Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N635

NAFO/FC Doc 82/IX/10
(Revised)

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1982

Provisional Report of the
Fisheries Commission

Tuesday, 14 September, 1700 hrs
Wednesday, 15 September, 0930 and 1450 hrs
Thursday, 16 September, 0940 and 1540 hrs

1. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada), at 1700 hrs, 14 September, in the Lord Nelson Hotel, Halifax, Nova Scotia, with the presence of representatives from all Commission members, except Bulgaria and Romania. (See Appendix I)

2. Under Agenda item 2, Rapporteur, Chris J. Allen (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Under Agenda item 3, Adoption of Agenda, the Canadian delegate proposed that Provisional Agenda item 19(f) be amended to read "Capelin in Div. 3NO" in view of the scientific advice being presented that the 3LNO capelin was in reality two different stocks. It was further stated that 3NO capelin would be discussed within NAFO but the Canadian delegate could see no reason for 3L capelin to be discussed within NAFO as the fishery took place entirely within the Canadian zone.

   The EEC delegate pointed out that he could not agree to having 3L capelin removed from the Agenda. He further stated that he did not necessarily object to discussing capelin as two separate stocks i.e. 3NO and 3L separately, but he felt that it should not simply be removed from the Agenda. The delegate of Canada mentioned that the discussion of 3L capelin might be difficult if the coastal state did not want to discuss the matter, and therefore proposed that no discussion be carried out within the Fisheries Commission on 3L capelin. It was then suggested to adopt the whole agenda leaving open only consideration and approval of Provisional Agenda item 19(f).

4. However, regarding item 9 on the Provisional Agenda, the USSR delegate advised that the transmission by the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe of Recommendation 913 should be passed as information and put under "Other Business" as was done in the General Council Agenda. The USSR delegate further stated that, regarding item 20 on the Provisional Agenda, it should read "Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area". It was agreed to delete the item on Recommendation 913 and to renumber the items on the Agenda accordingly and to reword Agenda item 19 as per the Soviet proposals. The Agenda was adopted as amended, subject to reconsideration of item 18(f) as explained above. (See Appendix II)

5. Under Agenda item 4, Admission of Observers, the Chairman declared that there were observers from Spain and the United States of America.

6. Under Agenda item 5, Publicity, it was agreed that the usual practice be followed whereby the Chairmen of the Fisheries Commission, the General Council, the Scientific Council and the Executive Secretary, would agree upon a press release for issuance at the close of the Meeting. (See Appendix III)

7. The delegate of Canada then suggested the Commission move immediately to Agenda item 17, Management Measures for the fish stocks in the Regulatory Area. Regarding item 17(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, the delegate of Canada proposed that the TAC remain at 20,000 tons with the allocations the same as in 1982 except for the allocations to Canada and the Soviet Union. Canada would decrease to an allocation of 2,000 tons and the Soviet Union would increase to an allocation of 13,850 tons. As well, the allocation of 2,000 t to Canada would include a transfer of 850 t to Cuba.

8. Under Agenda item 17(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the delegate of Canada proposed that the TAC and national allocations remain unchanged from 1982.

9. Regarding Agenda item 17(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of Norway pointed out that the Scientific Council had recommended that there be no directed fishery for that stock in 1983 and if such a measure were adopted, then Norway would have no fishing operations within the Regulatory Area and would therefore not be able to continue its membership in the Fisheries Commission. The delegate of the Faroe Islands agreed with the Norwegian statement and said that they were in the same position. He

further pointed out that a zero TAC or a reduction in quotas would be unacceptable. The delegate of Portugal reiterated the concerns of Norway and the Faroes and advised that a zero TAC would also be unacceptable to his country.

10. Regarding the proposals put forth by Canada with respect to Redfish and American plaice in Div. 3M, the delegate of Portugal questioned as to whether or not Bulgaria had fished in 3M recently and whether anyone knew as to whether or not it would be fishing there in 1983. The delegate of Portugal then proposed that if Bulgaria were not going to fish in 3M in 1983, then Portugal would like to have the Bulgarian 3M redfish allocation of 300 tons. The delegate of Japan suggested that the Executive Secretary should contact Bulgaria to determine whether or not it intended to fish the 3M redfish. If the answer were negative or if no reply were forthcoming, then it was felt to be in order at the next annual meeting to consider redistribution to other members of the present 300 ton allocation of redfish to Bulgaria.

11. The delegate of the USSR supported the Canadian proposal regarding Redfish in Div. 3M,which was subsequently adopted.

12. The delegate of Cuba supported the Canadian proposal regarding American plaice in Div. 3M, which was subsequently adopted.

13. Regarding Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of the EEC affirmed that the stock was in very bad shape and stated his amazement at the statements made by some members regarding their desire to continuing allocations of that stock in order to stay in NAFO. He strongly recommended that the Fisheries Commission take the scientific advice, that there be no directed fishery in 1983 for cod in Div. 3M. The delegate of the Faroe Islands pointed out that statements made by himself and other members earlier, were not made as a threat but were merely made to mention to other members that if some countries were to lose their allocations of 3M cod, which was their only allocation, they would therefore not be eligible for membership in the Fisheries Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 1755 hours.

14. The Chairman reopened the meeting on 15 September at 0930 with further consideration of Agenda item 3, Adoption of Agenda. The USSR delegate proposed, as a compromise, to omit reference of 3LNO in Agenda item 18(f) leaving it to read simply "Capelin". The proposal was seconded by Norway and agreed to by the delegates of both the EEC and Canada. The Agenda was then fully adopted, as amended.

15. Under Agenda item 6, Approval of the Report of the Third Annual Meeting, the delegate of Canada proposed to delete the mention of Iceland as a member of the Fisheries Commission. The Report, thus amended, was approved.

16. Under Agenda item 7, 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.

17. Under Agenda item 8, Approval of consequential amendments to Rules of Procedure, the delegate of Canada pointed out that that Agenda item was set aside in the General Council in order that the changes be reviewed before a final vote. The Executive Secretary announced that the amendments suggested for the Fisheries Commission were not the same as the amendments suggested for the General Council. Referring to Circular Letter 82/40, page 17, the Executive Secretaryexplained that the amendments for the Fisheries Commission were simple matters involving no substantial changes. The proposed amendments as found in Circular 82/40 were adopted.

18. Under Agenda item 9, Status of Proposals, the status as reported in Circular Letter 82/50 was accepted.

19. Under Agenda item 10, Conservation and Enforcement Measures, the Executive Secretary reported that the Working Group had met the evening of September 13th and that there were four documents for consideration. The latest edition of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures was found in FC Doc 82/VI/1. An explanation of the most recently introduced changes was to be found in FC Doc 82/VI/3 (Revised). FC Doc 82/VI/4 was the Report of the meeting of the Working Group held in June 1982. A further document FC Doc 82/VI/2(Rev) entitled "New Proposals and Studies Recommended by the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures" was tabled. The Executive Secretary explained that the items found within that last document were identified by the Working Group as suggested changes or amendments to the existing Measures, outside the Working Group terms of reference,or studies to be carried out for further improvement of the rules.

20. The Executive Secretary further pointed out that there were a number of minor corrections consequential to the meeting of the 15th of September to be made in FC Doc 82/VI/1. The delegate of Canada proposed that the document be adopted subject to the changes reported by the Executive Secretary. The delegate of Cuba seconded the proposal, and FC Doc 82/VI/1 as revised was subsequently adopted.

