposed that the Commission resume discussion on those two outstanding stocks at a later stage in the meeting.
35. The Observer from Spain requested confirmation that the Canadian proposals had, with only two exceptions, been accepted. On receiving that confirmation, he delivered a statement (FC Doc 81/1X/12). The Chairman thanked the Observer from Spain for the statement and expressed his approval of the Spanish intention to restrict the fishing effort of the Spanish fleet in the area outside the 200-mile limit.
36. Due to the lateness of the hour, the Commission recessed and the Meeting recovered at 1100 hrs Thursday, 10 September 1981.
37. Following a suggestion by the Chairman, it was agreed to make a formal request to the Executive Secretary to arrange that, in future, the meetings of Standing Committees and Working Groups take place in advance of meetings of the Fisheries Commission. In that way, the reports of these Committees and Groups would be available for immediate consideration by the Fisheries Commission and unnecessary delays in its work would be avoided.

It was agreed to consider the report of STACTIC, on Agenda Items 11 to 15 and 18 on Friday, September 11th.

38. Under Agenda Item 19, Review of the International Scientific Observer Program, the Delegate of Canada stated that a written report would not be provided and instead a brief review of the Program was put forward. Despite an excellent beginning in 1980 with 7 agreements and 218 observer days in the

Regulatory Area, it had been necessary in 1981 to renegotiate these agreements resulting in only 14 observer days in the Area that year. The Delegate of Cuba then announced that Cuba had just concluded a long-term bilateral agreement with Canada to participate in the Program. It was agreed that the subject be regularly reviewed at each Annual Meeting.

39. Under Agenda Item 17(b), Redfish in Div. 31N, it was agreed to vote on the two outstanding proposals. The EEC proposal was defeated by a vote of one in favour (EEC), 4 against (Canada, Cuba, GDR, Poland) and five abstentions (Faroe Islands, Japan, Norway, Portugal and the USSR). The Canadian proposal was therefore adopted.
40. Under Agenda Item 17(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 31NO, the Delegate of the USSR expressed his support for the Canadian proposal. The Delegate of Canada hoped that the two proposals would not have to come to a vote since only two parties, Canada and the EEC, were involved. He proposed that the two parties concerned consult on the matter. The Delegate of the EEC asked to have recorded the EEC view that its share of the TAC for that stock should be maintained. That was confirmed. He then reluctantly withdrew his proposal and the Canadian proposal was therefore agreed.
41. Returning to Agenda Item 17(f), Capelin in Div. 31NO, the Delegate of the USSR directed the attention of the members to footnote 4 in Table I of FC Doc 80/1X/16, Report of the Second Annual Meeting. He suggested a similar footnote for capelin. The Chairman responded that such a footnote would commit the Commission to a mid-year meeting contrary to the consensus then prevalent at the Meeting against mid-year meetings. The Delegates of Canada and the EEC reiterated their view that the NAFO Convention and Rules of Procedure allowed clearly for special meetings and that the absence of a footnote would not preclude a later review of capelin if that would be deemed necessary. It was agreed to record that the TAC and allocations for capelin were subject to review should there be any change in the scientific advice.
42. Returning to Agenda Item 17(g), Squid (*Loligo*) in Subareas 344, the Delegate of the EEC proposed that the explanation of the allocations to the EEC and Canada be added to the schedule rather than included in the Report of the Meeting. The Delegate of Canada stated his preference to have the explanation in the record rather than in a footnote to the schedule. He proposed informal consultations with the EEC to develop an agreed point of view.
43. The Chairman then observed that agreement in principle had been reached on the two sets of stock and that a Table would be prepared for formal agreement by the Fisheries Commission at its next session. The Meeting recessed at 1145 hrs. on Thursday, 10 September and reopened at 1100 hrs on Friday, 11 September 1981.
44. Under Agenda Item 9A, Election of Officers, Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Fisheries Commission and Dr. J. A. Varela (Cuba), was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.
45. Under Agenda Items 11 to 15 the Chairman of STACTIC, Mr. L. S. Parsons (Canada), presented the STACTIC report. (See Appendix IV)
46. Under Agenda Item 11, Review of Annual Return of Infringements and corresponding forms, the Fisheries Commission noted and approved the STACTIC recommendation that returns on inspections and infringements be submitted more promptly to the Executive Secretary.
47. Under Agenda Item 12, Fishing Vessel Registration, the Fisheries Commission in accordance with the STACTIC recommendation requested that the Executive Secretary issue as soon as the data would be available an updated list of vessels registered to fish in the Regulatory Area.
48. Under Agenda Item 13, Enforcement in Division 3M, the Fisheries Commission noted the STACTIC conclusion that, although progress had been made in expanding enforcement activity in Division 3M, the burden of enforcement had not been shared equitably in the past. The Delegate of Norway stated that he envisaged some practical problems for Norway in the enforcement scheme proposed in FC Doc 81/1X/10. He undertook to consult with Canada to see whether those difficulties could be resolved satisfactorily. The Delegate of Japan pointed out that, contrary to the STACTIC report, Japan would be unable to send a patrol vessel to Division 3M in 1982. It was then agreed that the proposal contained in FC Doc 81/1X/10 deserved further study and that each Contracting Party would submit to the Executive Secretary before the end of 1981 its specific plans for enforcement activity in Division 3M for 1982.
49. Under Agenda Item 14, Inspectors' Identity Cards, it was agreed that the Executive Secretary should provide identity cards in the quantities requested.
50. Under Agenda Item 18, Minimum Mesh Size for Groundfish in the Regulatory Area, it was noted that it had not been possible to achieve a consensus in STACTIC because of the lack of advice from the Scientific Council on that matter. It was agreed to defer discussion until the next annual meeting when the Scientific advice would likely be available.

