

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization



Report of the Standing Committee on International Control  
(STACTIC)  
2-4 May 2012  
Brussels, Belgium

NAFO  
Dartmouth, N.S., Canada  
2012

Report of the Standing Committee on  
International Control (STACTIC)  
2-4 May 2012  
Brussels, Belgium

Report of the Meeting .....	3
1. Opening by the Chair, Gene Martin (USA) .....	3
2. Appointment of Rapporteur.....	3
3. Adoption of Agenda .....	3
4. Consideration of Recommendations from the Performance Assessment Review Panel.....	3
5. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2004-2011), including review of Apparent Infringements.....	4
6. Review and Evaluation of Practices and Procedures.....	5
7. Review of current IUU List pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 51.3 .....	5
8. Half-year review of the implementation of new NCEM measures .....	5
9. Inspectors Web Page .....	6
10. Issues arising from the Editorial Drafting Group of the NAFO CEM (EDG).....	6
11. Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM.....	7
12. Advisory Group on Data Communication (AGDC) Update .....	11
13. NAFO VMS .....	11
14. Role of STACTIC in the evaluation and interpretation of VME-related provisions in the CEM.....	11
15. Other Matters.....	12
16. Time and place of next meeting .....	13
17. Adoption of Report.....	13
18. Adjournment.....	13
Annex 1. List of Participants .....	14
Annex 2. Agenda .....	17
Annex 3. NAFO 2011 Fisheries Profile and Trends (presented by the Secretariat).....	18
Annex 4. EDG presentation.....	27

## **Report of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)**

**2-4 May 2012  
Brussels, Belgium**

### **1. Opening by the Chair, Gene Martin (USA)**

The Chair opened the meeting at 10:05a.m.on Wednesday, May 2, 2012 at the Centre Albert Borschette in Brussels, Belgium. The Chair thanked the EU for hosting the meeting and welcomed the representatives for the following Contracting Parties (CPs): Canada, Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon), Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Japan, and the United States. A representative of the NEAFC Secretariat was also in attendance as an observer. (Annex 1)

### **2. Appointment of Rapporteur**

Amy Williams (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

### **3. Adoption of Agenda**

The following changes were made to the agenda:

1. The Secretariat requested that two items be added to agenda item #15:
  - a. Should NAFO become a member of the International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network?
  - b. Should NAFO become a sponsor of the International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference?
2. Russia requested that the following items (and related working papers) be removed from the agenda:
  - a. Fishing vessels communicating VMS hail reports (agenda item 11.b.ii)
  - b. "Cancel" message (agenda item 11.c)
3. The EU requested that STACTIC WP 12/6 (withdrawal report) be added to discussion under 11a: authorization to fish due to overlap.
4. The EU requested time to present an IT application designed to improve port inspections under the "Review of Practices and Procedures" (agenda item #6)
5. The EU requested time to give a presentation on electronic reporting system under the agenda item on the "Advisory Group on Data Communication" (agenda item #12)
6. Canada requested to table four papers previously discussed at the 2011 intersessional under agenda item #11.
7. Canada requested that STACTIC have an introductory discussion on the standardization of conversion factors under agenda item # 15.

*These changes were agreed to and the agenda was modified accordingly (Annex 2).*

### **4. Consideration of Recommendations from the Performance Assessment Review Panel**

The Fisheries Commission in FC WP 11/13 identified three items that STACTIC was to provide recommendations on:

1. With respect to the incorporation of the FAO Port State Measures Agreement into the NCEMs, Iceland pointed out that NEAFC is already doing this work. It was noted that an ad hoc working group on port state control under PECCOE intend to have a recommendation on this issue made at the annual meeting in November. In order to facilitate STACTIC's work, NEAFC have shared an analysis document that they created, and in addition NEAFC will, if possible, keep NAFO informed of progress on this issue.

*It was agreed that STACTIC should wait for that work to be completed to benefit from their work undertaken and facilitate a common approach within both NAFO and NEAFC.*

2. With respect to standardizing the methods for recording shark weight, many CPs support using green/live weight only: however Japan noted that other RFMOs have regulations on shark finning that we could learn from.

*It was agreed that the Secretariat compile this information for further discussion at the annual meeting in September.*

3. With respect to product labelling, Canada pointed out that this relates to other issues that impact traceability and compliance monitoring. Given that, Canada agreed to reflect this recommendation in the new working papers that they would present under agenda item 11.

*After discussion of STACTIC WP 12/18 presented by Canada, it was agreed to defer this item and Canada's proposal until the annual meeting in September.*

It was also raised that there were new recommendations brought forward in March in the meeting of the Working Group on Performance Review that related to STACTIC, however, the Chair clarified that STACTIC will not consider these until they have been officially assigned by the Fisheries Commission.

### **5. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2004-2011), including review of Apparent Infringements**

The Secretariat provided a presentation on NAFO compliance profiles and trends from 2004 – 2011 and preliminary results from the report on apparent infringements (Annex 3).

Based on the compilation, the Secretariat highlighted the following issues:

- COE is the only report where directed species are indicated. When vessels indicate numerous species as directed in the COE report, it presents difficulties in assigning fishery activity.
- If port reports are not submitted, the Secretariat does not know if it is a compliance issue or if a port inspection was not required.
- Reporting follow-up action on apparent infringements must be improved.

In addition, CPs raised the following concerns that were highlighted by the compilation report:

- Some discrepancies in landings versus what is on board may be due to partial offloads, not because there is a compliance issue. Canada committed to prepare a new working paper suggesting that a new 'check box' be added to the port inspection form to clarify this issue.
- There is concern with the limited information in the report (table C6) on actions taken with respect to apparent infringements. CPs expressed preference for more detailed account on follow-up on apparent infringements.
- Some CPs expressed preference for more detailed account for every landing; however the EU questioned the nature of table 1 and the use of partial landing for compliance evaluation.