21. The delegate of Cuba suggested that the substance of FC Doc 82/VI/2(Rev) should be referred to STACTIC to be considered by them at the next Annual Meeting and then presented to the Fisheries Commission with recommendations. Both the delegates of Canada and GDR supported the proposal which was subsequently adopted.

22. Regarding Agenda items 11 to 16, the Chairman of STACTIC reported that the draft report of the STACTIC meeting was not yet ready and therefore suggested that those items be dealt with later in the meeting.

23. Under Agenda item 17(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of the Faroe Islands proposed a continuation in 1983 of the 1982 TAC and national allocations. The delegates of Norway and Portugal supported the proposal. The delegate of Canada, while not wishing to make a definite proposal, wished to acknowledge that, although undoubtedly difficulties would result if the scientific advice for that stock would be followed, the scientific recommendation should be considered. He went through a brief history of the recent management practices regarding 3M cod and reported that the Fisheries Commission for the last number of years had consistently adopted a TAC higher than that recommended by the Scientific Council. He further stated that the stock continued to be in a depressed state and from a Canadian point of view he would prefer to see a reduction in the TAC than a continuation of the existing 1982 TAC. The delegate of the EEC reiterated his previous concerns about that stock and agreed with the Canadian view. However, he felt that it would not be possible for the EEC to adopt anything else other than following the scientific advice.

The delegate of Portugal read a statement (see Appendix IV) referring to paragraph 4 of Article XI of the Convention which stated in part "Proposals adopted by the Commission for the allocation of catches in the Regulatory Area shall take into account the interests of Commission members whose vessels have traditionally fished within that area." The delegate of Canada asserted that paragraph 4 of Article XI referred in fact to allocations and the Commission was discussing the adoption of a TAC. The relevant paragraph of Article XI would therefore be paragraph 2 which stated "the Commission may adopt proposals for joint action by the Contracting Parties designed to achieve the optimum utilization of the fisheries resources of the Regulatory Area. In considering such proposals, the Commission shall take into account any relevant information or advice provided to it by the Scientific Council." The delegate of Cuba said that for some time it had not been economical for their vessels to fish the 3M stock; however, they felt that a compromise should be reached between the two positions expressed. After some discussion, the delegate of Cuba concluded however that because of the sound, mainly economic reasons put forth by other members, there was obviously no room for a compromise. The delegate of Canada pointed out that although he continued to be concerned about the difficulties the adoption of the scientific advice posed for some countries, that advice was nevertheless clear. He further stated that he would have difficulty in accepting a TAC at the same level as in 1982 and would prefer to see a reduction in the TAC. In absence of such, the delegate of Canada made it clear that Canada would abstain from voting on the Faroese proposal. The delegate of the EEC affirmed that a mere reduction of the TAC would not be sufficient. The EEC would not be able to vote for anything other than a zero TAC, as recommended by the Scientific Council. The delegate of the EEC then proposed that the scientific advice be followed and that the 1983 TAC be zero. There was no seconder for that proposal. The delegate of the EEC then requested a vote on the Faroese proposal. The Faroese proposal, for a 1983 TAC and allocations to be the same as in 1982 with the same footnotes attached, was adopted with 4 members for (Faroes, Norway, Poland, Portugal), 1 against (EEC), and 5 abstentions (Canada, Cuba, GDR, Japan, USSR).

24. Under Agenda item 18, Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the delegate of Canada proposed TACs and allocations for Cod in Div. 3NO, Redfish in Div. 3LN, American plaice in Div. 3LNO, Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, and Squid in Subareas 3 and 4. He further stated that Agenda item 18(f), Capelin, would be proposed separately. The delegate of Cuba seconded the Canadian proposal regarding those stocks.

The meeting then adjourned for lunch.

25. The meeting reconvened at 1450 hrs to continue discussing Agenda item 18, Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits. The Chairman reiterated the Canadian proposal put forth in the morning session regarding all fish stocks of the Agenda item except for Capelin. Regarding Agenda item 18(b), Redfish in Div. 3LN, the delegate of the EEC recalled the statement made last year (item 28 of FC Doc 81/IX/14, revised) that there was no reason to exclude EEC fishermen from that fishery where historic evidence allowed them to claim a quota of 350 mt. Regarding Agenda item 18(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of the EEC stated that on the basis of previous allocations in 1980 and 1981 he felt that the EEC quota should be at least 400 mt. Nevertheless, after some discussion, the Canadian proposal as presented was adopted.

26. Under Agenda item 18(f), Capelin, the delegate of Canada proposed that in light of the scientific advice there be no directed fishery for capelin in Div. 3NO for 1983. The delegate of Cuba stated that with the lack of any other scientific advice, Cuba would go along and support the Canadian proposal. However, he further stated that there was a need for other members to help in the research in that area and he felt that the scientific advice given might not be the best advice possible, although it was all the advice available. He further stated that there should be more active participation in STACFIS by some members and that Cuba would be considering a greater participation in scientific work in the future. The delegate of Poland supported the Canadian proposal, as did the delegate of the EEC, pointing out however that the EEC did not recognize that there are necessarily two different capelin stocks within divisions 3LNO. The proposal was adopted with no further comments.

27. Under Agenda item 19, Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area, the delegate of Canada stated his belief that that item was a carry over from earlier meetings. He further made reference to FC Doc 82/IX/5 entitled "Canadian Information Concerning Minimum Mesh Size Regulation in Canadian Fisheries Waters" which had been circulated to member parties in order to inform them of the present differences in regulated mesh sizes between the Canadian zone and the Regulatory Area. He further stated that the item had been discussed within STACTIC but there had been no consensus to support such a measure i.e. 130 mm mesh size, within the Regulatory Area. The delegate of the USSR stated his opposition to the introduction of 130 mm mesh inside the Regulatory Area as he had seen no scientific advice for such an imposition. The delegate of Canada pointed out that studies were carried out within the Canadian zone which concluded that any short term losses brought about by the imposition of such a conservation measure did not outweigh the long term benefits.

28. As the matter had also been referred to the Scientific Council, the Chairman requested the Chairman of the Scientific Council to make a statement. The Chairman of the Scientific Council, Mr. R. Wells (Canada), stated that a minimum mesh size of up to 150 mm for cod in Div. 3M would result in an increase in yield per recruit. There would be some short term losses but the long term gain over 7-8 years would outweigh the losses. Regarding Redfish in Div. 3M, he informed the Commission that mesh sizes considerably less than 150 mm, i.e. perhaps 100 mm or less, would give the maximum yield per recruit. He further stated that the conclusion of the Scientific Council had been that the different types of material did not introduce great differences in the selection factors. He further advised that the matter had been discussed during the 1981 Annual Meeting of the Scientific Council but no conclusion had been reached. During the 1982 Annual Meeting there had been no new data available so there had been no further conclusions.

29. The delegate of Cuba pointed out that to change from 120 mm to 130 mm would mean to Cuba a loss of several hundred thousands of dollars in changing the gear. Cuba could not therefore support the Canadian suggestion that, in light of the Canadian management measures taken inside the Canadian zone, the Fisheries Commission should adopt a similar measure within the Regulatory Area. When questioned by the delegate of Canada, the Chairman of the Scientific Council restated that the conclusion had been that the type of material found in the codend, although making for some difference in selection patterns, made little difference in the yield per recruit. The delegate of Canada stated that in light of the comments made by the Chairman of the Scientific Council, Canada would reserve the right to study the Scientific Report of 1981 and perhaps reintroduce the item at a later time. The Chairman explained that the matter being discussed was not a proposal from Canada but simply information for other member states regarding a conservation measure taken by Canada within its zone.

