

## SECTION II

(pages 73 to 124)

### Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (STACFAC) 7-9 April 1992 Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada

1. Opening of the Meeting .....	75
2. National Reports on Fishing Activities of Vessels of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (including details of the type, flag of vessels and reported or estimated catches by species and area) .....	75
3. Consideration of Statistics Submitted by Contracting Parties on Their Imports of Groundfish Species Regulated by NAFO from Non-Contracting Parties Whose Vessels Fish in the Regulatory Area .....	76
4. National Reports on the Results of the Aide-Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarches) Dispatches to Non-Contracting Parties and Proposals for Follow-up Action .....	77
5. Report by the Executive Secretary on his Contacts with Non-Contracting Parties Regarding Fishing by Their Vessels in the Regulatory Area .....	80
6. Examination of Methods of Improving the Reporting of Catches, Transshipment, etc., and Landings from the Regulatory Area by Non-Contracting Parties .....	80
7. Examination of Options Open to Contracting Parties to Dissuade Their Nationals from Fishing in the Regulatory Area Under Non-Contracting Party Flags and to Discourage Such Activities Where They Are Currently Taking Place .....	81
8. Examination of Landing Declaration System to Collect Data on Landing of Catches by Non-Contracting Party Vessels in the Regulatory Area (for possible implementation in 1992) .....	81
9. Preparation of Comprehensive Report to the General Council and Recommendations on Measures to Resolve the Problem .....	83
10. Other Business and Adjournment .....	83
Annex 1. List of Participants .....	84
Annex 2. Agenda .....	86
Annex 3. Canadian Report on Non-Contracting Parties Fishing Activities in the NAFO Regulatory Area-1991 .....	87

Annex 4.	EEC Report on Activity of Non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991 .....	97
Annex 5.	Canadian Report on Groundfish Imports from non-Contracting Parties (January-December 1991) .....	106
Annex 6.	Japanese Report on Groundfish Imports from Non-Contracting Parties for January-December 1990 and January-October 1991 .....	108
Annex 7.	EEC Report on Groundfish Imports from Non-Contracting Parties during 1990 and 1991 .....	109
Annex 8.	Draft Aide Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarches) .....	110
Annex 9.	Draft Summary of Data Concerning Fishing by Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area .....	117
Annex 10.	EEC Draft of Landing Declaration .....	120
Annex 11.	Report on Fishing Activities by Vessels Flying the Flag of non-NAFO Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area .....	121

## Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (STACFAC)

Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada, 7-9 April 1992

### 1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The fourth meeting of the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (STACFAC) was held at NAFO Headquarters in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada through 7-9 April 1992 under the chairmanship of C. Southgate (EEC).
- 1.2 The following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), European Economic Community (EEC), Japan, Poland and the Russian Federation (Russia) (Annex 1).
- 1.3 The Chairman welcomed delegates and asked for nomination of a rapporteur; A. Donohue (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
- 1.4 The agenda was adopted as previously circulated (Annex 2).

### 2. National Reports on Fishing Activities of Vessels of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (including details on the type, flag of vessels and reported or estimated catches by species and area)

- 2.1 The Canadian representative tabled Canada's report (Annex 3) and presented its highlights. She pointed out that there were no sightings in 1991 of vessels from the Cayman Islands, Mexico, the USA or Chile. She also drew attention to Table II that indicates that many vessels sighted in 1991 had already been sighted in 1992. Estimated catches by Panamanian flag vessels continued to be very high.
- 2.2 In response to an inquiry by the representative of Japan, the Canadian representative informed the meeting that the absence of USA vessels from the Regulatory Area in 1991 might have resulted from the fact that the two USA companies that had fished in the Regulatory Area had gone bankrupt. There had been no indication that the USA had prohibited fishing by its vessels in the Regulatory Area.
- 2.3 The EEC representative commented that fishing activity in the Regulatory Area by non-Contracting Parties continued to be a threat to conservation. The absence from the Regulatory Area in 1992 of vessels from certain countries could have resulted from the demarches undertaken in July 1991 but these were not entirely successful as Venezuelan, Panamanian and Korean vessels continued to operate in this Area. On a more positive note, Panama had de-registered two trawlers but further follow-up would be needed. The EEC representative provided an overview of its report (Annex 4) which represented sightings in the Regulatory Area by the EEC inspection vessel.

- 2.4 In response to the Chairman's comment that certain vessels were reported under the flags of more than one country, the Canadian representative indicated that she would seek confirmation of the sightings information provided by Canada. The Chairman suggested it would be necessary to cross check between Canadian and EEC lists.

**3. Consideration of Statistics Submitted by Contracting Parties on Their Imports of Groundfish Species Regulated by NAFO From Non-Contracting Parties Whose Vessels Fish in the Regulatory Area**

- 3.1 The Canadian representative tabled a report (Annex 5) on relevant imports into Canada for 1991. She explained that it updated the previous statistics to September 1991 that had been attached to the Executive Secretary's letter GF/92-010 of 9 January 1992. The report indicated that imports of sole from Korea were down to 157 tons from 980 tons in 1990. These imports went mostly into the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. No conclusion could be drawn from the reduction. She said imports from the USA had not been included in the Canadian report since the USA had not fished in the Regulatory Area in 1990 and 1991. USA import statistics were available and showed the USA imported cod and flatfish mostly from Korea.
- 3.2 The Chairman noted that Cuba, Russia, the Faroes and Greenland reported to the Executive Secretary that they do not import fish species caught in the Regulatory Area from non-Contracting Parties whose vessels have been sighted in this Area. Japan imports fish from Korea and the USA but does not distinguish between those caught in the Regulatory Area and elsewhere. The Japanese representative explained that the figures tabled by Japan (Annex 6) were official import statistics and were not exact figures for the North Atlantic, e.g., redfish imports from Korea could have originated in either the Atlantic or Pacific. Similarly, there was no way to determine if fish imported from the USA were caught in the Regulatory Area.
- 3.3 The EEC representative stated that a similar caveat applied to EEC statistics. Certain deductions could be made from the statistics, e.g., where else would Maltese catches of witch and yellowtail have come from besides the Northwest Atlantic? The Chairman commented that the statistics were a useful indication of where products caught in the Regulatory Area by non-Contracting Party vessels were being landed.
- 3.4 The EEC representative highlighted the EEC's report (Annex 7) on imports from non-Contracting Parties fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. He pointed out that it included statistics for fresh, frozen and whole fish but not fillets. He also indicated that while there was no conclusive proof, the statistics pointed to a link between landings and sightings in the Regulatory Area. The Canadian representative agreed and added that imports of salted fish from Panama might also usefully be included in the reports. It was clear to her that certain patterns emerged when the statistics were viewed as a whole. The EEC representative agreed and added that the exercise confirmed that solutions were needed to end the threat to conservation posed by non-Contracting Party effort in the Regulatory Area.