- Canada expressed concern that most of the citations of 2011 have been closed without any significant consequence and without effective and strong deterrents these measures will be ineffective.

*The Chair requested that CPs reflect on what items should be included in a follow-up report and perhaps develop a proposal to that effect for the September annual meeting.*

## **6. Review and Evaluation of Practices and Procedures**

This is a new standing item to be discussed as necessary, and it provides an opportunity for CPs to present on domestic practices and procedures that they may wish to share with other CPs.

The EU gave a presentation on “Weighing Application for NAFO Port Inspections”. The objective of the application is to increase efficiency of port inspection and make the inspection framework within NAFO more cost effective. Although the application was developed for NAFO, it could be adapted for use anywhere. EU called for cooperation of other CPs and the NAFO Secretariat in testing and improving this application, which will be made available on the Practices and Procedures page of the NAFO members’ site for any other CPs that would like to use it or make improvements to it. In addition, the EU noted that they have a various check-lists that they will provide for posting on the website.

## **7. Review of current IUU List pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 51.3**

The Secretariat presented STACTIC Working Paper 12/7. This list was last reviewed at the Annual Meeting in September and no changes have been made since that point. All information is available on the website.

The EU expressed discomfort that vessels that are known to be inactive have not been removed from the list and that it is uncertain how such vessels should be removed. The Chair reminded participants that new criteria for delisting vessels were adopted last year (51.3.e) that puts the onus on CPs to provide sufficient evidence to STACTIC that vessels have been sunk, scraped or permanently reassigned in order for them to be delisted. Some CPs expressed concern with delisting vessels at all, given that evidence is often not official and vessels return to service after being delisted. Norway suggested that CPs, and especially those which have reported last known location of IUU vessels, should investigate and try to produce documentation that could be discussed based on the criteria for delisting.

*CPs were asked to review the list and bring evidence to the meeting in September on any vessels that may meet these criteria in order to update the list. The Chair encouraged CPs to try and ensure that any evidence provided is as official as possible.*

## **8. Half-year review of the implementation of new NCEM measures**

The Secretariat presented STACTIC Working Paper 12/8 which describes the Secretariat’s observations and experiences with these new measures. Although information does not always arrive in a timely manner, especially during the beginning of the year, it does appear that CPs are in compliance with these new measures. It was noted that it may be worthwhile for STACTIC to consider reviewing the procedure and timeline of implementation for VMS changes as it is sometimes difficult for service providers, FMCs and the Secretariat to implement the changes prior to the new measures coming into force.

## 9. Inspectors Web Page

The Secretariat provided a report on the status of the development of the inspectors' webpage. The Chair reminded participants that this is a four-phase project - phase 1 is completed, phase 2 has been approved, and phases 3-4 will be developed in the future.

The Secretariat presented Phase 1 of the webpage, which includes all vessel registration information and chartering information. It was noted that this is an independent and secure website from NAFO members area requiring a separate log-in to access the site.

CPs discussed who should have access to the website and how that access should be determined in order to preserve confidentiality.

***It was agreed that users should be identified by each CP's head of delegation and the NAFO Secretariat will provide individual usernames and passwords to each person. Once the website is further developed, the issue of levels of access should be revisited. It was also agreed that CPs should provide comments on any changes or concerns by June 1<sup>st</sup> on phase 1 and introductory comments on phase 2. (Temporary log-in information is available from the Secretariat.)***

## 10. Issues arising from the Editorial Drafting Group of the NAFO CEM (EDG)

The Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 12/9 which describes two issues requiring further clarification after the EDG revised the NCEM:

Article 25.5.b – forwarding the POR report to all CPs contradicts Article 26.10.b which states that VMS data should only be sent to CPs with an inspection presence. After discussion, it was concluded that there is no contradiction because, even though the POR, and other types of manual reports under Article 25, are transmitted over the same communication network as VMS messages, it is not to be considered as a VMS report under Article 26. It was pointed out that restricted access is only due for VMS reports automatically created under Article 26.

***It was agreed that the EDG would conduct an evaluation to identify other references of VMS that refer to positional data or activity data or both.***

Article 27.b.8 - Observer Program – the CAT report is missing a field for undersized catch. The EU reminded the group that this issue was clarified last year by explaining that the master includes the undersized fish in the RJ field code of the CAT message (along with other types of discards), and that it is the task of the observer to identify undersize fish in the OBR report or observer report.

The US, on behalf of the EDG, presented the proposed EDG approach for phase 2. The proposal is divided into 3 sections – core issues for reorganization, clarification of existing measures, and issues for further discussion (Annex 4). EDG recommends that CPs reflect on the category 3 items in order to have more substantive discussions on them at the annual meeting, as appropriate and necessary. EDG will meet in Canada in June to start preparations on work items.

CPs pointed out that the work plan was ambitious, but they supported EDG in their work.

***It was agreed that the EDG should continue its work consistent with the EDG presentation.***

## 11. Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM

### a) Authorization to Fish

i. DFG presented STACTIC WP 12/1 which proposes expanding Article 22.3 to add new sections on authorization, limited authorization, withdrawal and suspension to the NCEMs.

Japan expressed concern that they may not be able to issue specific authorizations under their domestic regulations and they would need time to carefully examine the proposal to consider how they could incorporate it into their licensing system. The EU questioned the rationale of the proposal, and was unsure how these changes could improve inspections or increase transparency. EU also questioned the procedure if the vessel changes its directed species, as well as the need for specific authorizations.

Canada reminded the group that some of the components in this proposal were raised in a proposal by Canada in 2009 to require that vessels maintain authorizations on board to ensure that inspectors can be confident that the vessel has proper authorizations.