30. The Chairman of the Scientific Council then noted that, in view of the depressed state of the cod stock in Div. 3M, there was an urgent need for biological sampling information and fishing effort data to be collected in 1982 and 1983 and reported to the Scientific Council.

31. The Chairman concluded that although there had been no proposal put forth under Agenda item 19, the item should continue to be part of the agenda of the Fisheries Commission for the next meeting.

32. Under Agenda item 20, Review of the International Scientific Observer Program, the delegate of Canada reported that Canada now had bilateral agreements with 5 countries (Cuba, Faroe Islands, GDR, Japan, Norway) and that Canada was carrying out discussions bilaterally with other members. He further reported that the coverage had not been as good as hoped for. In 1981 there were 78 days of observations and in 1982 the level of coverage was no greater. The delegate of Canada further said that in light of the earlier statement by the Chairman of the Scientific Council regarding the lack of information for 3M, he would urge other members to become more involved in the Scientific Observer Program to help remedy some of the data deficiencies. The delegate of the USSR informed that they now had agreements with GDR and Canada but those agreements had not yet been implemented.

33. Under Agenda item 10, Conservation and Enforcement Measures, the Chairman explained that the Executive Secretary had pointed out that there were two items on one of the documents (FC Doc 82/VI/2, Rev.) presented earlier in the meeting that could be dealt with immediately by the Fisheries Commission. The Executive Secretary then explained that items 8 and 10 of that document were simply proposals for cleaning up some drafting discrepancies involved in the transfer of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures from the old ICNAF regime to the NAFO regime and reflected purely legal matters. After an explanation of the points in question, the delegate of Cuba proposed that the changes be adopted and the documents be corrected. The delegate of Canada seconded the proposal and the proposal was subsequently adopted.

34. Regarding International Control (Agenda items 11-16), the Chairman asked the Chairman of STACTIC if he were prepared to discuss the items immediately. The Chairman of STACTIC reported that they would not be prepared to discuss those items until first thing next morning and the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1545 hrs.

35. The meeting reconvened at 0940 hrs, 16 September, to consider Agenda items 11-16, reported by STACTIC.

The Chairman requested the Chairman of STACTIC to present its Report. The Chairman of STACTIC presented the Report and went over its conclusions and recommendations. The delegate of the Faroe Islands stated his regrets that they were unable to be represented in the STACTIC sessions held earlier during the week. He declared that as the Faroese take part in the fisheries in the Regulatory Area, they felt they ought to become involved in the enforcement aspects, and in fact, they would like to send an inspector over in 1983 to conduct enforcement in conjunction with a Canadian patrol vessel. As there were no further comments, the STACTIC Report and recommendations were adopted. (See Appendix V)

36. Under Agenda item 21, Time and Place of Next Meeting, the Chairman affirmed that the Commission would await the decision of the General Council on the matter as the Fisheries Commission would meet in conjunction with the Council.

37. Under Agenda item 22, Other Business, the delegate of Canada made the announcement that a former ICNAF Commissioner, Mr. Kjell Henriksen, had died suddenly the night before. The Fisheries Commission held a one minute silence for Mr. Henriksen.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting at 1000.

38. The Chairman, at 1540 of 16 September, reopened Agenda item 10, Conservation and Enforcement Measures. The delegate of Canada brought to the attention of the Commission Schedule IV of Part V of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures (FC Doc 82/VI/1) which specified the authorized mesh size of nets. Schedule IV stipulated that the authorized mesh size for various groundfish species in the Regulatory Area was 130 mm for trawl nets made of manila. Note 2 of Schedule IV stated that "when trawl nets made of materials other than manila, or seine nets, are used the appropriate mesh size shall be as shown below:

(a) trawl nets of materials other than manila 120 mm"

The delegate of Canada referred to the wording of the relevant Regulation which previously applied in the ICNAF Convention Area. That Regulation provided for a minimum mesh size of 120 mm (4-3/4 in.) for "such part of any trawl net as is made of hemp, polyamide fibres or polyester fibers" and a minimum mesh size of 130 mm (5-1/8 in.) for "such part of any trawl net as is made of manila or any other material not mentioned above."

The delegate of Canada pointed out that in drafting Schedule IV of Part V of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures it would appear that the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures had inadvertently dropped the reference to "or any other material not mentioned above". That drafting in effect significantly changed the mesh size regulation in effect in the Regulatory Area. In addition, in Schedule IV the regulated mesh size for redfish appeared to be incorrectly formulated. It was proposed by Canada that Schedule IV be amended as per their proposal contained in FC Doc 82/IX/7.

39. After lengthy discussion it was agreed to use the wording contained in ICNAF Comm.Doc 78/VI/1 rather than what is presently contained in NAFO FC Doc 82/VI/1 or what Canada proposed in NAFO FC Doc 82/IX/7. The following proposal was then presented by Canada:

"To revise the decision taken yesterday by the Commission on the Conservation and Enforcement Measures, to adopt the new Conservation and Enforcement Measures except for the mesh size regulations on pages 5 and 35 of FC Doc 82/VI/1. The mesh size regulations shall continue to be those which applied when the NAFO Convention came into force, i.e. those in ICNAF Comm. Doc 78/VI/1. Further, we propose that STACTIC consider the mesh size regulations at the next annual meeting, to propose an appropriate text for inclusion in the new Conservation and Enforcement Measures." (See FC Doc 82/IX/8)

No delegation objected to that proposal; therefore the Chairman indicated the proposal was adopted.

40. The Chairman took the opportunity to confirm the next annual meeting of NAFO would be in Leningrad, 13-23 September 1983 and that during that period, the Fisheries Commission should meet from 19-23 September. There being no further business the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1630.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1982

List of Participants

Drafting Note

The classification of the participants into the categories of representatives, alternates, advisers and observers should be made and notified to the Executive Secretary by each Contracting Party as per Rule 1 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Council, Fisheries Commission and Scientific Council.

Unfortunately, not only very few Contracting Parties have complied with this rule, but also the ICNAF-type Registration Cards still in use are not very helpful for the purpose.

Consequently the following classification is the best "guess" of the Executive Secretary who requests the assistance of everybody in checking the present listing.

PRESIDENT OF NAFO

Dr. V. K. Zilanov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103031, USSR

CANADA

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

General Council

Mr. B. Applebaum, Director, International Fisheries Relations Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., 8th Floor West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Dr. A. W. May (see address above)
Ms. D. Pethick, International Fisheries Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Fisheries Commission

Dr. A. W. May (see address above)
Dr. W. M. Murphy, President, Mersey Sea Foods, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia B0T 1K0
Mr. L. S. Parsons, A/Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Scientific Council

Dr. R. G. Halliday, Chairman CAFSAC, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. A. T. Pinhorn, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. R. Wells, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

Advisers

Mr. C. J. Allen, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. T. Amaratunga, Invertebrates and Marine Plants Div., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. J. T. Anderson, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. S. W. Bartlett, Atlantic Operations Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. J. S. Beckett, Resource Services Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans,240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. A. Best, President, Independent Fish Producers Association, Box 9, Southern Harbour, Placentia Bay, Newfoundland
Mr. A. R. Billard, Eastern Fisherman's Federation, P. O. Box 384, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2P8
Mr. C. A. Bishop, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