51. Two more items taken from the STACTIC Report were then discussed: Review of STACTIC Forms and Procedure for Communicating with non-Members of NAFO. Under the first item, Review of STACTIC Forms, the Fisheries Commission agreed with the recommendation that a one day session of STACTIC should be held in advance of the next meeting of the Fisheries Commission to review that item and others.
52. Under the second item, Procedure for Communicating with non-Members of NAFO, it was discussed whether such communication, of inspection results for instance, should be sent direct to the non-member concerned or sent to the Executive Secretary. The Delegate of Canada argued in favour of sending the information to the Executive Secretary. The Chairman noted that there seemed to be agreement that information should be sent to the Executive Secretary but no consensus as to what the Secretary should do with such information. It was agreed to discuss the question further at the next annual meeting.
53. Under Agenda Item 20, Conservation and Enforcement Measures, it was noted that the Working Group on the subject had been unable to meet. It was agreed the Working Group would provide firm recommendations to the next annual meeting of the Fisheries Commission.
54. Under Agenda Items 16 and 17, concerning Fish stocks in the Regulatory Area and Stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Commission agreed on a table showing TAC's and quotas for 1982. (See Appendix V). On a proposal from the Delegate of Canada it was agreed to record that the footnote concerning cod in Division 3M should read as follows:

"The TAC will not be increased beyond 12,405 M.T. until the Scientific Council advises that the age 3 plus mean biomass has reached a level approximately equal to one half the mean age 3 plus equilibrium biomass associated with fishing at F_{max} and assuming long term average recruitment levels."
55. On squid (*Loligo*) in Subareas 3 plus 4, the Delegate of the EEC stated that he and the Delegate of Canada had agreed on the relevant footnote appended to the table. (See Appendix V). He wished to have recorded, however, the EEC view that the allocations of squid between Canada and the EEC should be shared in a manner to be determined by the Parties so as not to exceed the difference between the TAC and the total of other allocations. The Delegate of Canada expressed the view that the concept of sharing and joint determination would not be appropriate in the circumstances and that it would be sufficient to say that each of the two Parties should limit its allocation so that the combined total will not exceed the difference between the total of the other allocations and the TAC.
56. Under Agenda Item 21, Time and Place of Next Meeting, it was agreed that the next annual meeting would be held in Halifax September 15-17, 1982 and that meetings of STACTIC and Working Groups would be scheduled for September 14 in advance of the Fisheries Commission meeting.
57. As there was no further business, the Third Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission adjourned at 1150 hrs., 11 September 1981. The press statement is at Appendix V.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1981

List of Participants

PRESIDENT OF NAFO

Dr. A. W. May, Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries Service, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

CANADA

Head of Delegation: Dr. A. W. May
(see address above)

General Council

Mr. B. Applebaum, Director, International Fisheries Relations Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ont.
Dr. A. W. May (See address above)
Mr. L. S. Parsons, Director General, Atlantic Operations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Fisheries Commission

Dr. A. W. May (See address above)
Dr. W. M. Murphy, President, Mersey Seafoods Ltd., P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, N. S.

Scientific Council

Dr. W. G. Doubleday, Fisheries Research Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.
Dr. R. G. Halliday, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.
Mr. A. T. Pinhorn, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Nfld.
Mr. R. Wells, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Nfld.

Advisers

Mr. S. A. Akenhead, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. C. J. Allen, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. T. Amaratunga, Invertebrates Div., Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Mr. P. G. Amiro, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Mr. J. T. Anderson, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. R. Andrews, Assistant Deputy Minister, Nfld. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 4750, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. S. W. Bartlett, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. J. S. Beckett, Fisheries Research Branch, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. A. Best, President, Independent Fish Producers Association, Box 9, Southern Harbour, Newfoundland
Mr. A. R. Billard, Executive Director, Eastern Fishermen's Federation, P. O. Box 384, Stn "M", Halifax, N. S.
Mr. D. R. Bollivar, Manager, Fleet Strategy, National Sea Products, P. O. Box 2130, Halifax, N. S.
Mr. C. A. Borstad, Seakem Oceanography, 2045 Mills Road, Sidney, British Columbia
Mr. P. F. Brodie, Marine Ecology Lab, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.

Mr. D. M. Brown, Intergovernmental Affairs Analyst, Ground Floor, Confederation Bldg.,
St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. A. Campbell, Director General, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans,
240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. E. L. Dalley, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Ms. N. Dale, Chairman, 1982 AGAC Working Group, Fisheries and Oceans, 2511 Beech St.,
Halifax, N. S.

Mr. E. G. Dawe, Fisheries and Oceans, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. K. Drinkwater, MEL, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Mr. M. J. Dunbar, Institute of Oceanography, McGill University, 3620 University Ave.,
Montreal, Quebec

Mr. E. B. Dunne, Director General, Newfoundland Region, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O.
Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. H. K. Edel, Fisheries and Oceans, Marine Sciences and Information, 240 Sparks St.,
7th Floor West, Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. P. Fontaine, Directeur Par Interim, Direction de la Recherche Scientifique et
Technique, D.G.P.M. Ministère de l'Agriculture, Pêcheries and Alimentation, 2700
Rue Einstein, Ste. Foy, Quebec

Mr. J. A. Gagne, Marine Fish Div., BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.