Iceland supported the proposal and pointed out the importance that at-sea inspectors always have the information necessary for effective inspections, and suggested this information could be housed on the inspectors' webpage.

DFG conceded that they were willing to remove the concept of limited authorizations from the proposal as requested. Once placed in a strict format, it should make access to information easier.

*It was agreed that DFG and the EU would work intersessionally to prepare a new proposal for discussion at the annual meeting in September which may include Russia's proposal for withdrawal code (STACTIC WP 12/6) described below.*

ii. Russia presented STACTIC WP 12/6 on the implementation of a withdrawal report which would solve a gap in Article 22.3. The proposal suggests the creation of a new WIT report that would remove the corresponding NOT report where a vessel authorization has expired. This is the current process in NEAFC.

It was recognized that there was some overlap between this and the previous DFG proposal. The EU favoured this proposal because it directly solves a gap in the NCEM and because it allows the CPs to make the changes themselves, currently any changes must be done by the Secretariat. However, other CPs, including Iceland and Norway stated their preference to consider the broader picture of authorizations and notifications together.

*It was agreed that this issue would be dealt with in the revised proposal by DFG at the annual meeting in September.*

### b) Monitoring of Catch

#### i. Weekly monitoring

DFG presented STACTIC WP12/2 which aims to create more public access to quotas and quota uptakes of different fisheries, which would require an amendment to Article 25 (25.5.e). It was proposed that the Secretariat compile and make this information available weekly on secure website so CPs can have the most up-to-date information of status of quotas.

Several CPs, including Iceland and Norway, fully supported the proposal.

The US supported the intent of this and the utility of having updated information; however they expressed concern with protecting the confidentiality of this information.

The EU and France (SPM) were concerned with the rationale behind this proposal and indicated that the proposal would impose an unnecessary burden on the Secretariat to provide information on a more regular basis without adding any clear value or by providing any additional benefit to inspectors. The EU stated that the Secretariat has no responsibility for quota control. The EU also stated that this goes against the current limited access of catch data to CPs with an inspection presence. France (SPM) concurred with the views of the EU.

The Secretariat indicated that they could accommodate the request for the Secretariat to compile and make this information available weekly on a secure website.

***It was agreed that a revised proposal would be developed for discussion at the annual meeting in September.***

**c) Mid-water trawl**

**i. Definition of mid-water trawl**

Russia presented STACTIC WP 12/4 proposing a general definition of a mid-water trawl to be included in Article 1.

The EU questioned whether it was the role of STACTIC to define fisheries gear in a general way when there is already a definition in an FAO technical paper referred to in STACTIC WP 12/4; it was suggested that the NCEM should just reference the FAO definition rather than developing its own. However, it was noted that the FAO definition still allows the possibility of gear coming in contact with the bottom, whereas the definition proposed by Russia does not. The Chair and other CPs stated that it was appropriate to consider definitions of gear in the NCEM context if it is necessary to clarify measures.

Concern was expressed for the potential for mid-water trawl gear to come into contact with the bottom, and the smaller mesh being used to direct for groundfish. Therefore, it was agreed that it was a preferable approach to define mid-water trawl gear in the specific context of the fishery referred to in Article 13.2(f) rather than developing a general stand-alone definition in Article 1.

After consultations with the EU on wording, Russia presented STACTIC WP 12/4 rev which included a definition of a mid-water trawl within the text of Article 13.2(f). Following discussion on this new proposal, it was agreed that the reference to “3M” should be bracketed, as it was not STACTICs role to decide on mesh sizes and it was also agreed to add a sentence to the end to include a general prohibition on adding any attachment to the trawl that facilitates contact with the bottom. Japan expressed concern that this additional wording would inappropriately exclude chafing gear which is necessary to protect the net when it is hauled onboard a vessel.

***It was agreed that Japan, Russia and the EU would work together to develop new language that would satisfy the chafing gear issue for discussion at the annual meeting in September.***



## **ii. Reduction of mesh size of mid-water trawl in the redfish fishery in Division 3M**

Russia presented FC WP 11/9 proposing the reduction of the mesh size from 130 to 90mm for the pelagic redfish fishery in 3M. It was clarified that the Scientific Council had advised that such a reduction would not have an impact on the redfish stock, and also, as this fishery is believed to be clean, it likely not lead to an increase in bycatch.

*It was decided that this issue was accounted for in the revised STACTIC WP 12/4 by Russia.*

### **d) Observer Program**

The EU explained the purpose of STACTIC WP 11/27, introduced at last year's STACTIC intersessional regarding proposed changes to the observer program. The EU indicated that it is not necessary to have another substantive discussion during this meeting. However, they also reminded CPs that at the annual meeting CPs were asked to do an analysis of their compliance observer program and presenting the results and their views on continuing the current observer program as is at the next meeting. The EU pointed out that progress can best be made on this issue by CPs conducting such analyses and deciding on what aspects of the current observer program should be continued or modified.

Norway supported the views expressed by the EU and pointed out that changing the observer program should be on the agenda until a more cost effective system is established.

DFG offered to make a presentation describing its observer program but it was decided that there was not time for such presentations at this meeting. DFG and Canada provided an overview of their compliance observer program. It was noted that various components of observer programs have both advantages and disadvantages that need to be considered and it is a significant challenge to decide on what changes need to be made in the current observer program.

*CPs were asked to submit short (preferably 1 page) summaries of their observer programs to the Secretariat at least 30 days prior to the annual meeting for posting on the Practices and Procedures webpage and for discussion at the annual meeting in September. CPs were also invited to submit short white papers on their views regarding how the compliance observer program could work in the future.*

### **e) Reporting Requirements within existing fishing areas**

The US presented FC WP 11/23 that proposed to require observers to identify VME indicator species to the lowest taxonomic level possible throughout the NAFO Regulatory Area, not just new fishing areas. This proposal was originally presented to the Fisheries Commission at last year's annual meeting. The Fisheries Commission referred it to STACTIC for evaluation.