Mr. D. R. Bollivar, Manager, Fleet Strategy, National Sea Products, P. O. Box 2130, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3B7
Mr. W. R. Bowering, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Center, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. D. M. Brown, Intergovernmental Affairs, Ground Floor, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7
Ms. N. Dale, Chairman, AGAC Working Group, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. L. J. Dean, Government of Newfoundland, Department of Fisheries, P. O. Box 4750, St. John's,Newfoundland
Mr. D. L. Dunn, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5030, Moncton, New Brunswick E1C 9B6
Mr. E. B. Dunne, Director General, Newfoundland Region, Fisheries and Oeans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. F. P. H. Flewwelling, A/Chief, Surveillance and Enforcement, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, 6th Floor West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. S. Gavaris, Research and Resource Services, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Dr. T. D. Iles, A/Chief, Marine Fish Div., BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. C. Jones, Fisheries and Oceans,P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. W. H. Lear, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. G. R. Lilly, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. A. A. Longard, Director, Marine Resources, N.S. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4
Mr. A. D. Moores, Ocean Harvesters Ltd., Box 310, Harbour Grace, Newfoundland A0A 2M0
Mr. I. Ni, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. J. D. Pringle, Fisheries Research Branch, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S. B3J 2S7
Mr. R. J. Prier, Chief, Conservation and Protection Br., Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. L. G. Riche, Vice-President (Development), Fishery Products Ltd., P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5L1
Mr. D. Rivard, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., 6th Floor West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. T. W. Rowell, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. H. H. Scarth, Senior Policy Advisor, Foreign Fishing, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., 6th Floor West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Mr. D. W. Smith, Deputy Director, Legal Operations Division, Dept. of External Affairs, 189 MacKay St., Ottawa, Ontario K1M 2B5
Mr. G. R. Traverse, Head Offshore Management, Conservation and Protection Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. P. J. Vagneux, Peches Maritimes-MAPAQ, 200 A Chemin, Ste. Foy, Quebec
Dr. G. H. Winters, Research and Resource Services, Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

Observers or Experts

Ms. M. C. Annand, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. D. B. Atkinson, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. A. Campbell, Marine Fish Div., Biological Station, St. Andrew's, New Brunswick E0G 2X0
Mr. J. Carscadden, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. E. G. Dawe, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Dr. L. M. Dickie, Marine Ecology Laboratory,BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4A2
Mr. R. W. Elner, Marine Fish Div., Biological Station, St. Andrew's, New Brunswick E0G 2X0
Mr. G. L. Etchegary, 70 O'Leary Avenue, St. John's, Newfoundland
Dr. J. Gagne, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. G. Hearn, Independent Fish Producers Association, 158 Water Street, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. T. Kenchington, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. D. Kulka, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. B. Lewis, P.E.I. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2000, Charlottetown, P.E.I. C1A 7N8
Mr. J. E. H. Legare, Director General, N. B. Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 6000, Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 5H1
Dr. J. McGlade, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Ms. S. McGladdery, c/o Dept. of Biology, University of New Brunswick, Bag Service 45111, Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 6E1
Ms. M. McInerney-Northcott, Oceanography Dept., Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Mr. D. F. Markel, Huntsman Marine Laboratory, St. Andrew's, New Brunswick
Mr. P. Meerburg, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
Ms. K. Metuzals, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4A2
Mr. R. K. Misra, Fisheries Research Branch, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Mr. R. K. Mohn, Invertebrates and Marine Plants Division, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Ms. C. M. Morrison, Fisheries Research Branch, P.O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Dr. T. K. Pitt, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
Mr. H. Powles, Fisheries Research Branch, P. O. Box 15500, Quebec City, Quebec
Mr. J. S. Scott, Marine Fish Division, Biological Station, St. Andrew's, New Brunswick E0G 2X0

Mr. D. Shortall, Independent Fish Producers Association, 158 Water Street, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. A. F. Sinclair, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. M. Sinclair, Fisheries Research Branch, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
Dr. W. T. Stobo, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Dr. W. Templeman, 12 Darling Street, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 1V6
Mr. D. E. Waldron, Marine Fish Division, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Mr. L. VanGuelpen, Huntsman Marine Laboratory, St. Andrew's, New Brunswick
Ms. M. A. Yeadon, National Sea Products, Fleet Services, Coordinator, P. O. Box 2130, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3B7

CUBA

Head of Delegation: Mr. E. Oltuski
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera
Ensenada de Potes y Atares
Habana, Cuba

General Council

Mrs. E. Fabregas, Ministry of Fisheries, Ensenada de Potes y Atares, Habana, Cuba
Mr. E. Oltuski (see address above)
Dr. J. A. Varea, Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Ensenada de Potes y Atares, Habana, Cuba

Fisheries Commission

Mrs. E. Fabregas (see address above)
Mr. E. Oltuski (see address above)
Dr. J. A. Varea (see address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. R. J. Dominguez, Flota Cubana de Pesca, Desamparados Esq Mercado, Habana Vieta, Habana, Cuba

Advisers

Mr. O. Muniz, c/o Pickford and Black, P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2X1

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Head of Delegation: Mr. G. Weiss
Principal Administrator
200 rue de la Loi
B-1049 Brussels
Belgium

General Council

Mr. M. Leigh, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium
Mr. G. Weiss (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. M. Leigh (see address above)
Mr. G. Weiss (see address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. A. Forest, Director, CRIP, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches Maritimes, B P 1240, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
Mr. Sv. Aa. Horsted, Gronlands Fiskeriundersogelser, Tagensvej 135, Sal 1., DK-2200 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, Institut Scientifique et Technique des Peches Maritimes, 8, rue Francois Toullec, F-56100 Lorient, France
Mr. R. Noe, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Advisers

Mr. A. Bordes, Direction des Peches Maritimes, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France
Mr. R. A. Gregg, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London, England SW1P 2AE
Mr. H. Junge, Verband der Deutschen, Hochseefischereien e.v., Postfach 403, D-2850 Bremerhaven, Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. M. LeBolloch, Le Chef du Quartier des Affaires Maritimes, B P 1206, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
Mr. R. Salvatori, Ministero Marina Mercantile, Vile Asia-EVR, Pesca Maritima, Rome, Italy
Dr. J. H. L. Van Lissa, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Bezuidenhoutseweg 73, Gravenhage, The Netherlands

Observers or Experts

Mr. S. Proudfoot, Delegation of the Commission of the European Communities, Commercial and Economic Section, 350 Sparks St., Suite 1110, Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8
Mr. V. Siegel, Institut fur Seefischerei, Palmaille 9, D-2000 Hamburg 50, Federal Republic of Germany

FAROE ISLANDS

Head of Delegation: Mr. P. Ellefsen
Foroya Landsstyri
Tinganes
DK-3800 Torshavn
Faroe Islands

General Council

Mr. P. Ellefsen (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. P. Ellefsen (see address above)

Advisers

Mr. A. Olafsson, Director, Foroya Landsstyri, Tinganes, DK-3800 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
Mr. O. Olsen, Ministry of Fisheries, Tinganes, FR-3800 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation: Dr. W. Mahnke
Institut fur Hochseefischerei
251 Rostock-Marienehe 5
German Democratic Republic

General Council

Dr. W. Mahnke (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Dr. W. Mahnke (see address above)

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: Mr. K. Yonezawa
c/o Fishery Division
Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Tokyo, Japan

General Council

Mr. K. Yonezawa (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. K. Yonazawa (see address above)

Scientific Council

Dr. H. Hatanaka, Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, 1000 Orido, Shimizu 424, Japan

Advisers

Mr. J. Fujita, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Mr. Y. Odakura, Japan Fisheries Association, Suite 900, Royal Bank Bldg., 5161 George Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 1M7
Mr. Y. Takase, Embassy of Japan, 255 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 9E6

Observers or Experts

Mr. Y. Santo, Nippon Suisan Kaisha, Halifax Office, Toronto Dominion Bank Bldg., 16th Floor, 1791 Barrington Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3L1