**4. National Reports on the Results of the Aide-Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarches) Dispatches to Non-Contracting Parties and Proposals for Follow-up Action**

- 4.1 The Chairman pointed out that replies from non-Contracting Parties and the results of other contacts should be reviewed, in addition to any action taken by non-Contracting Parties in relation to undertakings.
- 4.2 The EEC representative reported on its initiatives as follows:

**Panama**

Following the NAFO demarche Panamanian authorities had issued a decree banning fishing by its vessels in the Regulatory Area with sanctions for non-compliance. The application of such sanctions should be monitored. Panamanian catches in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991 were estimated to be substantial. Further follow up was needed.

**Venezuela**

NAFO had received a positive reaction to its initiative and authorities had warned Venezuelan vessels to refrain from fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area and other waters managed by international conservation organizations under threat of withdrawal of license. Although only a limited quantity of cod was estimated to have been taken by Venezuelan vessels their activities continued and follow up was needed.

**Cayman Islands**

The EEC had approached UK authorities concerning activities of the Marsopla and were informed that its licence had been withdrawn. UK authorities had indicated that henceforth only Cayman nationals would be permitted to register vessels there. The vessel had subsequently registered in Panama.

**USA**

On behalf of NAFO, the EEC had made a high level demarche in Washington. The USA had indicated that its vessels had taken only 3 000 tons in 1989 and the USA was considering joining NAFO. No USA vessels had fished in the Regulatory Area in 1991.

**Korea**

Korea had reported catches of 24 000 tons of various species in the Regulatory Area in 1990.

**Malta**

Maltese authorities said they did not know that one of their vessels had been fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area and would be prepared to withdraw its license. Its activities had not been significant.

### **St. Vincents and the Grenadines**

There had not been a positive response from authorities who simply took note of the problem.

- 4.3 The EEC representative concluded that Korea and Panama appeared to be the biggest problem.
- 4.4 The Chairman stated that whilst no further action would be needed with respect to the Cayman Islands and Malta, Contracting Parties would have to approach Korea, Panama and Venezuela again.
- 4.5 The Canadian representative stated that the responses to the EEC's efforts were consistent with those elicited by Canada, and reported on Canada's efforts as follows:

#### **Panama**

Canada had made a joint demarche in Brussels with the EEC. In its bilateral efforts Canada had provided photos and computer generated data to Panamanian authorities who undertook to impose sanctions and had de-registered 2 vessels. They had been provided with evidence in respect of 10 vessels. Follow-up would be needed. Canada's Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, was going to Panama on 10 April 1992 and would meet with Panamanian Ministers. The outcome of his visit would be shared with NAFO Contracting Parties.

#### **Venezuela**

A follow up demarche could include surveillance data to assist Venezuela to carry out measures it had undertaken in response to the first demarche.

#### **Korea**

Bilateral contacts disclosed the complexity of the situation. Korea Licensed 5 vessels to fish in the Regulatory Area - 3 Korean and 2 Panamanian. Korean authorities had stated that one vessel, thought to have been Korean, was owned and predominantly crewed by Moroccan nationals. Korea had undertaken to withdraw 1 of the 5 licenses by June 1992 and another in 1993. Similar promises had been made before without result and there was no guarantee that vessels whose licences had been withdrawn would not continue to fish in the Regulatory Area. Korea had reported 22 967 tons had been caught in the Regulatory Area in 1991 (Canada's estimate was 24 200 tons), mainly redfish and sole and a small amount of cod. However, neither the number of vessels nor total catches had been substantially reduced from previous years.

#### **Honduras**

One vessel with a Korean crew had been sighted. A demarche should therefore be made to Honduras.

### Morocco

If the vessel thought to have been Korean was Moroccan, a demarche should be made to Morocco.

### St. Vincents and the Grenadines

It appeared that the vessel that had been flying the St. Vincent flag had been reflagged to Sierra Leone.

### Sierra Leone

It appears that Sierra Leone had become a "fallback" flag for Korean vessels. A demarche should therefore be made to Sierra Leone.

### Cayman Islands, Malta, USA

No vessels of these states had been sighted. The USA was taking steps to enable it to join NAFO should it choose to do so. It was not clear what the USA decision would be.