Iceland noted that this is a policy decision for managers, rather than STACTIC. Other CPs agreed with this position and noted that STACTIC can only evaluate how this proposal could be worded and integrated in to the NCEM. It was also noted that if the FC decides to implement this, STACTIC recommends that the amendments would be more appropriately made in Article 27 – Duties of Observers.

*It was agreed that STACTIC would explain to the Fisheries Commission that the addition of these new reporting requirements is a Fisheries Commission policy decision and that if the Fisheries Commission agrees to adopt these requirements, STACTIC has no problems with recommending wording for the NCEMs.*

**f) Product labelling by division and date of capture**

Canada, noting that this WP combines many of Canada's earlier proposals, presented STACTIC WP 12/18 which recommends that product be identified by species, product category, date of capture and division of capture in order to increase traceability as well compliance monitoring. Canada noted that this proposal is consistent with the recommendation made by the Performance Review Panel

Generally CPs were in favour of the proposal, although many requested more time to review it in detail.

*It was agreed to defer this item until the annual meeting in September.*

**g) Product labelling and stowage**

Canada presented STACTIC WP 12/15 proposing minor modifications to Article 24 which would ensure that labels are placed on packages in such a way that they are readily visible.

Generally CP's supported the proposal, although it was questioned why it was separate from STACTIC WP 12/18. Canada clarified that the proposals were developed separately because STACTIC WP 12/18 was a response to a Performance Review Panel recommendation; they can easily be combined if that is preferred.

*It was decided to defer this item until the annual meeting in September to allow CPs more time to reflect on it.*

**h) Catch recording in log books**

Canada presented STACTIC WP 12/16 recommending that vessels be required to record catches on a tow-by-tow basis in order to allow for more effective compliance monitoring.

Many CPs, including DFG, Iceland, Russia and Norway had no immediate concerns with the proposal as they already do tow-by-tow recording domestically. The EU and the US requested more time to reflect on the proposal to determine how it will fit with current domestic reporting systems.

*It was decided to defer this item until the annual meeting in September.*

**i) Communication of catch in cases where bycatch limits are exceeded**

Canada presented STACTIC WP 12/17 which would require vessels to send a report to the Secretariat outlining the date, time, catch composition, tow duration, start and end positions of any tow that required them to move 10 nautical miles (nm) due to exceeding bycatch. Vessels are currently required to log this information and this proposal would require them to submit such information to the Secretariat so that the Secretariat could compile this information which in turn could be used to identify trends and perhaps high bycatch areas.

Iceland requested that this item be deferred to September to allow more time to look at proposal, in particular the tables. Iceland also noted that the proposal was incomplete. Several CPs also noted that they are reluctant to make changes to existing reporting system right now given that STACTIC is moving towards an electronic reporting system.

*It was decided to defer this item until the annual meeting in September.*

## **12. Advisory Group on Data Communication (AGDC) Update**

The Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 12/11, which provided an update on AGDC matters. Giving NAFO a formal status in the AGDC is still ongoing; the Terms of Reference are being modified and will be presented at the NEAFC annual meeting in November. The outcome of the meeting will be conveyed to NAFO and the Secretariat will continue to work with NEAFC Secretariat to finalize the new Terms of Reference.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> party CA certificate update is almost complete; there were no issues. The meeting of security and confidentiality is an ongoing matter.

*No action required.*

Related to this issue, the EU gave a presentation on their electronic reporting system (ERS). The EU highlighted the difficulties and costs associated with using multiple systems and noted that they aim to cooperate with as many parties as possible collecting best practices and preferences in order to facilitate the development and use of standardized data systems.

*A copy of the presentation will be posted on the Practices and Procedures page of the NAFO members' site.*

## **13. NAFO VMS**

The Secretariat presented STACTIC WP 12/12 regarding whether NAFO should renew the contract with the current VMS service provider (Visma) or retender when it expires at the end of the year. Generally, the Secretariat is satisfied with current provider; but they wanted to hear the views of STACTIC.

Many CPs indicated that this is not a decision for STACTIC, however STACTIC could provide a recommendation based on operational considerations. Generally, CPs were satisfied with the service provided by Visma, but questions were raised regarding cost sharing and how that would affect CPs domestic contracts with Visma, and whether it was advisable to sign a new five-year contract if STACTIC in light of the ever changing nature of technical requirements in moving to a new electronic reporting system.

*It was agreed that the Secretariat would look into the cost sharing issue, and they would also investigate information about and perhaps options for shorter contracts and provide an update at the annual meeting in September.*

## **14. Role of STACTIC in the evaluation and interpretation of VME-related provisions in the CEM**

The Secretariat introduced a discussion on STACTIC's role regarding the VME provisions in the NCEMs. This question is being asked in response to a letter sent by the EU to all CPs regarding what steps are necessary for a vessel to begin exploratory fishing activities.

The group discussed various options for STACTIC role regarding the VME revisions in the NCEMs and it was decided that while it was the role of the VME Working Group to clarify the intent of any measures they develop, it is STACTIC's role to ensure that all measures are clear and not contradictory not only for this issue but for all issues.

*It was decided that STACTIC could not make a specific recommendation until the VME Working Group clarified the intent of the measures; however it should be noted that STACTIC does have a role in ensuring that the language in any measures being contemplated in NAFO are unambiguous.*

## 15. Other matters

### a. International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (IMCS) Network

The Secretariat attended the Business Meeting of the IMCS Network in March and gave a brief presentation on the meeting (STACTIC WP 12/10). At the meeting, the Network adopted a new constitution which now allows RFMOs to be members and they invited NAFO to become a member. It was agreed that while it may be beneficial for CPs to be members of the Network, there is no obvious benefit for NAFO and there would likely be some level of financial commitment required. Some concern was raised about the extent of NAFO's involvement in other organizations and RFMOs.