NORWAY

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

General Council

Mr. H. Rasmussen (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. H. Rasmussen (see address above)

Advisers

Mr. N. Farstad, Fisheries Counselor, Embassy of Norway, 2720 34th St., Washington, D.C. 20008 USA
Mr. L. Gronnevet, Norwegian Fishermens Association, N-6170 Vartdal, Norway

POLAND

Head of Delegation: Mr. W. Polaczek, Consul
Trade Commissioners Office of Poland
3501 Ave du Musee
Montreal, Quebec H3G 2C8

General Council

Mr. W. Polaczek (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. W. Polaczek (see address above)

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation: Capt. J. G. Boavida
Direccao Geral do Desenvolvimento E Coordenacao das Pescas
Av. 24 De Julho 80-20
1200 Lisbon
Portugal

General Council

Capt. J. G. Boavida (see address above)
Commander M. Cunha, P. O. Box 5249, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5W1

Fisheries Commission

Capt. J. Boavida (see address above)
Commander M. Cunha (see address above)

Scientific Council

Ms. M. L. Coelho, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Avenida de Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa, Portugal

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Head of Delegation: Dr. V. K. Zilanov
Ministry of Fisheries
12 Rozhdestvensky Boul.
Moscow K-45, 103031
USSR

General Council

Mr. A. A. Volkov, Welsford Place, Suite 2202-3, 2074 Robie Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3K 5L3
Dr. V. K. Zilanov (see address above)

Fisheries Commission

Mr. A. A. Volkov (see address above)
Dr. V. K. Zilanov (see address above)

Scientific Council

Mr. Y. B. Riazantseu, All-Union Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow B-140, 107140, USSR
Dr. V. A. Rikhter, Atlantic Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (AtlantNIRO), 5 Dmitry Donskoy Street, Kaliningrad, 236000, USSR

Advisers

Mr. E. N. Sabourenkov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103031, USSR
Mr. L. Shepel, Welsford Place, Suite 2202, 2074 Robie Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3K 5L3

O B S E R V E R S

SPAIN

Capt. J. L. Arambarri, 10 Topsail Road, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1E 2A5
Mr. A. Collado, Embassy of Spain, 350 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1R 7S8
Mr. R. DeMiguel, Subsecretaria de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid, Spain
Mr. G. Alberto, Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia, Apartado 130, La Coruna, Spain
Dr. M. G. Larraneta, Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
Mr. J. L. Meseguer, Subsecretaria de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid, Spain

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. F. P. Almeida, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Center, Woods Hole, Mass. USA
Mr. E. D. Anderson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Center, Woods Hole, Mass. USA
Mr. J. J. Graham, Maine Dept. of Marine Resources, West Boothbay Harbor, Maine 04575 USA
Mr. M. J. Fogarty, Northeast Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, Woods Hole, Mass. USA
Mr. A. G. Johnson, Panama City Laboratory, 3500 Delwood Beach Road, Panama City, Florida USA
Mr. S. A. Murawski, Northeast Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, Woods Hole, Mass. USA
Mr. D. A. Reifsnyder, Office of International Fisheries Affairs, NOAA/NMFS/F-IA2, 3300 Whitehaven St., NW Washington, D.C. USA
Mr. C. Sindermann, National Marine Fisheries Service, Sandy Hook Laboratory, Highlands, NJ USA

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
Mrs. D. C. A. Auby, Clerk Typist, NAFO
Mr. R. A. Myers, Clerk-Duplicator Operator, NAFO
Mr. B. T. Crawford, Clerk-Duplicator Operator, NAFO
Mrs. F. E. Perry, Documents and Mailing Clerk, NAFO
Mrs. B. L. Marshall, Statistical Clerk, NAFO
Mrs. C. L. Kerr, Statistical Clerk, NAFO
Miss V. M. Bullen, Data Processing Clerk, NAFO

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Mrs. L. Payment, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 8th Floor West, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

APPENDIX II

4th Annual Meeting of NAFO
Halifax, Nova Scotia - 8-17 September 1982

Fisheries Commission

Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES

1. Opening by the Chairman, Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

ADMINISTRATION

6. Approval of the Report of the Third Annual Meeting, September 1981 (FC Doc 81/IX/14, Rev.)
7. Review of Commission Membership
8. Approval of consequential amendments to Rules of Procedure (see attachment 1 to Appendix 4 of Circular 82/40)

COMMISSION PROPOSALS

9. Status of Proposals (see Circular Letter 82/50)
10. Conservation and Enforcement Measures (see attachment 2 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 82/40)

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

11. Annual Return of Infringements and review of corresponding forms (see attachment 3 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 82/40. Also section 51 of FC Doc 81/IX/14, Revised)
12. Fishing Vessel Registration (see attachment 4 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 82/40. Also section 47 of FC Doc 81/IX/14, Revised)
13. Inspectors identity cards (see attachment 5 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 82/40)
14. Enforcement in the Regulatory Area (see attachment 6 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 82/40 and numbers 8 and 14 of the Report of STACTIC in Appendix IV to FC Doc 81/IX/14, Revised and section 48 of this same Doc.)
15. Procedure for Communicating with non-Members of NAFO (see Section 52 of above-mentioned FC Doc.)
16. Report of STACTIC

CONSERVATION

17. Management Measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area
    (a) Cod in Div. 3M - Long-term management plan
    (b) Redfish in Div. 3M
    (c) American plaice in Div. 3M
18. Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits
    (a) Cod in Div. 3NO
    (b) Redfishin Div. 3LN
    (c) American plaice in Div. 3LNO
    (d) Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO
    (e) Witch flounder in Div. 3NO
    (f) Capelin
    (g) Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4

19. Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area (see Section 50 of FC Doc 81/IX/14, Rev.)

OTHER MATTERS

20. Review of the International Scientific Observer Program (see Section 18 of the above-mentioned FC Doc)

ADJOURNMENT

21. Time and Place of Next Meeting

22. Other Business

23. Adjournment

APPENDIX III

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1982

PRESS NOTICE

1. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, during 8-17 September 1982, under the chairmanship of Dr V. K. Zilanov, President of NAFO and Head of the USSR Delegation. The sessions of the General Council and Fisheries Commission were held 13-17 September and the sessions of the Scientific Council from 8-17 September.

2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Canada, Cuba, European Economic Community (EEC), Faroe Islands, German Democratic Republic, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Observers were present from Spain and the United States of America.

3. The Scientific Council met to complete the biological advice to be provided to the Fisheries Commission and the coastal States.

4. On the basis of the scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1982 and in the Annual Meeting of the Organization, agreement was reached on conservation and management measures for 1983 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 overlap the 200 mile fishing zone in Divisions 3L, 3N and 3O (Table 1). Allocations were also made for the 1983 TAC for the short-finned squid (*Illex illecebrosus*) in Subareas 3 and 4.

5. The Fisheries Commission adopted, with a few details still out for revision, a new draft of the whole NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

6. The Rules of Procedure of the General Council were considered for revision and a final decision will be taken at the next annual meeting.

7. The Organization approved a new Pension Plan for its employees proposed by the International Fisheries Commissions Pension Society, with a new Deposit Funding, which should ensure added security to the participants.

8. The Organization accepted an invitation from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to hold next year's Annual Meeting in the city of Leningrad during 13-23 September 1983.

20 September 1982

Office of the NAFO Secretariat
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada

Table 1. Total allowable catches and quotas (metric tons) for 1983.