J. Gagnon, Data Quality and Products Section, MEPS, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St.,
Ottawa, Ontario

Ms. C. A. Gavaris, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. J. E. R. Gower, IOE Pat Bay, P. O. Box 6000, Sidney, British Columbia

Mr. T. D. Hies, A/Chief MFD, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Mr. D. K. Jones, CBRTFGW, Box 1061, Lunenburg, Nova Scotia

Mr. C. L. Jones, Quota Management Coordinator, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. J. K. Keeley, Marine Environmental Data Service, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. R. G. Kingsley, Director, Fisheries Technology Div., Government of Newfoundland,
Dept. Fisheries, Box 4750, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. J. A. Koslow, Oceanography Dept., Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. C. Lilly, NAFC, Fisheries and Oceans, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. A. A. Lougheed, Director, Marine Resources, N.S. Dept. of Fisheries, Box 2223,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. D. McKone, Fisheries Ecology Br., Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa,
Ontario

R. Mahon, Marine Fish Div. BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.

Mr. D. Markle, Huntsman Marine Laboratory, St. Andrews, New Brunswick

Mr. R. Mohr, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. A. D. Moore, Ocean Harvesters Ltd., Box 310, Harbour Grace, Newfoundland

Ms. E. Mundell, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street,
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. B. Nakashima, Fisheries and Oceans, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O.
Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

Ms. D. E. Pethick, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. R. J. Prier, A/Chief, Conservation and Protection Br., Fisheries and Oceans,
P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S.

Mr. J. D. Pringle, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S.

Mr. L. C. Riche, Fishery Products Ltd., P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. A. A. Rosenberg, Dept. of Oceanography, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. C. K. Ross, Ocean Circulation Div., Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratory, BIO,
P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Mr. T. W. Rowell, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Mr. E. J. Sandeman, Research and Resource Services, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O.
Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

A. Sauleleja, Atmospheric Environmental Service, 4905 Dufferin St., Downsview, Ontario

Dr. D. E. Sergeant, Arctic Biological Station, 555 Blvd. Ste. Pierre, Ste Anne de
Bellevue, Quebec

Mr. M. Sinclair, MFD, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.

Mr. R. C. Stirling, Executive Director, Seafood Producers Association of N.S.,
P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, N.S.

Mr. W. T. Stebo, Marine Fish Div., BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S.

Mr. H. T. Strauss, Dept. of External Affairs (FLO), 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario

Dr. B. J. Topliss, Atlantic Geoscience Centre, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N.S.

Mr. G. R. Traverse, Head, Offshore Management, Conservation and Protection Br.,
Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

R. W. Trites, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Mr. L. VanGuelpen, Huntsman Marine Laboratory, St. Andrews, New Brunswick

Mr. D. E. Waldron, Marine Fish Div., BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Mr. A. W. White, Fisheries and Oceans, Biological Station, St. Andrews, New Brunswick

K. A. Wilson, N.B. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 6000, Fredericton, New Brunswick

Dr. C. H. Winters, Research and Resource Services, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box
5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

CUBA

Head of Delegation: Dr. J. A. Varea
Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera
Ensenada de Potes Y Atares
Habana, Cuba

General Council

Dr. J. A. Varea (See address above)
Capt. N. Gomez, c/o Pickford & Black, P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, N. S.

Fisheries Commission

Dr. J. A. Varea (See address above)
Capt. N. Gomez (See address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. E. Fraxedas, Flota Cubana de Pesca, Ave. la Pesquera, Habana, Cuba

Advisers

Mr. O. Muniz, Flota Cubana de Pesca, Desamparados Esq Mercado, Habana Vieja,
Habana, Cuba
Mr. E. Fabregas, Ministry of Fisheries, Ensenada de Potes y Atares, Habana, Cuba

European Economic Community

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

General Council

Mr. M. Leigh (See address above)
Mr. J. B. P. Farnell, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European
Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Fisheries Commission

Mr. M. Leigh (See address above)
Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (See address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. Sv. Aa. Horsted, Gronlands Fiskeriundersogelser, Tagensvej 135, Sal 1.
DK-2920 Kobenhavn N, Denmark
Mr. R. H. Letaconnoux, Institut Scientifique et Technique Des Peches Maritimes,
B. P. 1049, F-44037 Nantes-Cedex, France
Dr. J. Messtorff, Institut fur Seefischerei Fischkai, D-2850 Bremerhaven 29,
Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. J. P. Minet, Director, CRIP, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches
Maritimes, B P 1240, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
Mr. R. Noe, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities,
200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Advisers

Mr. C. DeLord, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches Maritimes, B P 1240,
F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
Mr. H. DuPouy, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches Maritimes, B P 1240,
F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
Mr. H. Junge, Assoc. of German Trawler Owners, P. O. Box 403, D-2850 Bremerhaven 29,
Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. N. Kleeschulte, Bundesministerium fur Ernährung Landwirtschaft und Forsten,
RheinstraÙe 1, D-5300 Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Mr. M. LeBolloch, Chef du quartier des Affaires Maritimes, B.P. 1206, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
 Mr. A. Pignatti, Italian Embassy, 175 Slater St., 11th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario
 Mr. S. Prondfoot, Suite 1110, Inn of the Province, 35 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario
 Mr. B. Salva, Administrateur des Affaires Maritimes, Direction des Pêches Maritimes-Marine Marchande, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France
 Mr. T. H. Smith, Ministry of Agric., Fisheries & Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London, England
 Mr. P. Vallée, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Pêches Maritimes, B.P. 1240, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon

FAROE ISLANDS

Head of Delegation: Mr. A. Olafsson, Director,
 Foroya Landsstyri
 Tinganes
 DK-3800 Torshavn
 Faroe Islands

Advisers:

Mr. J. Klett, Foroya Landsstyri, Tinganes, DK-3800 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation: Mr. K. Plagemann
 Fischkombinat Rostock
 25 Rostock
 German Democratic Republic

General Council

Mr. K. Plagemann (See address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. K. Plagemann (See address above)

Scientific Council

Dr. W. Mahnke, Institut für binnere Fischerei, 291 Rostock-Marienhe 5, German Democratic Republic