*It was decided that CPs would reflect further on whether STACTIC should recommend that NAFO become a member of this network and to have a further discussion at the annual meeting in September.*

### b. International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference (IFOMC)

In response to the request to NAFO to sponsor a March 2013 meeting of the IFOMC, the Secretariat presented information on this meeting as contained in STACTIC WP 12/14.

Although NAFO is in a good position to share experiences within an organization such as this, it was agreed that NAFO probably does not have sufficient funds to become a sponsor. Also, some CPs were concerned that becoming a sponsor for this meeting may set an undesirable precedent leading to requests from other organization to be a sponsor.

*It was agreed that STACTIC would recommend that NAFO should not become a sponsor at this time due to funding limitations and concerns regarding the over-extension of NAFO in attending these events.*

### c. Standardized conversion factors

Canada introduced this general discussion item on standard conversion factors. Canada explained the benefits to compliance monitoring of having standardized conversion factors and asked if this issue had previously been discussed by STACTIC.

DFG noted that NEAFC attempted to do this; the outcome was that the NEAFC CPs shared their domestic conversion factors for each product. Currently in NEAFC there is only one situation where they are standardized – pelagic redfish in international waters – because the variation among NEAFC CPs was too significant.

The EU noted that they have a public regulation which establishes conversion factors to be used.

The US noted that this item has been included on the EDG phase two priority list and agreed that the issue should be investigated.

There was concern expressed that any NAFO conversion factors may be relegated to the lowest common denominator.

It was concluded that this is a very complex issue, and that further study of other CP conversion factors is needed.

*It was agreed that CPs should send information on their domestic conversion factors to the Secretariat for further discussion at the annual meeting in September.*

#### **16. Time and Place of next meeting**

The next STACTIC meeting will be held in St. Petersburg, Russia during the 2012 NAFO Annual Meeting.

#### **17. Adoption of Report**

The report was adopted by Contracting Parties on May 4, 2012.

#### **18. Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:50 p.m. on May 4, 2012.

## Annex 1. List of Participants

### CANADA

#### Head of Delegation

Jenkins, Randy, Director, Enforcement, Conservation and Protection (C&P), Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6

Phone: +613 990 0108 – Fax: +613 941 2718 – E-mail: [randy.jenkins@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:randy.jenkins@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

#### Advisers

Gilchrist, Brett, Senior International Fisheries Officer, Atlantic and Americas Regional Affairs Bureau, International Affairs Bureau, International Affairs Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6

Phone: +1 613 991 0218 – Fax: +1 613 993 5995 – E-mail: [brett.gilchrist@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:brett.gilchrist@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

Lambert, Bob, Chief, Enforcement Operations, Conservation and Protection (C&P) NCR, NL Region, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, NL A1X 5X1

Phone: +709 772 5482 – Fax: +709 772 3628 – E-mail: [robert.lambert@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:robert.lambert@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

Ward, Chad, Conservation & Protection Supervisor, Offshore Detachment, Fisheries & Aquaculture, Management Branch, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, NL A1C 5X1

Phone: +709 772 4412 – Fax: +709 772-0008 – E-mail: [chad.ward@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:chad.ward@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

Williams, Amy, International Fisheries Enforcement, Enforcement Br., Conservation and Protection, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6

Phone: +613 993 7259 – E-mail: [amy.williams@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:amy.williams@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

### DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)

#### Head of Delegation

Trolle Nedergaard, Mads, Fiskerilicensinspektør, Head of Department, Grønlands Fiskerilicenskontrol, Postbox 501, DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland

Phone: +299 553347 – Fax: +299 323235 – E-mail: [mads@nanoq.gl](mailto:mads@nanoq.gl)

#### Advisers

Gaardlykke, Meinhard, Adviser, Faroe Islands Fisheries Inspection, Yviri við Strond 3, P. O. Box 1238, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Phone: +298 311065 – Fax: +298 313981 – E-mail: [meinhardg@fve.fo](mailto:meinhardg@fve.fo)

Jacobsen, Petur M., Head of Section, Grønlands Fiskerilicenskontrol, Postbox 501, DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland

Phone: +299 345393 – Fax: +299 323235 – E-mail: [pmja@nanoq.gl](mailto:pmja@nanoq.gl)

Kruse, Martin, Adviser, FMC-Manager, Faroe Islands Fisheries Inspection, Yviri við Strond 3, P. O. Box 1238, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Phone: +298 291001 – Fax: +298 313981 – E-mail: [martink@fve.fo](mailto:martink@fve.fo)

### EUROPEAN UNION

#### Head of Delegation

Spezzani, Aronne, European Commission, Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, 99 Rue Joseph II, B-1049, Brussels, Belgium

Phone: +32 2 295 9629 – Fax: +32 2 296 2338 – E-mail: [aronne.spezzani@ec.europa.eu](mailto:aronne.spezzani@ec.europa.eu)

#### Advisers

Dross, Nicolas, International Relations Officer, International Affairs, Law of the Sea and Regional Fisheries Organizations, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs (DG MARE.B.1), Rue Joseph II, 99, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Phone: +32 2 298 0855 – Fax: +32 2 295 5700 – E-mail: [nicolas.dross@ec.europa.eu](mailto:nicolas.dross@ec.europa.eu)

Lansley, Jon, EU Fisheries Inspector, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs (DG MARE.B.1), Rue Joseph II, 79, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Phone: + 32 2 295 8346 – E-mail: [jon.lansley@ec.europa.eu](mailto:jon.lansley@ec.europa.eu)