CONTRACTING PARTY	COD		REDFISH		AMERICAN PLAICE		YELLOWTAIL	WITCH	CAPELIN	SQUID (*Illex*)
	3M	3NO	3M	3LN	3M	3LNO	3LNO	3NO	3NO	3+4
Bulgaria	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
Canada	100	10,800	2,000[7]	12,000	250	54,200	18,535	3,000	-	-[6]
Cuba	480	850[3]	1,550	2,250	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
European Economic Community	2,405	210	1,200	-	-	700	380	-	-	-[6]
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	3,340	13,850	8,900	1,000	-	-	1,950	-	5,000
Others	50	700	100	150	500	100	85	50	-	-
TOTAL	12,405[1]	17,000[2]	20,000	25,000	2,000	55,000	19,000	5,000	0	150,000[4],[5]

[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 to 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] This allocation is transferred to Canada for 1983.

[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.

[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.

[7] Includes 850 M.T. transferred to Cuba for 1983.

APPENDIX IV

Statement of the Delegate of Portugal
Regarding the Cod Fishery in Div.3M

Paragraph 4 of Article XI of the Convention states that "Proposals adopted by the Commission for the allocation of catches in the Regulatory Area shall take into account the interest of Commission members whose vessels have traditionally fished within that Area....".

As it is well known, Portugal has been the first country to fish in this area, now designated as the Regulatory Area. The beginning of this cod fishery goes back to the 15th century.

Although the Portuguese fishing vessels in this area are more than 50 (actually the figure is 54), from the application of the philosophy of quota allocations used by the Commission until now it has resulted in a continuous decreasing of the resources available for Portuguese fishing vessels. Our fishery is only for domestic consumption and I should like to emphasize the fact that in the year 1982 we have bought from Canada, until now, codfish to a value of $65 million and that we have bought for domestic consumption from Iceland more than 30,000 metric tons of salted fish. We have, consequently, a very great interest in the harvesting of the Regulatory Area as we are a fish consuming country.

We now have scientific advice to place the 3M cod fishery at a "zero" level. We are prepared to accept this, if the Commission could accommodate us, in other divisions, for the losses in the 3M cod fishery. The principle of accommodation of vital losses seems to my delegation was utilized in the Canadian proposal yesterday informally discussed outside the Fisheries Commission. As a matter of fact, we have seen that one member Party will be entitled to an increase of 3,500 tons of redfish in 3M, which in our view largely compensates the loss of 1,270 tons of cod in 3M.

Consequently, my delegation hopes to see this principle, that is an equity principle, applied to all member parties with vital quotas in 3M.

Thank-you.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1982

Provisional Report
of the
Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

1. The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) was opened by the Chairman, Mr. L. S. Parsons. Delegates from Cuba, Canada, EEC, Japan, Norway, Portugal and USSR were present.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur. Mr. R. Prier was appointed as Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda. The provisional agenda was accepted as circulated.

4. Review of Annual Return of Infringements, of Registration of Fishing Vessels and of Corresponding Reporting Forms. The Chairman proposed to handle items 4 and 5 of the Agenda together and asked the Executive Secretary to comment on the status of information with respect to both of those items.

The Executive Secretary referred to pages 19 and 20 of NAFO Circular Letter 82/40 dated 15 June 1982 which listed those Contracting Parties who had submitted annual returns of infringements. He noted that the same nations had reported both in 1980 and 1981. They were the following: Canada, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, and the USSR.

The Chairman asked if any further submissions were available. He was informed that no others had been submitted but some could be made available during the meeting. It was agreed that the Executive Secretary would forward all submissions received to the Rapporteur who would summarize those reports.

The Chairman indicated that STACTIC was to review and comment on the following forms:
- Annual Return of Inspections and Infringements
- Annual Return of Infringements and their Disposition
- Registration of Vessels

5. The Executive Secretary with regard to the Fishing Vessel Registration indicated that no special form had been approved by NAFO; however, Part III B2 of the proposed Conservation and Enforcement Measures indicated what information should be included for each vessel. He also indicated that the list should be amended to include whether the vessel was a fishing or processing vessel and, in the event of being a fishing vessel, what type of gear she would utilize. (See # 7 of FC Doc 82/VI/2 Rev.)

6. Since no comments had been received by the Executive Secretary, the Chairman asked for comments from members present on the Annual Return of Inspections and Infringements. The USSR delegate stated the form was acceptable as printed. The EEC delegate indicated the sub-paragraph in the title would have to be amended to refer to Contracting Parties.

7. After a lengthy discussion including the identification of an additional form (STACTIC Form 2B 02/74) it was the consensus that all 3 forms should continue to be used. It was recommended that the existing three forms be retained, with the following main amendments and other amendments consequential thereto:

a) Annual Return of Infringements and their Disposition (National) - See Stactic Form 1 (01/77)
- "Country Reporting" to be amended to read "Contracting Party Reporting"
- Under item "Penalties" to read: "Penalties imposed (specify currency)"
- delete small footnote 5 on Fish Size
- delete note 5
- new column "Others" to be incorporated

b) Annual Return of Inspections and Infringements (International) - See Stactic Form 2A (02/74)
- amend sub-title in parentheses to read "(to be used by authorities of Contracting Parties inspecting vessels of other Contracting Parties)"
- Add "Excess By-catch" under type of Infringement

c) Annual Return of Disposition of Infringements (International) - See Stactic Form 2B (02/74)
- amend sub-title in parentheses to read "(to be used by authorities of Contracting Parties whose vessels were inspected by other Contracting Parties)"
- title of first column to read "Contracting Party reporting infringement"

Those forms, as revised, were appended as Attachments I-III - Stactic Forms 1,2A and 2B(09/82) respectively.

8. The Chairman opened the discussion of the form for the registration by Contracting Parties of vessels fishing or intending to fish in the Regulatory Area by referring to the proposed Conservation and Enforcement Measures Part III A and B, which listed the information required for research, fishing and processing vessels.

It was agreed that under Part III B 2, two other items should be included:

(g) whether fishing or processing vessel,
(h) type of gear to be used

The agreed form for Notification of Fishing and Processing Vessels was appended as Attachment IV - Stactic Form 3 (09/82).

9. Inspector's Identity Cards. The Chairman reviewed that item and asked if there were any problems. As there were none, the Chairman considered the item dealt with, subject to possible clarification by the Executive Secretary.

10. Enforcement in the Regulatory Area. The Chairman indicated that there were two topics to be discussed under that item:

a) report by members on enforcement activities in the Regulatory Area, in 1981 and 1982 up to the date of the meeting, and proposed activities for 1983

b) further consideration of the Canadian proposal (FC Doc 81/IX/10) for shared participation in Enforcement Program in Division 3M tabled at the last Annual meeting

The delegate of Canada reported that enforcement in the Regulatory Area in 1981 and 1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31) including Division 3M had been as follows:

Sea days	1981	157
	1982	68
Inspections	1981	170
	1982	93
Air Surveillance	1981	475 hours
	1982	200 hours
Vessel Sightings	1981	1963 (including sightings inside Canadian zone in 3LNO)
	1982	1804 (including sightings inside Canadian zone in 3LNO)
Apparent Infringements (not including non-members)	1981	2 (fishing for species for which Contracting Party had no quota)
	1982	2 (1 small mesh size gear; 1 fishing for species for which Contracting Party had no quota)

Included in the above figures were activities of vessels of non-member countries as follows:

Country	Year	Sightings	Inspections
Spain	1981	1000	80
	1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31)	829 (61 different vessels)	61
Korea	1981	-	-
	1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31)	6 (1 vessel)	-
Mexico	1981	87 (7 vessels)	5
	1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31)	17 (4 pairs)	-
Venezuela	1981	-	-
	1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31)	7 (2 vessels)	-
Panama	1981	3 (3 vessels)	1
	1982	4 (1 pair)	1
USA (Swordfish vessels)	1981	6	-
	1982 (Jan 1-Aug 31)	-	-

STACTIC wished to draw the Commission's attention to the observations on continued substantial fishing activity by non-members in the Regulatory Area.