- 4.6 A brief discussion ensued regarding Korean licensing procedures. It was agreed that Korea did not exercise effective control over the activities of its nationals in the Regulatory Area.
- 4.7 The Japanese representative reported that Japan had received a reply from Korea in January 1992 indicating that Korea would withdraw 1 vessel from the NAFO Regulatory Area by June 1992 and would limit the future sending of crew for replacement of crew on board the 5 vessels currently fishing under Korean license in the Area, including the 2 reflagged vessels.
- 4.8 The representative of Denmark supported the idea of new diplomatic demarches to non-Contracting Parties, and proposed to develop new texts of Aide-Memoires for such countries as Panama, Venezuela, and Korea, and to send the Aide-Memoires along the lines of the old text to new countries fishing in the Regulatory Area.
- 4.9 Further discussion followed on the Korean problem. The Executive Secretary drew attention to the fact he had not received any communication from Korea. The EEC representative suggested that the NAFO demarche should be followed up bilaterally in order to demonstrate to Korea the importance the Contracting Parties attach to the problem. He suggested Contracting Parties carry out a joint initiative before the Annual Meeting. He also said Panama and Venezuela should be approached again to express concern at the lack of action. He suggested the new joint demarches should contain stronger language. It was agreed new demarches would be made. A drafting group was asked to prepare a set of demarches to the new non-Contracting Parties whose vessels had been sighted for the first time in 1991 and 1992, second round texts for Panama and Venezuela and a text for Korea that expressed concern with Korea's practice of licensing vessels to fish in the Regulatory Area.

- 4.10 Drafts produced by a working group comprising representatives from Canada, Japan and the EEC were discussed as they became available throughout the meeting. It was agreed that the demarche to Morocco would be held in abeyance to be executed only if a Moroccan vessel reappeared in the Regulatory Area in 1992. Canada undertook to inform the Executive Secretary of such sighting.
- 4.11 The Executive Secretary undertook to circulate the agreed texts (Annex 8) to Contracting Parties for comments and approval by mail vote and indication as to which non-Contracting Parties each would agree to approach. The meeting unanimously requested the Executive Secretary to handle the matter expeditiously. It was agreed that on the basis of brief reports by Contracting Parties to the Executive Secretary, the Rapporteur would prepare a draft report on the results of the demarches.

#### **5. Report by the Executive Secretary on his Contacts with Non-Contracting Parties Regarding Fishing by Their Vessels in the Regulatory Area**

- 5.1 The Executive Secretary indicated that his report (Working Paper 92/1) contained a full account of his activities on this subject. The Moroccan vessel referred to earlier had not been sighted in the Regulatory Area in 1992. It had been indicated that the owner had been reprimanded by Moroccan authorities and would not be authorized to return in 1992. Finland and Estonia had sought information on providing the Finnish flag to Estonian vessels to fish in the Regulatory Area. The Executive Secretary had sent letters to the Finnish agent and to the Finnish Ambassador to Canada explaining the role of NAFO and discouraging these plans.
- 5.2 In the discussion that followed it was noted that it was evident that non-Contracting Party vessels were supplying fish for sale in Contracting Party markets. The representative of Denmark restated that Denmark does not supply its market with fish product from non-Contracting Parties fishing in the Regulatory Area. He further suggested that NAFO needs some sort of "brain storming" for elaboration of positive suggestions and ideas to deal with this problem.

#### **6. Examination of Methods of Improving the Reporting of Catches, Transshipment, etc., and Landings from the Regulatory Area by Non-Contracting Parties**

- 6.1 The Chairman opened the discussion, pointing out that the catch estimates tabled by Canada gave a starting point for consideration of the volume of catches of each non-Contracting Party and import data from non-Contracting Parties was also available for some Contracting Parties. While there was no direct evidence to show how much of the cod the EEC, for example, imported from Panama had been caught in the NAFO Regulatory Area, it seemed probable that most Panamanian cod did in fact come from the NAFO Regulatory Area. It was noted that flag of convenience non-Contracting Parties probably did not collect catch statistics for their vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area and therefore could provide none. It was agreed that while caution should be exercised not to confer legitimacy on the activity of non-Contracting Party vessels in the Regulatory Area, non-Contracting Parties should be asked to fulfil their Law of the Sea obligation to cooperate in the provision of statistics.



- 6.2 The Canadian representative pointed to the need to improve information on transshipment. For example, it would be useful to receive statistics on transshipment through St. Pierre and Miquelon. The EEC representative agreed that a standard format including information on transshipment would be desirable. The EEC would check its import statistics for imports from St. Pierre and Miquelon.
- 6.3 At the suggestion of the Canadian representative it was agreed to compile all statistical data into a single document showing each non-Contracting Party's vessels, total catches in the Regulatory and corresponding imports by Contracting Parties (Annex 9). This document would be appended to the Committee's report to the General Council and could, in addition to providing an overview of non-Contracting Party activity, prove useful to the work of the Scientific Council.

**7. Examination of Options Open to Contracting Parties to Dissuade Their Nationals from Fishing in the Regulatory Area Under Non-Contracting Party Flags and to Discourage Such Activities Where They Are Currently Taking Place**

- 7.1 The Canadian representative reported that Canada would make efforts to include in any future relevant legislation measures to deal with the problem should it arise with respect to Canadian vessels. It had not hitherto been a problem in Canada. Canada had been involved in recommending that provisions addressing this problem be included in the new North Pacific anadromous species convention, in the NASCO convention and in the Living Marine Resources text being developed in the UN Conference on Environment and Development. The Chairman offered the view that this subject was at the heart of STACFAC deliberations.
- 7.2 The EEC representative agreed that this was an increasingly important issue that was also being considered in NASCO and ICCAT. While it was a priority for the EEC, it was not an easy problem to solve and posed serious impediments to the implementation of the EEC fisheries policy. The EEC was examining ways of preventing nationals of its member states from contravening conservation regulations since under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) states were responsible for controlling the activities of their nationals.
- 7.3 The Danish representative agreed that states had to control their nationals and reported that Denmark had unsuccessfully tried to solve the problem in the NASCO context.
- 7.4 The Canadian representative suggested that one way to deal with the problem would be to withdraw fishermen's privileges such as port access. Delegates agreed that effective domestic solutions would have to be found.

**8. Examination of Landing Declaration System to Collect Data on Landing of Catches by Non-Contracting Party Vessels in the Regulatory Area (for possible implementation in 1992)**

- 8.1 Discussion opened with a review of the purpose of the paper annexed to the EEC proposal (Working Paper 92/26 at the 13th Annual Meeting) - whether it was intended to record the volume of imports into the territories of Contracting Parties for

statistical purposes alone or to provide a record of non-Contracting Party vessel catches in the Regulatory Area to establish a link to the point of importation.