Pagliarani, Giuliano, Administration Officer-NAFO Coordinator, Fisheries Control in International Waters, European Commission, Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Rue Joseph II, 99 (01/062), B-1049, Brussels, Belgium

Phone: +32 2 296 3834 – Fax: +32 2 296 2338 – E-mail: [giuliano.pagliarani@ec.europa.eu](mailto:giuliano.pagliarani@ec.europa.eu)

Babcionis, Genadijus, Desk Manager, European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA), Apartado de Correos 771 – E-36200 – Vigo, Spain

Phone: +34 986 12 06 40 – E-mail: [genadijus.babcionis@efca.europa.eu](mailto:genadijus.babcionis@efca.europa.eu)

Duarte, Rafael P., European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, Rue Joseph II, 79 (02/217), 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Phone: + 32 2 299 0955 – E-mail: [rafael.duarte@ec.europa.eu](mailto:rafael.duarte@ec.europa.eu)

Parker, Michael, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, Unit B3.1, Rue Joseph II, 79 (02/221), 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Phone: + 32 2 296 8234 – E-mail: [michael.parker@ec.europa.eu](mailto:michael.parker@ec.europa.eu)

Alcaide, Mario, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, Rue Joseph II, 79 (02/219), 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Phone: + 32 2 296 5567 – E-mail: [mario.dos-santos-alcaide@ec.europa.eu](mailto:mario.dos-santos-alcaide@ec.europa.eu)

Meremaa, Epp, Estonian Ministry of Agriculture, Lai tn 39//41, 15056 Tallinn, Estonia

Phone: + 372 6796926 – Fax: +372 6796925 - E-mail: [epp.meremaa@agri.ee](mailto:epp.meremaa@agri.ee)

Carvalho, Ricardo, Departamento dos Recursos, Direccao Geral das Pescas e Aquicultura, Avenida da Brasilia, 1449 -030 Lisbon, Portugal

E-mail: [ricardocarvalho@dgrm.min-agricultura.pt](mailto:ricardocarvalho@dgrm.min-agricultura.pt)

Chamizo Catalan, Carlos, Head of Fisheries Inspection Division, Secretariat General de Pesca Maritima, Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, y Medio Rural y Marino, Velázquez, 144, 28006 Madrid, Spain

Phone: +34 91 347 8313 – Fax: +34 91 347 1512 – E-mail: [cchamizo@mapya.es](mailto:cchamizo@mapya.es)

## FRANCE (IN RESPECT OF ST. PIERRE ET MIQUELON)

### Head of Delegation

Bigorgne, Matthias, Ministère de l'alimentation, de l'agriculture et de la pêche, 3, place de Fontenoy 75700 Paris 07 SP

Phone: +33 1 49 55 53 55 – Fax: +33 1 49 55 82 00 – E-mail: [matthias.bigorgne@agriculture.gouv.fr](mailto:matthias.bigorgne@agriculture.gouv.fr)

### Adviser

de Beauregard, Guillaume, Administrateur des affaires maritimes Adjoint au chef du pôle maritime, 1, rue Gloanec, B.P 4206, 97500 Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon

Phone: +508 41 15 36 – Fax: +508 41 48 34 – E-mail: [guillaume.de-beauregard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr](mailto:guillaume.de-beauregard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr)

## ICELAND

### Head of Delegation

Freyr Helgason, Kristján, Special Advisor, Department of Resource Management, Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture, Skulagata 4, 150 Reykjavik

Phone: +354 545 8300 – Fax: +354 552 1160 – E-mail: [kristjan.freyr.helgason@slr.stjr.is](mailto:kristjan.freyr.helgason@slr.stjr.is)

### Advisers

Geirsson, Gylfi, CDR Senior Grade, Icelandic Coast Guard, Skogarhlid 14, 105 Reykjavik

Phone: +354 545 2000/545 2071 – Fax: +354 545 2040 – E-mail: [gylfi@lhg.is](mailto:gylfi@lhg.is)

Thormar, Anna, Quota Allocations Department, Directorate of Fisheries, Dalshrauni 1, 220 Hafnarfjordur

Phone: +354 569 7900 – Fax: +354 569 7991 – E-mail: [annatho@fiskistofa.is](mailto:annatho@fiskistofa.is)

## JAPAN

### Head of Delegation

Uoya, Toshinori, Assistant Director, Fisheries Management Div. Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100-8907

Phone: +81 3 6744 2363 – Fax: +81 3 3501 1019 – E-mail: [toshinori\\_uoya@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:toshinori_uoya@nm.maff.go.jp)

**Adviser**

Takagi, Noriaki, Director, Executive Secretary, Japan Overseas Fishing Association, NK-Bldg., 6F, 3-6 Kanda Ogawa-Machi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-0052

Phone: +81 3 3291 8508 – Fax: + 81 3 3233 3267 – E-mail: [noritakagi@jdsta.or.jp](mailto:noritakagi@jdsta.or.jp)

**NORWAY****Head of Delegation**

Johnsen, Stein-Aage, Senior Legal Adviser, Resource Management Dept., Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, Sentrum, NO-5804 Bergen

Phone: +47 55 23 80 00 / 8124 – Fax: +47 55 23 80 90 – E-mail: [stein-age.johnsen@fiskeridir.no](mailto:stein-age.johnsen@fiskeridir.no)

**Adviser**

Østgård, Hanne, Senior Legal Adviser, Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, Sentrum, 5804 Bergen

Phone: +47 46 80 52 05 – Fax: +47 55 23 80 90 – E-mail: [hanne.ostgard@fiskeridir.no](mailto:hanne.ostgard@fiskeridir.no)

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION****Head of Delegation**

Agalakov, Vadim E., Chief State Inspector, Barentsevo-Belomorskoe Territorial Department, Federal Agency for Fisheries, str. Komintern 7, 183038 Murmansk