Canada planned to commit 125 sea days in 1983, the same as committed for 1982. However, aircraft coverage might have to be reduced in 1983.

11. The Chairman stated other Contracting Parties had indicated at the last Annual Meeting that they would be participating in the 3M Enforcement Program and he asked for reports. The EEC delegate indicated they did not have a report available but one would be provided. He further stated that the EEC hoped to be able to provide a vessel in 1983. The delegate of Cuba reported that there were no Cuban inspection vessels in the Regulatory Area in 1982. However, they did have an inspector on a fishing vessel which carried out inspections on all Cuban vessels. Due to his late arrival on the grounds, he did not carry out any inspections on foreign vessels because the Cuban fleet by that time was operating inside Canadian waters. An inspector would be placed on a fishing vessel again in 1983 and would arrive earlier in order to carry out inspections on foreign vessels. The delegate of Norway reported no inspection activity was carried out in 1982, and regretted that none was forecast for 1983. The delegate of Japan informed that Japan had sent one inspection vessel for one week to the Regulatory Area. However, due to dense fog and adverse weather conditions, no vessels were inspected. Japan was unable to make immediately a commitment for 1983. The delegate of Portugal reported that his country had not carried out inspections in 1982; however, in 1983 Portugal hoped to do so from two fishing vessels.

The Chairman noted in summary that several Contracting Parties had participated in the enforcement scheme and the overall level of activity appeared to be similar to last year.

12. The Chairman then turned to the second part of item 7. He recalled that Canada last year had proposed expanded levels of activities by Contracting Parties taking into account the level of allocations to each Contracting Party. There was limited discussion last year but it had been agreed that the burden of enforcement should be shared equitably by all Contracting Parties fishing in Division 3M. The Chairman requested Canada to comment further on its proposal. The delegate of Canada stated that, because participation had increased, there was a need for some form of organized planning of enforcement activity; that had prompted the Canadian proposal. He indicated Canadian authorities preferred quotas to catches as the parameter for determining patrol commitment but he informed they were flexible. The delegate realized that those members with small allocations might find it impractical to send a patrol vessel for a short period. One possibility would be to use a minimum of 2000 MT as a cut-off. Those members with allocations greater than 2000 MT might play leading roles in a Joint Program. Based on 1982 allocations or based on average allocations or catches over the past several years, Canada, Cuba, EEC, Faroes, Portugal and USSR would be the main players in the 3M program. Participants with smaller allocations might wish to take on some of the responsibility by doing inspections from fishing vessels. That would make up the shortfall. The delegate of Canada emphasized that he was not proposing a rigid system whereby a member must commit a certain number of days. He felt however that a flexible program could be developed with some prior knowledge of a member's intentions.

13. The delegate of the EEC noted the importance of the program and expressed the EEC's hope to participate on an ad hoc basis as in the past but indicated that the EEC could not agree to a specific formula stipulating the level of commitment to be provided by each member, because there were extraneous factors which had not been taken into consideration. The delegate of Cuba indicated that Cuba had no patrol vessels and could not commit a fishing vessel for a set number of days.

It was generally agreed that there was a requirement for early notification of participation for planning purposes as there was the possibility of duplication of effort.

14. The Chairman noted that the USSR was a major contributor to enforcement within the Regulatory Area and requested that the delegate of the USSR report on its activity in 1981 and plans for the future. The USSR delegate stated the ZURBAGAN arrived in the Regulatory Area on August 19, 1982 with two inspectors on board. They had inspected 2 Cuban vessels to date and found no infringements. The USSR plans for 1983 were for the UMBRINA to arrive in October 1982 with 3 inspectors on board and remain in the area for 5 months. In March 1983 the ROTAN would arrive and the ZURBAGAN would return for July and August of 1983. The Chairman was pleased to note the high level of activity maintained by the USSR in 1982 and the similar commitment for 1983.

15. Following further discussion, STACTIC agreed to endorse the principle of equitable participation in the Joint Enforcement Scheme by Contracting Parties fishing in the Regulatory Area taking into account the level of fishing activity. However, due to extraneous factors affecting each Contracting Party's participation, it was the consensus that no specific formula for participation could be adopted. It was recommended that each Contracting Party intending to conduct inspections submit to the Executive Secretary not later than January 1st of each year its plans for enforcement activity in the Regulatory Area for that year. The Executive Secretary would then disseminate to all Contracting Parties the commitments of the Contracting Parties for that year to enhance their respective planning of enforcement units.

16. Each Contracting Party should be requested to designate a contact for the Program and all the designated contacts would form an Enforcement Planning Working Group. It was suggested that the Chairman of STACTIC undertake to coordinate that Working Group to ensure a coordinated schedule of activities would be provided.

17. Procedure for Communicating with non Members of NAFO. The Chairman explained that at the 1981 meeting of the Commission it had been agreed that inspection reports on non members of NAFO would be forwarded to the Executive Secretary; however, the question of disposition of these inspection reports by the Executive Secretary was left open.

The delegate of the USSR stated there was an international responsibility for conservation, therefore, all nations fishing in the Regulatory Area should respect the findings of any inspection carried out in the Regulatory Area. The delegate of the USSR recommended inspection reports be forwarded to non members of NAFO. The delegate of the EEC concurred with the USSR's approach and voiced the opinion that the Foreign Affairs Ministry of the non member country whose vessel had been inspected in the Regulatory Area would be the appropriate channel for such reports.

Following discussion, it was agreed to recommend that the Executive Secretary be requested on behalf of NAFO to forward such reports to the Foreign Affairs Ministry of the non member Country of the vessel inspected in the Regulatory Area.

18. Minimum Mesh Size for Regulated Groundfish in the Regulatory Area. The delegate of Canada provided information on recent initiatives by Canada in Canadian fisheries waters regarding minimum mesh size. The delegate of the USSR pointed out that the item should only pertain to regulated species of groundfish. The USSR supported uniform mesh size; however, the mesh size to be used should be based on scientific information. The USSR could not agree in principle to support 130 mm without a firm basis on scientific information. The USSR delegate asked the Canadian delegation whether Canada had done any studies on losses incurred using 130 mm. He indicated that previous USSR studies showed that, using 130 mm instead of 120 mm, cod losses amounted to 16 per cent in the short term and 3 per cent in the long term. In Redfish in 3M losses equalled 33 per cent and in 3NO losses equalled 56 per cent. The USSR could not accept those losses and therefore recommended more experiments on the matter. The Chairman noted that the Scientific Council had been asked to address that problem. He had been informed that limited advice would be forthcoming from the Scientific Council during the meeting. The delegate of Cuba indicated that without firm scientific advice to support 130 mm, he could not support the Canadian proposal. The delegate of Canada indicated that the proposal had been presented on a practical basis to seek consistency since 130 mm was the legal uniform mesh size required within the Canadian zone.

In summary, there was no consensus in STACTIC to recommend a minimum mesh size of 130 mm in the Regulatory Area pending receipt of clear advice from the Scientific Council on the matter.

19. Appointment of a new Chairman. The Chairman requested nomination for a new Chairman of STACTIC. Mr. Volkov of the USSR was elected chairman of STACTIC.