- 8.2 In response to the Danish delegate's concern that inclusion of the word "statistical" in the title of the form could be misinterpreted as an indication that the form is unimportant, it was agreed to amend the form by inserting an explanation into the first footnote. (Annex 10)
- 8.3 Discussion also focussed on which domestic authorities would be responsible for administering the system. It was noted that the form was drafted with customs administration in mind but that fisheries inspectors could also be involved if necessary.
- 8.4 With respect to its scope, it was agreed the declaration would be required only of non-Contracting Party vessels whose flag state had not provided catch statistics to NAFO.
- 8.5 With respect to implementing the system, the EEC representative explained that to be effective given its purpose, the system should be simple, non-discriminatory and be used to document the link between non-Contracting Parties fishing in the Regulatory Area and the species being caught. The Canadian representative added that another crucial link was the point of landing. She concluded that the meeting should agree on a common understanding of the purpose of the declaration. Contracting Parties should consult domestic authorities on how to implement the system and distribute the form to those who will be asked to submit it.
- 8.6 Discussion on potential problems posed by transshipment elicited comments that:
- fish are the product of the flag state of the vessel;
  - the master of the vessel that catches the fish must fill out the form, sign it and it must accompany the shipment into the Contracting Party port;
  - if the form is not filled out by the master of the catcher vessel, the master of the transport vessel would fill it out to present on landing;
  - customs authorities should have no difficulty in dealing with transshipment;
  - Japan does not generally permit direct landings by foreign vessels in its ports and transshipments must be reloaded in port, not at sea. Thereupon the fish are considered the product of the country where they were reloaded.
- 8.7 On scope and implementation it was suggested that,
- no system is perfect; STACFAC should try to recommend the best possible system that will work;
  - since there will be no trade penalties for reporting catches from the Regulatory Area, there will be no incentive to evade producing the landing declaration;

- product coverage should include raw fish and processed products to the frozen fillet stage;
- trade between non-Contracting Parties would not be captured;
- the system could be a useful tool for management and cooperation in the NAFO Regulatory Area; if adopted the system would be a NAFO obligation and should be implemented by all Contracting Parties;
- if the General Council adopts the recommendation to implement the system, this would be communicated to the non-Contracting Parties that had not provided requested statistics;
- the system should be consistent with international law and the GATT, should not disrupt trade and should simply be used to collect statistical information for a clear conservation purpose.

#### **9. Preparation of Comprehensive Report to the General Council and Recommendations on Measures to Resolve the Problem**

- 9.1 The Committee discussed the text of a draft report to the General Council prepared by the Chairman and agreed that the Chairman prepare a revision including comments of the Contracting Parties (Annex 11). This was a first attempt at the outline of a Report and will be subject to correction and revision in the light of an analysis of catch estimates and import data (Annex 9) and of further information which might become available at the next STACFAC meeting. The report sets out clearly the information gathered to date, the need for further work, areas of agreement between the parties and current undertakings. The report will be finalized at the next STACFAC meeting in September, once the second round of diplomatic representations has been completed. Canada agreed to prepare a compilation of non-Contracting Party catches and Contracting Party import statistics and draw any apparent inferences.

#### **10. Other Business and Adjournment**

- 10.1 There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 1240 hrs on 9 April 1992.

## Annex 1. List of Participants

### CANADA

#### Head of Delegation

L. Forand, International Fisheries Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, 14th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

A. Donohue, International Fisheries Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

J. Fitchett, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario

B. Mayne, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Center, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

### DENMARK (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

#### Head of Delegation

O. Loewe, Danish Embassy, 85 Range Rd., Apt. 702, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 8J6

### EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

#### Head of Delegation

H. Koster, Commission of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels

T. Abadia, Commission of the European Communities, 200 rue de la Loi, B-1049 Brussels

S. Kristensen, Council of the European Communities, 170 rue de la Loi, B-1048 Brussels

G. F. Kingston, Delegation of the Commission of the European Communities, 350 Sparks St., Suite 1110, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1R 7S8

A. A. Machado Leite, Direcçao Geral das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa, Portugal

A. I. Pereira, Embassy of Portugal, 645 Island Park Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1Y 0B8

M. I. Aragon, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritime, Ortega y Gasset 57, Madrid, Spain

C. C. Southgate, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Nobel House, Rm 428, Smith Square, London, United Kingdom

### JAPAN

#### Head of Delegation

K. Hanafusa, Deputy Director, International Affairs Div., Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

T. Hasegawa, Japan Fisheries Association, Suite 1101 Duke Tower, 5251 Duke Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

M. Okuno, Trade and Marketing Div., Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

M. Yoshida, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association, 601 Yasuda Bldg., 3-6 Kanda, Ogawa-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

### POLAND

#### Head of Delegation

J. Stremlau, Consul, Trade Commissioners Office of Poland, 3501 Ave du Musee, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 2C8

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

A. Mikhailov, Representative of the Russian Federation on Fisheries in Canada, 2074 Robie Street, Ste. 2202-3, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3

Y. I. Videneev, 2074 Robie Street, Ste. 2202-3, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3

**NAFO SECRETARIAT**

L. I. Chepel, Executive Secretary

T. Amaratunga, Assistant Executive Secretary

B. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary

## Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chairman, C. C. Southgate (EEC)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. National reports on fishing activities of vessels of non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (including details on the type, flag of vessels and reported or estimated catches by species and area)
5. Consideration of statistics submitted by Contracting Parties on their imports of groundfish species regulated by NAFO from non-Contracting Parties whose vessels fish in the Regulatory Area (including details on the quantities by species landed, transhipped and countries and ports through which the product may be shipped)
6. National reports on the results of the Aide-Memoire (for joint diplomatic demarches) dispatches to non-Contracting Parties and proposals for follow-up action
7. Report by the Executive Secretary on his contacts with non-Contracting Parties regarding fishing by their vessels in the Regulatory Area
8. Examination of methods of improving the reporting of catches, transshipments, etc. and landings from the Regulatory Area by non-Contracting Parties
9. Examination of options open to Contracting Parties to dissuade their nationals from engaging in fishing activities in the Regulatory Area under non-Contracting Party flags and to discourage such activities where they are presently taking place
10. Examination of a landing declaration system to collect data on landing of catches by non-Contracting Party vessels in the Regulatory Area (for possible implementation in 1992)
11. Preparation of a comprehensive report to the General Council and recommendations on measures to resolve the problem
12. Other business
13. Adjournment