Interpreter

Ms. M. Förster, 25 Rostock, VEB Hochschule für Fischerei, German Democratic Republic

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: Mr. Kunio Yonazawa
 Fishery Division
 Economic Affairs Bureau
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 2-2-1 Kasumigaoka
 Chiyoda-Ku
 Tokyo, Japan

General Council

Mr. K. Yonazawa (See address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. K. Yonazawa (See address above)

Scientific Council

Dr. H. Hatanaka, Far Seas Fishery Research Laboratory, 100 Ordo, Shimizu 424,
Japan

Advisers

Mr. K. Kirimura, Japan Fisheries Association, 900 Royal Bank Building, 5161 George
St., Halifax, N. S.
Mr. K. Ito, Hoko Fishing Co. Ltd., P. O. Box 696, Dartmouth, N. S.
Mr. Y. Ito, Fishery Division, Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
2-2-1 Kasumagaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan
Mr. Y. Santo, Nippon Suisan Kaisha, Halifax Office, 16th Floor, Toronto Dominion
Bank Bldg., 1791 Barrington St., Halifax, N. S.

NORWAY

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

Advisers

Mr. L. Grønnevet, Norwegian Fishermen's Association, N-6170 Vardal, Norway
Mr. T. Banevold, First Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Suite 700, Wellington
St., Ottawa, Ontario

POLAND

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

General Council

Mr. W. Kalinowski (See address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. W. Kalinowski (See address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. A. J. Paciorek, Polska Instytut Rybacki, Skrz. Poczt. 184, 81-345 Gdynia, Poland

Advisers

Mr. W. Polaczek, Trade Commissioners Office of Poland, 3501 Ave du Musée, Montreal, Que.

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation: Mr. J. Miranda Mendes, Director General
Direcção Geral do Desenvolvimento e
Coordenação das Pescas, Secretaria da
Estado das Pescas, Caixa Postal 2849,
1121 Lisboa Codex, Portugal

General Council

Mr. J. Miranda Mendes (See address above)
Mr. L. G. Boavida, Direcção Geral do Desenvolvimento e Coordenação das Pescas,
Av. 24 de Julho 80-20, 1200 Lisbon, Portugal

Fisheries Commission

Mr. J. Miranda Mendes (See address above)
Mr. J. G. Boavida (See address above)
Commander M. Cunha, P. O. Box 5249, St. John's, Newfoundland

Scientific Council

Dr. M. Lima Dias, Instituto de Investigacao das Pescas, Alges-Praia, 1400 Lisbon,
Portugal

Advisers

Ms. M. L. M. Coelho, Instituto de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. de Brasilia,
1400 Alges, Lisbon, Portugal

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Head of Delegation: Mr. A. A. Volkov
Welsford Place, Suite 2202-3
2074 Robie Street
Halifax, N. S.

General Council

Mr. A. A. Volkov (See address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. A. A. Volkov (See address above)

Advisers

Mr. G. M. Chursin, Embassy of USSR, 1500 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C.
USA 20005
Mr. V. N. Kleitoy, Welsford Place, 2074 Robie St., # 2202, Halifax, N. S.
Mr. E. Sabourenkov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45,
103045, USSR
Mr. L. Shepel, Welsford Place, 2074 Robie St., # 2202, Halifax, N. S.
Dr. Y. Znamensky, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45,
103045, USSR

O B S E R V E R S

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. H. H. Lee, Korean Embassy, 151 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. N. W. Paik, Korean Embassy, 151 Slater Street, Burnside Bldg., Suite 608,
Ottawa, Ontario

SPAIN

Mr. A. Collado, First Secretary, Embassy of Spain, 350 Sparks St., Rm. 802, Ottawa, Ont.
Mr. R. DeMiguel, Subsecretaria de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid, Spain
Dr. M. C. Larraneta, Instituto Investigaciones Pesqueras, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
Dr. E. C. Lopez-Veiga, S. Cooperative de Armadores de Pesca del Puerto de Vigo (ARVI),
Apartado 1078, Vigo Pontevedra, Spain
Mr. J. L. Meseguer, Subsecretaria de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid, Spain
Mr. J. Prat, Director General de Relaciones Pesqueras Internacionales, Direccion
General de Pesca Maritima, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid 14, Spain

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. D. L. Chamberlin, Atlantic Environmental Group, National Marine Fisheries Service,
 RR 7A Narragansett, RI, USA 02882
 Mr. D. S. Crestin, National Marine Fisheries Service, 14 Elm Street, Federal Bldg.,
 Gloucester, Mass., USA 01930
 Mr. M. P. Fahay, NOAA, NMFS, Sandy Hook Marine Lab, Highlands, N.J., USA 07716
 Mr. J. J. Graham, Fisheries Research Laboratory, West Boothbay Harbour, Maine, USA 04575
 Dr. M. D. Grosslein, Northwest Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service,
 Woods Hole, Mass., USA 02543
 Mr. R. M. Hayes, U.S.C.G. Oceanographic Unit, Bldg. 159E, Navy Yard Annex, Washington,
 D.C., USA 20543
 Ms. A. M. T. Lange, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Center,
 Woods Hole, Mass., USA 02543
 Mr. D. G. Mountain, Northeast Fisheries Centre, Woods Hole, Mass., USA 02543
 Mr. D. A. Rottavder, Office of International Fisheries Affairs, NOAA/NMFS/F-1A2,
 1300 Whitehaven Street NW, Washington, D.C., USA 20235
 Mr. M. Sissenwine, Deputy Chief, Resource Assessment Div., Northeast Fisheries Center,
 Woods Hole, Mass., USA 02543
 Mr. D. Stevenson, Maine Dept. of Marine Resources, West Boothbay Harbour, Maine,
 USA 04573
 Mr. V. Anthony, Northeast Fisheries Center, NMFS, Woods Hole, Mass., USA 02543
 Mr. G. Waring, National Marine Fisheries, Northeast Fisheries Center, Woods Hole,
 Mass., USA 02543