Phone: +7 815 2 798 116 – Fax: +7 815 2 451 945 – E-mail: [murmansk@bbtu.ru](mailto:murmansk@bbtu.ru)

**Adviser**

Volkov, Victor M., Deputy Head of Murmansk Branch of the Fisheries Monitoring Centre, 43, Tralovaya, Murmansk, 183950

Phone: +7 8152 47 4167 – Fax: +7 8152 47 4852 – E-mail: [volkov@mrcm.ru](mailto:volkov@mrcm.ru)

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA****Head of Delegation**

Christel, Doug, Fishery Policy Analyst, Sustainable Fisheries Div., US Dept. of Commerce, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01970

Phone: +978 281 9141 – Fax: +978 281 9135 – E-mail: [douglas.christel@noaa.gov](mailto:douglas.christel@noaa.gov)

**Advisers**

Ash, Carrie, Commander, Deputy Chief, Law Enforcement, U.S. Coast Guard, First Coast Guard District, 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02110-3350

Phone: +617 223 8685 – E-mail: [carrie.m.ash@uscg.mil](mailto:carrie.m.ash@uscg.mil)

Martin, Jr., Gene S., Attorney, Office of the General Counsel Northwest, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northeast, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930

Phone: + 978 281 9242 – Fax: + 978 281 9389 – E-mail: [gene.s.martin@noaa.gov](mailto:gene.s.martin@noaa.gov)

**NAFO SECRETARIAT**

Ricardo Federizon, Senior Fisheries Commission Coordinator

[rfederizon@nafo.int](mailto:rfederizon@nafo.int)

Cindy Kerr, Senior Fisheries Information Manager

[ckerr@nafo.int](mailto:ckerr@nafo.int)

**OBSERVERS**

João Neves, IT Manager and VMS Administrator, North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), 22 Berners Street, London W1T 3DY, UK

Phone: +44 (0) 207 631 0016 – Fax: +44 (0) 207 636 9225 - E-mail: [joao@neafc.org](mailto:joao@neafc.org)



**Annex 2. Agenda**

1. Opening by the Chair, Gene Martin (USA)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Consideration of Recommendations from the Performance Assessment Review Panel
5. Compilation of fisheries reports for compliance review (2004-2011), including review of Apparent Infringements.
6. Review and evaluation of Practices and Procedures
7. Review of current IUU list pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 51.3
8. Half-year review of the implementation of new NCEM measures
9. Inspectors Web Page
10. Issues arising from the Editorial Drafting Group of the NAFO CEM (EDG)
11. Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM
  - a) Authorization to Fish
  - b) Monitoring of Catch (Article 25)
    - i. Weekly monitoring
  - c) Mid-Water Trawl (Articles 1 and 13)
    - i. Definition of mid-water trawl
    - ii. Reduction of mesh size of mid-water trawl in the redfish fishery in Division 3M
  - d) Observer Program (Article 27)
  - e) Reporting Requirements within existing fishing areas (Article 20.1.i)
  - f) Product labelling by division and date of capture
  - g) Product labelling stowage
  - h) Catch recording in log books
  - i) Communication of catch in cases where bycatch limits are exceeded
12. Advisory Group on Data Communication (AGDC) Update
13. NAFO VMS
14. Role of STACTIC in the evaluation and interpretation of VME-related provisions in the CEM
15. Other Matters
  - a) International Monitoring Control and Surveillance (IMCS) Network
  - b) International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference
  - c) Standardized conversion factors
16. Time and Place of next meeting
17. Adoption of Report
18. Adjournment

**Annex 3. NAFO 2011 Fisheries Profile and Trends****NAFO 2011 FISHERIES  
PROFILE and TRENDS**

(from the Compilation of NAFO  
Fishing Reports for STACTIC  
Compliance Review)

STACTIC Interseasonal Meeting –Brussels, Belgium May 2011

1

In this presentation . . .

- **The big Table 1**
- **Vital Statistics 2011 – Groundfish (GRO), Shrimp (PRA), and pelagic redfish (REB)**
- **Trends 2004 – 2011**
  - **Effort – days-at-sea**
  - **Number of vessels**
  - **At-sea inspections**
  - **Inspection Rate**

STACTIC Interseasonal Meeting –Brussels, Belgium May 2011

2

In this presentation . . .

- **Apparent Infringements in 2011 and disposition**
- **Issues identified during compilation**
- **Next steps towards the finalization of the STACTIC Annual Compliance Review.**

**Table 1. Overview of fishing reports from vessels and CP in the NRA.**  
 (Please refer to the distributed hard copy)

The table is a complex spreadsheet with numerous columns and rows. The columns are organized into several distinct sections, each with a colored header: blue, green, yellow, orange, and red. The data within the table appears to be a detailed record of fishing reports, including vessel information, catch data, and compliance status. The text is too small to read accurately, but the structure suggests a comprehensive overview of fishing activities and associated reports in the NRA.