### Annex 3. Canadian Report on Non-Contracting Parties Fishing Activities in the NAFO Regulatory Area - 1991

#### 1.0 Introduction

This report examines the activities of NAFO non-Contracting Party vessels that fish groundfish species in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The report attempts to distinguish between "non-Contracting Party vessels", such as those from Korea or the USA and reflagged vessels, generally crewed by western Europeans.

The information sources for this report are Canadian air surveillance and courtesy boardings<sup>1</sup> conducted by Canadian officials on non-Contracting Party vessels. Catch reports to NAFO are used in the case of USA vessels.

#### 2.0 Fleet Profile

During the 1985-91 period, approximately 200 NAFO Contracting Party vessels fished groundfish in the Regulatory Area on an annual basis. By comparison, the annual presence of non-Contracting Party vessels increased from 11 in 1984 to 35 - 45 for the 1985 - 91 period. Table 1 provides a full summary of groundfish vessels for the 1985-91 period.

TABLE 1. Number of vessels fishing for groundfish in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1985 to 1991.

	Year						
	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
<b>Contracting Parties - Total</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>218<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>220<sup>a,b</sup></b>
Caymen Islands	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Korea	1	1	1	3	5	6 <sup>c</sup>	3
Mauritania	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Malta	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Morocco	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Panama (Korean crewed)	4	3	4	5	5	2	2
(European crewed)	4	5	8	15	19	22	23
Mexico/Chile	6	4	6	4	0	0	0
Sierra Leone	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
St. Vincents	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
USA	14	15	9	11	14	9	0
Venezuela	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
<b>Non-Contracting Parties - Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>254</b>

<sup>a</sup> Preliminary data.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes thirteen (13) and nine (9) Norwegian vessels that fished exclusively for capelin in 1990 and 1991 respectively.

<sup>c</sup> May include a squid fishing vessel registered in Taiwan (Hes Wen No. 1).

<sup>1</sup> Non-Contracting Party vessels are not subject to NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures and, therefore, are not required to permit NAFO inspectors on board.

The 1991 non-Contracting Party fleet included 25 crewed by Western Europeans (6 pair trawlers, 13 single trawlers) and 9 crewed by Koreans. No USA groundfish vessels<sup>1</sup> were sighted in the NAFO Regulatory Area during 1991.

Table 2 provides a list of non-Contracting Party vessels and crew nationalities that fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991.

TABLE 2. Non-Contracting Party vessels and crew nationalities that fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area during 1991.

Western European	Korean	USA
Colombo III - Panama	Marsopla - Panama	NIL
Columbo IV - Panama	Peona #9 - Panama	
Columbo V - Panama	Golden Venture - Korea	
Columbo VI - Panama	Puk Yang II - Korea	
Columbo VII - Panama	Sam Won Ho - Korea	
Columbo VIII - Panama	Great Splendor - Sierra Leone	
Anita I - Panama	Hao Quang #3 - St. Vincent's	
Elly I - Panama	Danica - Honduras	
Pescamex III - Panama	Ein Chanech - Morocco	
Pescamex IV - Panama		
Pescagel - Venezuela		
Bacanova - Venezuela		
Alpes II - Panama		
Leone - Panama		
Santa Joana - Panama		
Cidade de Aveiro - Panama		
Espadarte - Panama		
Porto Santo - Panama		
Amazones - Panama		
Classic Belair - Panama		
Tierra de Lemos - Panama		
Porto de Aveiro - Panama		
Rio Gabriel - Panama		
Leone III - Panama		
Izarra - Panama		

<sup>1</sup> Prior to 1985, there were no observations of USA groundfish vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Since 1985, an average of 12 USA vessels have been sighted in the NAFO Regulatory Area on an annual basis. This average is believed accurate. However, due to the nature of fishing trips (4-6 days in the NAFO Regulatory Area) and air surveillance deployment strategies, it is conceivable that the average could be higher.



### 3.0 Catch Statistics

#### 3.1 Method of determining catch statistics

In the absence of catch reports to NAFO, the catch statistics for each non-Contracting Party are obtained from logbooks/verbal conversations with masters during courtesy boardings combined with an estimate for non-inspected periods. Estimated statistics represent a "best estimate" of vessel activity and catches.

The catch estimate methodology involves four (4) basic procedures:

- 1) Calculation of Total Logged Catch and Effort obtained during courtesy boardings on a nation by nation basis for all NAFO divisions and species. This provides the total "logged" catch for each nation, as well as blended or overall year-to-date catch rates for each fishery.
- 2) Calculation of Effort not obtained during courtesy boardings on a vessel by vessel basis through the application of formulas that estimate effort between surveillance sighting dates. This effort calculation is then summarized by nation to provide total estimated effort by division for non-inspected periods.
- 3) Calculation of Non-Inspected Catch through the application of the blended catch rates calculated in Procedure I applied to the non-inspected effort calculated in Procedure II to provide estimated catch on a nation, division and species basis.
- 4) Combination of "Logged" and Estimated Catch and Effort to provide total catch and effort by nation, division and species.