20. There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting.

ATTACHMENT I

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

CONSERVATION AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

ANNUAL RETURN OF INSPECTIONS, INFRINGEMENTS AND THEIR DISPOSITION (NATIONAL)

Contracting Party_____ Year_____

Items			Mesh Size	Mesh Obstruction	Excess By-catch	Closed Areas	Fish Size	Others
Inspections (ships)	At sea	(1)						
	In harbour	(2)						
	Total	(3)						
Apparent Infringements		(4)						
Percentage of (4) on (3)		(5)						
Warnings given		(6)						
Prosecutions (4) - (6)		(7)						
Successful prosecutions		(8)						
Penalties imposed (in specific currency)	Total							
	Highest							
	Lowest							
Remarks: (e.g. re cases pending, illegal nets, etc.)								

Date of Return:

Reported by: _____
Address: _____

(see over for explanatory notes)

STACTIC FORM 1 (09/82)

EXPLANATORY NOTES

A Contracting Party that carried out inspections of its own vessels to ascertain their compliance with NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures, should use this form (STACTIC 1, 09/82) to report the number of those inspections carried out and of infringements observed, during the calendar year. The same form should also be used to provide the annual corresponding figures on warnings given, proceedings instituted, convictions obtained, and penalties imposed.

In one boarding at sea, as in only one survey in harbour, one inspection may verify the compliance with several NAFO Measures. This should be entered as one inspection in each of the corresponding columns of the form with the corresponding one infringement, one warning, etc. as the case may be, if any, in each of the same columns, the heading of which typifies the Measure in question.

The different types of inspections (and corresponding infringements, if any) to be considered, are as follows:

Mesh size: numbers returned should include only inspections made on gears which are used to fish primarily for regulated species.

Mesh obstruction (chafing gear, liners, etc): numbers returned should include only inspections made on gears used to fish primarily for regulated species.

Excess by-catch: numbers returned should include only cases where by-catches of regulated species could be taken in the course of fishing for other species.

Closed areas: numbers returned should include only incidents of fishing in seasonally closed areas with gear capable of catching demersal species, and incidents of fishing for quota-regulated species in areas closed to such fishing following notification that a specialized fishery has ceased.

Fish size: numbers returned should include only inspections relating to species size limitation measures the Commission may pass.

Others: numbers returned should include only inspections relating to measures the Commission may pass or has passed and cannot be included in any of the above types.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

ANNUAL RETURN OF INSPECTIONS AND INFRINGEMENTS (INTERNATIONAL)
(to be used by Authorities of Contracting Parties
inspecting vessels of other Contracting Parties)

Contracting Party of Inspected Vessel(s):	Year:

SUMMARY OF INSPECTIONS AND INFRINGEMENTS

Type	No. of inspections	No. of infringements	Remarks
Mesh size			
Mesh obstruction			
Excess by-catch			
Seasonal closure			
Quota closure			
Fish size			
Others			

DETAILS OF INFRINGEMENTS (list individually)

Type of infringement	Date	Location	Remarks (e.g. date reported)

Date of Return:

Reported by Address:

(see over for explanatory notes)

EXPLANATORY NOTES

A Contracting Party that carried out inspections of vessels of other Contracting Parties to ascertain their compliance with NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures, should use this form (STACTIC 2A, 09/82) (upper part) to report the number of those inspections carried out and of infringements observed, during the calendar year. The same form (lower part) should also be used to provide details of each infringement. A separate return should be completed for each one of the Contracting Parties whose vessels were inspected.

In one boarding, one inspection may verify the compliance with several NAFO Measures. This should be entered as one inspection in each of the corresponding lines of the form with the corresponding one infringement, , if any, in each of the same lines, the lead of which typifies the Measure in question.

The different types of inspections to be considered, and corresponding types of infringements that may occur are as follows:

Mesh size: use of net containing a codend or any other part with mesh size below the minimum prescribed.

Mesh obstruction: use of net attachments (e.g. chafing gear, liners, etc.) other than those authorized, or in an unauthorized manner.

Excess by-catch: retention of regulated species on board a vessel, fishing primarily for other species, in excess of the permitted amounts or percentages.

Seasonal closure: use, during certain periods in certain areas, of fishing gear in a manner that is capable of catching species to which the seasonal closure applies.

Quota closure: use of fishing gear to take quota-regulated species in an area closed to such fishing following notification that a specialized fishery for such species has ceased.

Fish size: the taking or possession of species below the minimum prescribed size, regulated by size limitation measures the Commission may pass.

Others: such incidents as refusal of the captain of a fishing vessel to permit boarding by an authorized inspector, refusal to permit inspection of gear, catch, fishing log, etc.

ATTACHMENT III

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

ANNUAL RETURN OF DISPOSITION OF INFRINGEMENTS (INTERNATIONAL)
(to be used by Authorities of Contracting Parties whose vessels were inspected by other Contracting Parties)

Contracting Party reporting infringement	Type of infringement	Date	Location	Disposition

Date of Return:

Reported by:
Address:

STACTIC FORM 2B (09/82)

(See over for explanatory notes)

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Contracting Parties, whose vessels were inspected by other Contracting Parties and to whom infringements of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures were reported, should use this form (STACTIC 2B, 09/82) to report on the disposition of the infringements reported by inspectors of other Contracting Parties during the calendar year.

The different types of infringements that may be reported and are to be considered are as follows:

Mesh size: use of net containing a codend or any other part with mesh size below the minimum prescribed.

Mesh obstruction: use of net attachments (e.g. chafing gear, liners, etc.) other than those authorized or in an unauthorized manner.

Excess by-catch: retention of regulated species on board a vessel, fishing primarily for other species, in excess of the permitted amounts or percentages.

Seasonal closure: use, during certain periods in certain areas, of fishing gear in a manner that is capable of catching species to which the seasonal closure applies.

Quota closure: use of fishing gear to take quota-regulated species in an area closed to such fishing following notification that a specialized fishery for such species has ceased.

Fish size: the taking or possession of species below the minimum prescribed size, regulated by size limitation measures the Commission may pass.

Others: such incidents as refusal of the captain of a fishing vessel to permit boarding by an authorized inspector, refusal to permit inspection of gear, catch, fishing log, etc.

of Fishing and Processing Vessels

Owner/Charterer	Certification	Gear Type	Principal Target Species in Which Division													
			COD	RED	PLA	YEL	WIT	CAP	SQI							

(See over for explanatory notes)

ATTACHMENT IV

EXPLANATORY NOTES

It is understood without any further remarks, that notification indicates the owner of the vessel. However, if the vessel is chartered, indicate the charterer, preceding his name by the explicit designation-Charterer.

The column "Certification" should make clear whether the master of the vessel has been provided with the extant Commission's Measures.

When specifying the gear type, use the Standard Abbreviation Code as per Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Part V, Schedule II, Attachment I.

When specifying the Principal Target Species, each column corresponds to a species designated by the Species Name Code as per Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Part V, Schedule II, Attachment II.

Those already printed in are those for which TAC's have customarily been established in the past. Those without printed codes are open to receive any species chosen as targets.

Under each column, enter the Division or Divisions in which the vessel in question intends to have the corresponding species as the target species.

ALSO, please note that, in accordance with Part III B1 of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures - Each Contracting Party shall notify the Executive Secretary of all vessels of that Party of more than 50 gross tons engaged in fishing or in processing fish in the Regulatory Area.

(a) prior to 1 January of each year, if possible; or

(b) in a timely manner following departure of the vessel from her home port; or

(c) by message within 30 days of any changes in the terms of notification