## What is Table 1?

- **Metadata – fishing reports received by the Secretariat**
  - **VMS Hails – COE, COX, ENT, EXI, CAT**
  - **Port Inspection Reports**
  - **Observer Reports**
  - **At-sea inspection Reports**

## What Table 1 can offer?

- **Identifies missing reports (except Port Inspections)**
- **Allows derivation of basic statistics – e.g. how many boats, how many days on fishing ground?**



### 2011 Fishing Effort Profile in NAFO Regulatory Area


	 Groundfish	 Shrimp	 Redfish	TOTAL
 Number of vessels	47	8	2	56
 Effort (Days present)	4920	372	18	5310

*Note:*

- Groundfish fishing effort back to 2006 – 2007 level
- Pelagic redfish effort prior to the moratorium in July 2011

## TRENDS 2004-2011





22

## Apparent Infringements and disposition in 2011

Vessel	Insp Date	Dir/Dir (according to COE)	Apparent Infringement	Article (2011 NOEM)	Disposition / Follow up / Update as of April 2012 (Article 37.4 requirement)	STATUS as of April 2012
7	07-Mar-11	CO/RED/GHL	By-catch requirements	Art. 12.3.a	[awaiting disposition report]	No information
4	24-Apr-11	GHL/RED	Stowage plans	Art. 24.6	The AI was not confirmed during port inspection in Vigo	Closed
6	01-May-11	CO/B	Stowage plans	Art. 24.6	Strong verbal rebrief	Closed
7	21-May-11	RED/GHL	Product Labelling	Art. 23	[awaiting disposition report]	No information
5	28-Jun-11	GHL/RED/GFA	Stowage Plans	Art. 24.6	Captain fined 40 Euros.	Closed
1	02-Jul-11	GHL/RED	Stowage Plans	Art. 24.6	Pending	Pending
2	02-Aug-11	CO/RED/GHL	Mesh Size	Art. 13.1	Could not be confirmed during port inspection at Vigo on July 2011.	Closed
3	24-Oct-11	PPA	Capacity Plans	Art. 21.3	Pending	Pending

\* 8 cases involving 7 vessels from two CPs – 1 serious, 7 non-serious.

\* Bycatch requirements (1), stowage plans (4), product labelling (1), capacity plans (1), mesh size (1)

22

# ISSUES

## ISSUE: Directed Species and bycatch

Examples of Directed Species as reported in the Catch-On – Entry (COE)

HAL

COD

YEL

PRA

RED

GHL


COD

GHL SKA RED HKW

RED HKW RNG SKA

**Stocks not mentioned in COE considered bycatch? How should Article 6 be applied?**





### ISSUE: Follow-up on AIs – Article 37.d requirement

Case#	ReqDate	D/Fish (according to COE)	Assess/Intelligence	Article 37.d (NDR)	Disposal of follow-up (Article 37.d requirement)	STACTIC (Art. 37.d)
7	03-Mar-11	COE RED GIL	Bycatch requirements	Art. 12.3.a	pending disposition report	No information
4	24-Apr-11	CoL RED	Bycatch plans	Art. 24.6	no AI was not confirmed (single inspection Vigi)	Closed
6	21-May-11	RED GIL	Bycatch plans	Art. 24.6	no AI was not confirmed (single inspection Vigi)	Closed
7	21-May-11	RED GIL	Bycatch labeling	Art. 25	pending disposition report	No information
6	05-Jun-11	CoL RED GIL	Bycatch plans	Art. 24.6	no AI was not confirmed (single inspection Vigi)	Closed
6	05-Jun-11	CoL RED GIL	Bycatch plans	Art. 24.6	no AI was not confirmed (single inspection Vigi)	Closed
2	04-Aug-11	COE RED GIL	Bycatch plans	Art. 31.1	no AI was not confirmed (single inspection Vigi in July 2011)	Closed
3	28-Oct-11	IRA	Capacity plans	Art. 27.3	pending	pending

# of cases: 8  
 # of closed: 4  
 # of pending: 2  
 # of cases with no follow-up information: 2

PRP recommendation: Reporting follow-up actions must be improved.

STACTIC International Meeting –Brussels, Belgium May 2014 46

**NEXT STEPS (STACTIC WP 10/38):**

- 1. CPs, particularly those with inspection presence shall present compliance issues/concerns at this meeting.**
- 2. STACTIC to discuss these issues at this meeting.**
- 3. Secretariat prepares the compilation tables to be transmitted to STACTIC by 18 June 2012 (90 days before Annual Meeting and in accordance with Rules of Procedure 5.1.e).**

**NEXT STEPS (STACTIC WP 10/38):**

- 4. Secretariat compiles additional information forwarded 60 days before the Annual Meeting.**
- 5. Secretariat prepares draft Annual Compliance Report**
- 6. STACTIC to review draft; insert conclusions; finalize the Annual Compliance Review for presentation at FC during the 2012 Meeting**

## **Annex 4. EDG Presentation**

### **Phase II Priorities**

- Builds upon Phase I efforts
- Divided into 3 groups:
  1. Core issues for reorganization
  2. Clarification of existing measures
  3. Issues for further discussion

#### **Core Issues for Reorganization**

##### **1. Bycatch (Article 6)**

- Redraft section into new style and organization
- Clarify how bycatch ratios are applied (trip, cumulative, etc.)
- Consider applying bycatch provisions to total catch (including discards) versus only what is retained.

##### **2. Non-contracting party scheme (Articles 45-53)**

- Redraft section into new style and organization

##### **3. Catch limitation (Article 5)**

- Redraft section into new style and organization

#### **Clarification of Existing Measures**

- Article 1 - Define terms (groundfish, regulated species, fishery, etc.)
- Article 14.4 – Discuss whether to make relocation rules consistent
- Article 16 - Insert map of seamount, coral and sponge protection zones
- Article 24 – Increase the precision of labeling requirements
- Article 25.1.d.iv – Clarify duration of production logbook retention
- Article 25.1.h – Standardize format of stowage plans
- Article 26.9.a – Evaluate feasibility of data report submission timing
- Article 28.8 – Decide if inspectors should have firearms when boarding non-CP vessels
- Article 30.2.b – Assess whether surveillance reports are obsolete

- Article 36.2 – Clarify language regarding applicability of notices of infringements
- Correct several inaccurate references

### **Issues for Further Discussion**

1. Are chartering arrangements still necessary if quota transfers exist (Article 23)?
2. Define which skate species are referenced in Annex I.A
3. Specify uniform conversion factors to convert product weight to live/round weight for all stocks.