**NOTE:** Present sighting ratios for fishing vessels are once for each 12 days fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The formulas calculate effort on the basic assumption that vessels have remained in the Regulatory Area between sighting dates. This assumption is consistent with comparisons drawn between sighting dates and inspected catch records. Additionally, the formulas reduce effort by 15% to account for fishing vessel downtime.

#### 3.2 Overview - 1991

During 1991, 254 groundfish vessels fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Eight of these nations are NAFO Contracting Parties and accounted for 220 vessels. Seven (7) non-Contracting Parties accounted for the remaining 34 groundfish vessels.

In 1991, it is estimated that non-Contracting Parties caught 47 300 tons of groundfish consisting of 11 600 tons of cod, 17 050 tons of redfish, 11 650 tons of flounder, 6 150 tons of Greenland Halibut and 850 tons of various other species. Tables 3 and 4 give a breakdown of catch for each non-Contracting Party which fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991.

TABLE 3. Groundfish catches of non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991.

Non-Contracting Parties	No. of vessels	Effort (days)	Catch (tons)	C/R
Honduras	1	225	4 000	17.7
Korea	3	550	7 400	13.4
Morocco	1	60	600	10.0
Panama - European	23	2 200	22 000	10.0
- Korean	2	400	7 000	17.5
Sierra Leone	1	225	3 200	14.2
St. Vincents	1	200	2 000	10.0
Venezuela	2	125	1 100	8.8
Sub-Total (European)	25	2 300	23 100	10.0
(Korean)	9	1 700	24 200	14.2
Overall Total	34	4 000	47 300	11.8

TABLE 4. Groundfish catches (by species) of non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991.

Non-Contracting Parties	Estimated catch (tons)					Total
	Cod	Redfish	Flounder	Greenland halibut	Other	
Honduras	200	3 200	600			4 000
Korea	600	3 750	2 850	50	150	7 400
Morocco			600			600
Panama - European	9 200	4 800	1 400	6 100	500	22 000
Panama - Korean	100	2 300	4 500		100	7 000
Sierra Leone	300	1 500	1 350		50	3 200
St. Vincent's	100	1 500	350		50	2 000
Venezuela	1 100					1 100
Total	11 600	17 050	11 650	6 150	850	47 300

*Explanatory Notes:*

Catch information is generally provided verbally by master(s) and, therefore, the separation of catches on a divisional basis cannot always be completed accurately. In 1991, it is believed that

all (95%) flounder catches were taken in Div. 3N and 3O, cod catches were primarily (60 - 70%) from Div. 3L and 3M, Greenland halibut catches were primarily (90%) from Div. 3L and redfish catches were split between Div. 3L, 3M and 3N.

### 3.3 Catch Overview - 1984-91

Since 1984, there has been an increase in the amount of effort by all nations fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Non-Contracting Party activity increased dramatically from 840 days in 1984 to 4 400 days in 1990 and 4 000 days in 1991. Non-Contracting Party catches increased from 12 000 tons in 1984 to 30 000 tons in 1987, 46 800 tons in 1990, and 47 300 tons in 1991.

From 1984 to 1991 Non-Contracting Parties used an average of 33 fishing vessels per year in the NAFO Regulatory Area. These vessels fished for an average of 2 760 days catching approximately 31 200 tons of groundfish, an average catch per day of 11 tons (Table 5). Except for 1986, the estimated groundfish catches have increased in every year during the 1984-91 period.

The yearly average of 31 200 tons of groundfish caught by non-Contracting Parties consisted of a yearly average of 7 700 tons of cod, 13 200 tons of redfish, 8 200 tons of flounder, 1 200 tons of Greenland halibut, 870 tons of various "other" species.

TABLE 5. Fishing activity of Non-Contracting Parties fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1984 to 1991.

Year	No. of different vessels	Estimated effort (days)	Estimated catch (tons)
1984	11	840	12 000
1985	30	1 730	23 500
1986	30	2 030	19 300
1987	29	2 640	29 400
1988	41	3 130	35 200
1989	47	3 290	35 400
1990	44	4 420	46 800
1991	34	4 000	47 300

TABLE 6. Groundfish catches (by species) of non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1984 to 1991.

Year	Estimated catch (tons)					Total
	Cod	Redfish	Flounder	Greenland halibut	Other	
1984	3 800	0	8 200	0	0	12 000
1985	7 100	500	15 300	0	600	23 500
1986	4 500	0	14 600	0	200	19 300
1987	5 400	20 900	3 100	0	0	29 400
1988	7 800	23 500	3 000	0	900	35 200
1989	5 900	24 000	4 500	0	1 000	35 400
1990	15 400	19 400	5 300	3 300	3 400	46 800
1991	11 600	17 050	11 650	6 150	850	47 300

### 3.3.1 USA

From 1984 to 1990 an average of ten (10) USA vessels per year fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area. These vessels averaged 320 fishing days and 2 785 tons of groundfish (primarily flounder species) per year over the seven (7) years. No USA groundfish vessels were observed in 1991. Attachment I outlines USA fishing activity for 1984-90.

### 3.3.2 St. Vincents (Korean crew)

A St. Vincent's-registered vessel fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area during the 1988-91 period catching an average of 2 300 tons of groundfish in 150 days.

### 3.3.3 Cayman Islands (Korean crew)

From 1984 to 1990 one (1) vessel (Marsopla) fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area catching an average of 2 700 tons in 170 days. In 1991, the Marsopla transferred registry to Panama.

### 3.3.4 Korea

During the years 1984 to 1991, an average of three (3) Korean vessels fished the NAFO Regulatory Area. Attachment II outlines the Korean fishing activity for 1984-91.

### 3.3.5 Malta (Korean Crew)

In 1989 and 1990, one (1) Maltese vessel was observed fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area catching an estimated 1 100 tons per year. No Maltese vessels were sighted in 1991.