SECRETARIAT

Capt. J. C. E. Cardoso, Executive Secretary, NAFO
 Mr. V. M. Hodder, Assistant Executive Secretary, NAFO
 Mr. W. H. Champion, Administrative Assistant, NAFO
 Mr. F. D. Keating, Finance and Publications Clerk-Steno, NAFO
 Mrs. B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary, NAFO
 Mr. G. M. Moulton, Senior Statistical Clerk, NAFO
 Mr. R. A. Myers, Clerk-Duplicator Operator, NAFO
 Ms. R. A. Alphonse, Clerk-Typist, NAFO
 Mrs. C. F. Guedes, Junior Secretary, NAFO
 Mr. B. T. Crawford, Clerk-Duplicator Operator, NAFO
 Mrs. F. E. Perry, Documents and Mailing Clerk, NAFO
 Miss B. L. Perry, Statistical Clerk, NAFO
 Miss C. L. Martin, Statistical Clerk, NAFO
 Miss V. N. Bullen, Data Processing Clerk, NAFO

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Ms. S. Groulx, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 8th Floor West,
 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
THIRD ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1981

Fisheries Commission

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. Final Approval of the Reports of the 2nd Annual Meeting (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised) and of the Report of the Second Special Meeting (FC Doc 81/IV/4, Revised).
7. Approval of the Report of the Third Special Meeting (FC Doc 81/VI/7)
8. Review of Commission Membership
9. Review of Rules of Procedure
 - a) Proposal to replace Rule 4.1 so that a Draft Provisional Agenda is sent 100 days before the date fixed for the opening of the meeting (FC Doc 81/IX/5)
 - b) Study of the status of Observers (FC Doc 81/VI/7, Section 20, page 4)
- 9A. Election of Officers

COMMISSION PROPOSALS

10. Status of Proposals (Circular Letter 81/51)

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

11. Annual Return of Catch/efforts and corresponding forms
12. Fishing Vessel Registration
13. Enforcement in Div. 3M (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised, Section 22, page 5 and FC Doc 81/IV/4, Revised, Section 24, page 6)
14. Inspectors identity cards (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised, Section 26, page 5)
15. Report of STACTIC

CONSERVATION - Appendix 1 of the Report of the Scientific Council (SCS Doc 81/VI/20)

16. Management Measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area
 - (a) Cod in Div. 3M
 - (i) Long-term management plan
 - (b) Redfish in Div. 3M
 - (c) American plaice in Div. 3M
17. Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits
 - (a) Cod in Div. 3M
 - (b) Redfish in Div. 3M
 - (c) American plaice in Div. 3M
 - (d) Yellowtail Flounder in Div. 3M
 - (e) Witch Flounder in Div. 3M
 - (f) Capelin in Div. 3M
 - (g) Squid (Lycoteuthis) in Subareas 3 and 4

18. Minimum mesh size for groundfish in the Regulatory Area (FC Doc 80/111/2, Revised September 20; Schedule IV, Part V of Conservation and Enforcement Measures in NAFO Regulatory Area; and FC Doc 80/IX/16 Revised, Section 27, page 6)

OTHER MATTERS

19. Review of the International Scientific Observer Program (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised, Section 14, pages 2 and 3)
20. Conservation and Enforcement Measures for NAFO (FC Doc 80/IX/16, Revised, Section 10, page 3, Section 15, page 4 and Section 23, page 6)

ADJOURNMENT

21. Time and Place of Next Meeting
22. Other Business
23. Adjournment

Rules of Procedure For the Fisheries CommissionNotice of Amendment of Rule 4ORDER OF BUSINESSRule 4:

- 4.1 A draft provisional agenda for each annual or special meeting of the Fisheries Commission, or any of its subsidiary bodies, shall be prepared by the Executive Secretary, in accordance with instructions from the Chairman, or the Chairman of the relevant subsidiary body, and be dispatched by the Executive Secretary to all Contracting Parties, their representatives, and invited observers, not less than 90 days before the date fixed for the opening of the meeting.
- 4.2 A provisional agenda for each annual or special meeting of the Fisheries Commission, or any of its subsidiary bodies, shall be prepared by the Executive Secretary, in accordance with the instructions from the Chairman, or the Chairman of the relevant subsidiary body, taking into account any suggestions or comments received following distribution of the draft provisional agenda, and be dispatched by the Executive Secretary to all Contracting Parties, their representatives, and invited observers, not less than 60 days before the date fixed for the opening of the meeting.
- 4.3 Except as provided in paragraph 4.4, no order of business shall be the subject of a decision, unless the subject matter has been included in the provisional agenda and explained in a memorandum, circulated by the Executive Secretary to all the representatives of the members, together with the corresponding provisional agenda.
- 4.4 The Fisheries Commission, by a majority of the votes of all members present and casting affirmative or negative votes, may take decisions involving amendment of these Rules of Procedure, provided that no vote shall be taken unless there is a quorum of at least two-thirds of the members.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1981