### 3.3.6 Panama (West European and Korean crews)

During the years 1984 to 1991 an average of nineteen (19) Panamanian-registered vessels per year fished in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The number of vessels has risen from a low of ten (10) in 1984 to a high of twenty-five (25) in 1991. Panamanian flagged vessels averaged 17 924 tons of groundfish in 1 725 fishing days for each of the past eight (8) years. Attachment III outlines Panamanian fishing activity for 1984-91.

### 3.3.7 Mauritania (European crew)

One (1) Mauritanian vessel operated in the NAFO Regulatory Area during 1986, 1988 and 1989.

### 3.3.8 Venezuela (Western European)

In 1990 and 1991, one (1) Venezuelan pair trawler (Bascanova/Pescagel) was observed fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. It is estimated that this vessel caught an average of 850 tons of cod in each year.

**Attachment I. USA fishing activity and groundfish catches (by species)  
in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1984 to 1990.**

USA fishing activity			
Year	No. of different vessels	Estimated effort (days)	Catch reported to NAFO (tons)
1984	0	0	0
1985	14	370	5 531
1986	15	380	5 770
1987	9	580	3 345
1988	11	560	2 868
1989	14	330	1 956
1990	9	20	27

USA groundfish - estimated catch (tons)					
Year	Cod	Redfish	Flounder	Other	Total
1984	0	0	0	0	0
1985	84	85	5 362	0	5 531
1986	315	4	5 451	0	5 770
1987	217	0	3 128	0	3 345
1988	266	0	2 602	0	2 868
1989	111	---	1 749	96	1 956
1990	---	---	---	0	27

**Attachment II. Korean fishing activity and groundfish catches (by species)  
in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1984 to 1991.**

Korean fishing activity			
Year	No. of different vessels	Estimated effort (days)	Estimated catch (tons)
1984	1	240	4 900
1985	1	220	3 400
1986	1	210	3 200
1987	1	220	3 000
1988	3	130	2 100
1989	5	620	11 800
1990	6	1 000	17 200
1991	3	550	7 400

Korean groundfish - estimated catch (tons)					
Year	Cod	Redfish	Flounder	Other	Total
1984	300	0	4 600	0	4 900
1985	0	0	3 300	100	3 400
1986	100	0	3 100	0	3 200
1987	0	2 000	1 000	0	3 000
1988	0	1 800	200	0	2 000
1989	0	10 800	1 000	0	11 800
1990	5 900	7 700	3 400	200	17 200
1991	600	3 750	2 850	200	7 400

**Attachment III. Panamanian fishing activity and groundfish catches (by species)  
in the NAFO Regulatory Area from 1984 to 1991.**

Panamanian fishing activity			
Year	No. of different vessels	Estimated effort (days)	Estimated catch (tons)
1984	10	600	7 100
1985	14	1 050	15 700
1986	12	1 230	12 000
1987	18	1 570	18 900
1988	24	2 150	24 500
1989 <sup>a</sup>	24	1 850	14 500
1990 <sup>a</sup>	24	2 700	21 700
1991 <sup>a</sup>	25	2 600	29 000

Panamanian groundfish - estimated catch (tons)						
Year	Cod	Redfish	Flounder	Greenland halibut	Other	Total
1984	3 500	0	3 600	0	0	7 100
1985	7 000	400	8 100	0	200	15 700
1986	4 200	0	7 800	0	0	12 000
1987	5 300	13 600	0	0	0	18 900
1988	7 500	16 100	0	0	900	24 500
1989 <sup>a</sup>	5 700	6 500	1 400	0	900	14 500
1990 <sup>a</sup>	8 900	6 300	0	3 300	3 200	21 700
1991 <sup>a</sup>	9 300	7 100	5 900	6 100	600	29 000

<sup>a</sup> Includes four (4) trawlers formerly registered in Mexico/Chile.



**Annex 4. EEC Report on Activity of Non-Contracting Parties in the  
NAFO Regulatory Area in 1991**

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
LEONE III Vessel no: 18599-LP Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: GO	01-09-1991 1045 N4358 W05008 Area: N3N-I	Drifting
IZARRA Vessel no: PAN-xx Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	01-09-1991 1715 N4339 W05047 Area: N3N-I	Fishing
PEONIA Vessel no: 9 Call sign: 0 Nat: PAN Gear: TT	03-09-1991 1114 N4325 W04918 Area: N3N-I	Hauling
COLOMBO VI Vessel no: HP-5140 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TS	06-09-1991 1335 N4706 W04443 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
COLOMBO V Vessel no: HP-5141 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TS	06-09-1991 1335 N4706 W04443 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
ELLY Vessel no: HP-4689 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TS	06-09-1991 1314 N4704 W04444 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
ANITA Vessel no: HP-4690 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	06-09-1991 1314 N4704 W04444 Area: N3M-I	Fishing

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
ELLY Vessel no: HP-4689 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	08-09-1991 1025 N4646 W04442 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
ANITA Vessel no: HP-4690 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	08-09-1991 1025 N4642 W04442 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
COLOMBO VI Vessel no: HP-5140 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	08-09-1991 1015 N4643 W04441 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
COLOMBO V Vessel no: HP-5141 Call sign: Nat: PAN Gear: TT	08-09-1991 1015 N4643 W04441 Area: N3M-I	Fishing
Nat: KOREA, REPUBLIC Area: N3N-I		
GOLDEN VENTURE Vessel no: Call sign: 6MAN Ves. type: TT	23-09-1991 1000 UTC N4344 W05020	Fishing
HO QUANG Vessel no: NO-3 Call sign: Ves. type: TT	24-09-1991 1034 UTC N4333 W04918	Fishing