Report of the
Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

1. The Third Annual Meeting of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) was opened by the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission, Mr. Farnell. Delegations from Japan, EEC, USSR, Cuba, Portugal, and Canada were present.
2. Election of Chairman. Mr. L. S. Parsons (Canada) was elected Chairman.
3. Adoption of Agenda. The Provisional Agenda was amended by adding two items referred to STACTIC by the Fisheries Commission, with respect to Inspector Identity Cards and Minimum Mesh size for regulated species of groundfish in the Regulatory Area. (Appendix D)
4. Appointment of Rapporteur. Mr. R. Prier was appointed as Rapporteur.
5. Review of Annual Return of Infringements. The Chairman stated that the Executive Secretary had informed him that the annual returns were incomplete. He requested the delegates present to indicate when the Executive Secretary could expect their returns. The Cuban Delegate stated they would submit their returns on September 9th. The USSR Delegate stated they had already submitted their returns for 1980 and are now prepared to submit a report on 1981. It was agreed that these returns would be summarized in a document to be issued by the Secretariat. STACTIC noted that there appeared to be considerable delays in the submission of the required information and drew to the Commission's attention the need for more timely submission to the NAFO Secretariat by Contracting Parties of returns on inspections and infringements and disposition of infringements.
6. Review of STACTIC Forms. The Chairman deferred the discussion of this item pending clarification from the Executive Secretary.
7. Review of Registration of Vessels Fishing in the Regulatory Area. The Chairman stated the Executive Secretary had apparently received, to date, information only from Canada. The Chairman referred to the minutes of the First Annual Meeting in which Canada and Portugal had indicated they would update their submission. The Portuguese delegate stated this information was on its way to the Executive Secretary. It was agreed that the Secretariat be requested to issue an updated list of vessels registered to fish in the Regulatory Area.

8. Consideration of Enforcement in Division 3M. The Chairman reviewed the record of the previous meeting of the Fisheries Commission in which an expansion of 3M enforcement by the members of NAFO was proposed. At that time, Canada, USSR, EEC, Cuba and Portugal had indicated a commitment to participate in this proposal for increased enforcement in Division 3M. The Chairman requested the delegates to indicate their level of participation in 1981 and plans for 1982. The delegate from the EEC stated that because of external factors the level of participation by the EEC fleet in the Northwest Atlantic had been less than originally anticipated for 1981. Since the level of participation in the Joint Enforcement Scheme was dependent on the level of fishing activity in the NAFO area by the EEC, there would be no participation in 1981 by the EEC. He was hopeful that the EEC would be able to participate in 1982 but could not make a firm commitment at this time. The delegate from Cuba indicated that Cuba had met her commitment in 1981. A Cuban inspector accompanied a Canadian patrol vessel which patrolled in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The delegate from Canada stated that Canada had planned to provide 90 sea days in Division 3M in 1981. During the period January 1 to August 31, Canada has patrolled in 3M for 38 days. Due to other commitments the sea days allocated to 3M had to be reduced. However Canada had provided 71 hours of air surveillance in 3M and carried out 49 inspections of foreign fishing vessels of which 18 were in apparent violation of NAFO regulations. The Portuguese delegate stated they were ready to carry out joint inspections in 1981 but have not carried out any to-date. However, they hope to do so in the near future. In 1982 they intend to carry on this activity throughout the year. The USSR delegate stated that in 1981 two Soviet patrol vessels have been engaged in joint enforcement in the NAFO Regulatory Area. One vessel, the ZURBAGAN, had been on patrol from February 17 to May 31 for 104 days. During this period the ZURBAGAN conducted 27 inspections (14 Spanish, 9 Portuguese, 2 Cuban, 2 Japanese). In addition 10 Soviet vessels were inspected. A second vessel, the UMBRINA commenced her patrol on June 2 and will remain in the NAFO Regulatory Area until October. To-date the UMBRINA has conducted 29 foreign inspections (13 Spanish, 13 Portuguese, 3 Canadian) and in addition 7 Soviet. The USSR delegate indicated that 5 Spanish vessels boarded did not allow inspections below decks and that a joint Canada/USSR inspection conducted on one Spanish vessel on August 22 had noted apparent infringements of mesh size and log keeping. In 1982 the USSR will send two patrol vessels to conduct inspections in Division 3M. The USSR delegate reaffirmed that on February 16, 1981 the USSR had submitted its report on infringements and vessel registration for 1980.

The Chairman requested that the delegate from Canada present the Canadian proposal contained in NAFO/FC Doc. 81/IX/10. The Canadian delegate stated that the proposal was that each Contracting Party provide an enforcement capability in proportion to its allocation in Division 3M. For every 100 M.T. of allocation it was suggested that each Contracting Party commit 1 patrol day. The Chairman asked delegates for comment on the Canadian proposal. The delegate from USSR stated the USSR could support the Canadian proposal. The delegate from the EEC indicated that although it was an interesting proposal, they could not support it because the scale is based on allocations, and catches do not necessarily equate to allocations. He further indicated that, in his view, the proposal was too rigid and that a more flexible approach is required. He stated that a wide range of factors determine the ability of a nation to participate in the enforcement scheme. The Chairman summarized the comments and suggested that the proposal be discussed further at a subsequent meeting.

9. Inspector Identity Cards. The Chairman stated that the Executive Secretary had requested each Contracting Party to estimate the number of Identity Cards that it would require. Replies had been received from all Contracting Parties except three. It was agreed that the Executive Secretary be requested to provide these Identity Cards in the quantities requested.

10. Minimum Mesh Size for Regulated Species of Groundfish in the Regulatory Area. The Chairman referred to the Canadian proposal tabled at the September 1980 meeting in which Canada proposed a minimum mesh size of 130 mm irrespective of material in order to ensure consistency with the regulation that had been adopted in the Canadian zone of jurisdiction. This proposal had been referred by the Fisheries Commission to the Scientific Council for review. To-date the Scientific Council has not provided any definitive advice on this issue. The Fisheries Commission had requested STACTIC to determine whether there is a problem with the adoption of a common mesh size irrespective of material. The USSR delegate agreed that there are advantages to a common mesh size but the simplest solution would be for Canada to adopt 120 mm minimum mesh size for its area of jurisdiction. The USSR delegate indicated that there was no scientific advice to support a uniform minimum mesh size of 130 mm. He further indicated that all NAFO measures and regulations should be based on scientific studies. In addition the adoption of such a regulation would create economic problems for USSR vessels. The delegate from Cuba expressed deep concern with regard to this proposal. He indicated that more scientific data should be gathered on this subject. He noted that in the redfish fishery there

was a great escapement of redfish when using 120 mm mesh size and the adoption of this proposal would not decrease this problem. In fact, in the case of redfish a reduction in the mesh size may be appropriate. The delegate from Canada indicated that the concerns with respect to redfish had been taken into consideration. The Cuban delegate reiterated his concern that more scientific evidence is required before establishing 130 mm as a uniform minimum mesh size irrespective of material. He stated Cuba would also have economic concerns with the proposal. The EEC delegate stated that the EEC could support the Canadian proposal. The Chairman noted that the Scientific Council had not yet provided firm advice on the uniform minimum mesh size proposal and that there may not be time at this meeting for the Scientific Council to provide advice on this issue. He suggested that this item be discussed further in the Fisheries Commission if scientific advice were to be forthcoming before the end of the Annual Meeting; otherwise, the matter would have to be deferred to the next Annual Meeting.

The Chairman advised the delegates he would speak to the Chairman of the Scientific Council to ascertain when further advice on the proposal could be expected. He then requested views on whether the existence of different regulations within the Regulatory Area and the Canadian zone of jurisdiction would pose major problems. The EEC delegate stated that it would not be a serious problem since 130 mm is already required for EEC vessels fishing West of Greenland. The Portuguese delegate stated he would be interested to know why Canada increased the mesh size. The Canadian delegate stated that the preamble of the proposal outlined the Canadian rationale for increasing the mesh size. Enforcement officers and vessel captains found it next to impossible to determine applicable mesh size due to difficulties in establishing the material used in the manufacture of nets. The rationale was one of practical enforcement. The delegate from the USSR stated that there would be problems since Soviet fishermen would have to use two trawls; however, USSR vessels would be able to cope pending further scientific advice.

11. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1810 hours Tuesday, September 8.

12. The Chairman, Mr. L. S. Parsons, reconvened the STACTIC meeting at 0925, 10 September. Delegates from Japan, Poland, EEC, USSR, Cuba, Faroes, and Canada were present. The Chairman welcomed those members who were not present at the first session and outlined the 3 items which were deferred from the last meeting. The three items to be discussed further were:

- (a) Mesh size
- (b) Enforcement in 3M
- (c) Review of STACTIC forms

13. Minimum Mesh Size for Regulated Species of Groundfish in Regulatory Area.

The Chairman stated in respect to mesh size that he had agreed to meet with the Chairman of the Scientific Council to determine if they would be able at this meeting to provide more definitive advice on the implications of a uniform minimum mesh size. He had been informed that the Scientific Council would be unable to produce a report at this meeting other than what was reported at the June meeting.

14. Consideration of Enforcement in Division 3M. The Chairman summarized the discussions on this item at the first session and indicated some progress had been made on expanding the enforcement activity in 3M not only by individual Contracting Parties but through joint enforcement activities. He briefly reviewed the activity by Contracting Parties in 1981 and pointed out that some Contracting Parties had expressed support for the proposal while others felt it was too rigid and that a more flexible approach was required. The Canadian delegate stated Canada would like to see an expanded program adopted in Division 3M along the lines indicated in the proposal, however, Canada was prepared to consider alternative means of accomplishing this. The main point was that the participation of Contracting Parties should bear some relation to the fishing activity by those Contracting Parties in 3M. He added that Canada is willing to cooperate with other nations through joint enforcement in Division 3M. The delegate from Cuba expressed the view that the paper is a basis from which to develop an enforcement program and that the proposed formula would be useful as a guide to minimum requirements. His delegation would like to study the proposal further, following which Cuba would forward its specific plans to the NAFO Secretariat. The delegate from the EEC reiterated that patrol effort would depend on the EEC's overall level of fishing activity in the Convention Area. He noted that the Canadian proposal had served as a useful reminder to all Contracting Parties that the burden of enforcement has not been equally shared to-date. He agreed with the Cuban delegate that the delegations should further consider the proposal and forward to the NAFO Secretariat their plans for 1982. The Faroese delegate asked the Chairman to review the enforcement activity in 3M in 1981. The Chairman complied. The Faroese delegate further asked whether foreign inspectors could go on Canadian patrol vessels. The Canadian delegate indicated they welcomed foreign inspectors on Canadian patrol vessels for training purposes. He added that if Contracting Parties found it difficult to send patrol vessels to the Regulatory Area they should consider placing inspectors on their fishing vessels. If this was done then the NAFO Secretariat must be informed that the designated fishing vessels would be carrying inspectors.

The Polish delegate indicated that they did not have much fishing activity in 3M but could support the Canadian proposal. He indicated they intend to send an inspector on board a fishing vessel in 1982. The Faroës delegate stated he was unable to make any commitments at this time pending further study of the document. He, however, expressed interest in the possibility of sending an inspector on a Canadian patrol vessel. The delegate from Japan stated that they would be unable to send an inspector to 3M in 1982. The delegate from Canada requested that those Contracting Parties who intend to send patrol vessels or inspectors to the Regulatory Area inform the NAFO Secretariat in order that maximum coverage of the Area be made with the resources available.

In summary, the Chairman noted progress had been made in expanding enforcement activity in 3M. There seemed to be general agreement that the burden of enforcement should be shared equitably, taking into account the level of fishing activity in the Regulatory Area by the respective Contracting Parties. It was generally acknowledged that this task had not been equitably shared in the past and that efforts should continue to ensure that the enforcement responsibilities are shared by all Contracting Parties. STACTIC agreed that the proposal contained in NAFO FC Doc 81/EX/10 should be studied further by all Contracting Parties following the Annual Meeting and that each Contracting Party be requested to submit to the Secretariat before the end of 1981 its specific plans for enforcement activity in Division 3M in 1982.

15. Review of STACTIC Forms. The Chairman tabled three forms that the Fisheries Commission had requested be reviewed in light of the revisions to the Conservation and Enforcement Measures. These were:

- (a) Annual report of inspections and infringements
- (b) Disposition of annual reports of inspections and infringements
- (c) Registration of vessels

and asked for comments. After some discussion the EEC delegate recommended that the NAFO Secretariat draft revised forms to be discussed at a STACTIC meeting to be held one day earlier than the next scheduled Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO. STACTIC agreed to recommend to the Commission that (1) a one-day session of STACTIC be scheduled in advance of the next scheduled meeting of the Fisheries Commission to review this and other items; (2) that Contracting Parties be requested to examine the forms and submit any suggestions for revision to the Executive Secretary before the end of 1981; and (3) that the Executive Secretary be requested to produce draft revised forms in advance of the meeting suggested in (1) and taking into account such suggestions for revision.

16. The Chairman asked if there was any further business. The Canadian delegate noted that there was no clear provision within existing NAFO rules for the communication to non-members of the results of inspections carried out in the Regulatory Area on vessels of non-members. STACTIC agreed that the Commission be requested to address this issue at its current meeting with a view to clarifying procedures. One possibility would be to require that the results of such inspections be forwarded to NAFO Secretariat for transmission to the appropriate authorities of non-member states.

17. There being no further business the Chairman thanked the delegates for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 1010.

Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

Agenda

1. Opening by Chairman of the Fisheries Commission, Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (EEC)
2. Election of Chairman
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Appointment of Rapporteur
5. Review of Annual Returns of Infringements
6. Review of STACTIC Forms
7. Review of Registration of Vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area
8. Consideration of Enforcement in Division 3M
9. Inspector's Identity Cards
10. Minimum Mesh Size

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATIONTHIRD ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1981Press Notice

1. The Third Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held at Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, during 8-18 September 1981, under the chairmanship of Dr. A. W. May, President of NAFO and Head of the Canadian Delegation. The meetings of the General Council and Fisheries Commission were held 8-11 September and the meetings of the Scientific Council from 8-18 September.
2. Attending the meetings were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Canada, Cuba, European Economic Community (EEC), Faroe Islands, German Democratic Republic, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Observers were present from Spain, the United States of America, and Korea.
3. On the basis of scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1981, agreement was reached on conservation and management measures in 1982 regarding total allowable catches (TAC's) and allocations for certain fish stocks, three of which are entirely outside the Canadian 200 mile fishing zone in NAFO Division 3M and six stocks overlapping the 200 mile fishing zone in Divisions 3L, 3N, and 3O (Table 1). Allocations were also made for the 1982 TAC for the short-finned squid (*Illex illecebrosus*) in Subareas 3 and 4.
4. The election of officers for the next two-year period was also carried out. Dr. V. K. Zilmanov (USSR) was elected Chairman of the General Council with M. Leigh (EEC) as Vice-Chairman. Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada) was elected Chairman of the Fisheries Commission with Dr. J.A. Varea (Cuba) as Vice-Chairman.

Table 1. Total allowable catches and quotas (metric tons) for 1982 of particular stocks in Subareas 3 and 4 of the NAFO Convention Area. (The values listed include quantities to be taken both inside and outside the 200-mile fisheries zone, where applicable.)

CONTRACTING PARTY	COD		REDFISH		AMERICAN PLAICE		YELLOWTAIL 3LNO	WITCH 3NO	CAPELIN 3LNO	SQUID 3+4
	3M	3NO	3M	3LN	3M	3LNO				
Bulgaria	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
Canada	100	9,800	5,500	10,000	250	54,200	22,470	3,000	30,000 ³	- ⁴
Cuba	480	850	1,550	2,250	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
European Economic Community	2,405	210	1,200	-	-	700	430	-	-	- ⁵
Faroe Islands (Denmark)	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japan	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
Norway	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poland	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000
Portugal	3,500	1,100	600	850	250	-	-	-	-	500
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,270	4,340	10,350	10,900	1,000	-	-	1,950	-	5,000
Others	50	700	100	150	500	100	100	50	-	-
TOTAL	12,405 ¹	17,000 ²	20,000	25,000	2,000	55,000	23,000	5,000	30,000	150,000

¹ The TAC will not be increased beyond 12,405 M.T. until the Scientific Council advises that the age 3+ mean biomass has reached a level approximately equal one-half the mean age 3+ equilibrium biomass associated with fishing at F_{max} , and assuming long term average recruitment levels.

² TAC shall not be increased until such time as the Scientific Council reports that age 3+ annual mean biomass has reached 200,000 metric tons.

³ Reserved for Canadian fishing in 3L.

⁴ Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para. 3 of the NAFO Convention, provided that the TAC for squid is not exceeded. Transfers made to Contracting Parties conducting fisheries for squid in the Regulatory Area shall be reported to the Executive Secretary, and the report shall be made as promptly as possible.

⁵ The opening date for the squid (Illex) fishery is 1 July 1982.

⁶ The dashes which appear in the place of allocations to Canada and the EEC do not signify zero allocations. Allocations to these Contracting Parties, as yet undetermined, shall not exceed the difference between the total of allocations to other Contracting Parties and the TAC.