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
Nat: PANAMA Area: N3M-I		
SANTA JOANA Vessel no: 1073-LP Call sign: Ves. type: TT	30-09-1991 0925 UTC N4700 W04347	Fishing
ANITA I Vessel no: PAN-1 Call sign: HP4690 Ves. type: TT	02-10-1991 1556 UTC N4707 W04511	Fishing
ELLY Vessel no: PAN-2 Call sign: HP4684 Ves. type: TT	02-10-1991 1556 UTC N4707 W04511	Fishing
COLOMBO VIII Vessel no: Call sign: Ves. type: TT	02-10-1991 1418 UTC N4702 W04458	Fishing
COLOMBO VII Vessel no: Call sign: Ves. type: TT	02-10-1991 1418 UTC N4702 W04458	Fishing
AMAZONAS Vessel no: 19776-LP Call sign: HP-5620 Ves. type: TS	04-10-1991 1217 UTC N4642 W04413	Fishing
CLASSIC BEL AIR Vessel no: 19855-LP Call sign: 3EAB8 Ves. type: TT	04-10-1991 1301 UTC N4639 W04419	Fishing

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
--------	-----------------------	---------

Nat: PANAMA

Area: N3N-I

TERRA DE LEMOS

Vessel no: Z0935-PEXT

23-09-1991

Fishing

Call sign: 6318-HP

1630 UTC

Ves. type: TT

N4333 W05031

IZARRA I

Vessel no: 20069LPEXT

24-09-1991

Fishing

Call sign: HP 5826

1820 UTC

Ves. type: TT

N4345 W04917

Nat: PANAMA

Area: N3L-I

PESCAMEX III

Vessel no: PAN-1

28-09-1991

Steaming

Call sign: HP 5562

1118 UTC

Ves. type: TT

N4711 W04716

PESCAMEX IV

Vessel no: PAN-2

28-09-1991

Steaming

Call sign: HP 5563

1118 UTC

Ves. type: TT

N4711 W04716

Nat: HONDURAS

Area: N3O-I

DANICA

Vessel no: HND-1

17-10-1991

Fishing

Call sign: HQID4

0925 UTC

Ves. type: TT

N4317 W05128

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
Nat: KOREA, REPUBLIC Area: N3N-1		
-----		
GOLDEN VENTURE		
Vessel no: KOR-2	18-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: GMAU	1640 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4247 W05011	
-----		
GOLDEN VENTURE		
Vessel no: KOR-2	20-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: GMAU	0955 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4347 W05018	
-----		
Nat: PANAMA Area: N3N-1		
-----		
IZARRA 1		
Vessel no: 20935-PEXT	18-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign:	1134 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4335 W05051	
-----		
PEONIA 9		
Vessel no: PAN-3	18-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: 3EGZ7	1757 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4250 W04957	
-----		
CLASSIC BEL AIR		
Vessel no: 19655LP	19-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign:	1035 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4355 W04933	
-----		
ELLY		
Vessel no: PAN-1	19-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: HP-4684	1010 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4357 W04930	
-----		
ANITA		
Vessel no: PAN-2	19-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: HP-4690	1010 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4357 W04930	
-----		

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
TERRA DE LEMOS		
Vessel no: 20936-PEXT	25-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: 6318-HP	0949 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4338 W05040	
Nat: SIERRA LEONE		
Area: N3N-I		
HAO QUANG NR3		
Vessel no: SLE-1	18-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: 9LGJH	1632 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4250 W05009	
GREAT SPLENDOR		
Vessel no: SLE-1	18-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: 9LFZT	1632 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4250 W05009	
Nat: HONDURAS		
Area: N3N-I		
DANICA		
Vessel no: HND-1	14-10-1991	Fishing
Call sign: HQID4	2104 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4247 W05013	
Nat: KOREA, REPUBLIC		
Area: N3N-I		
PUK YANG NR11		
Vessel no: KOR-1	14-10-1991	Steaming
Call sign: DTUV	1935 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4252 W04959	

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
Nat: PANAMA Area: N3M-I		
COLOMBO VI Vessel no: PAN-4 Call sign: HP-5140 Ves. type: TT	21-10-1991 1357 UTC N4656 W04450	Fishing
COLOMBO V Vessel no: PAN-5 Call sign: HP-5141 Ves. type: TT	21-10-1991 1357 UTC N4656 W04450	Fishing
ESPADARTE Vessel no: PAN-6 Call sign: HP-5129 Ves. type: GO	21-10-1991 2009 UTC N4725 W04458	Fishing
COLOMBO VII Vessel no: PAN-7 Call sign: Ves. type: TT	22-10-1991 1155 UTC N4704 W04425	Fishing
COLOMBO VIII Vessel no: PAN-8 Call sign: Ves. type: TT	22-10-1991 1155 UTC N4704 W04425	Fishing
COLOMBO VI Vessel no: PAN-4 Call sign: HP-5140 Ves. type: TT	23-10-1991 1206 UTC N4704 W04426	Fishing
COLOMBO V Vessel no: PAN-5 Call sign: HP-5141 Ves. type: TT	23-10-1991 1206 UTC N4704 W04426	Fishing
TERRA DE LEMOS Vessel no: 20935-PEXT Call sign: 6318-HP Ves. type: TT	12-10-1991 1340 UTC N4335 W05045	Fishing

Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
ELLY Vessel no: PAN-1 Call sign: HP-4684 Ves. type: TT	13-10-1991 1047 UTC N4416 W04944	Fishing
ANITA Vessel no: PAN-2 Call sign: HP-4690 Ves. type: TT	13-10-1991 1047 UTC N4416 W04944	Fishing
PEONIA NR9 Vessel no: PAN-3 Call sign: 3EGZ7 Ves. type: TT	14-10-1991 1033 UTC N4318 W04924	Fishing
IZARRA 1 Vessel no: 20069-LPEXT Call sign: HP-5826 Ves. type: TT	15-10-1991 0931 UTC N4315 W05027	Fishing
TERRA DE LEMOS Vessel no: 20935-PEXT Call sign: 6318-HP Ves. type: TT	15-10-1991 1415 UTC N4336 W05031	Fishing
ELLY Vessel no: PAN-1 Call sign: HP-4684 Ves. type: TT	16-10-1991 1125 UTC N4437 W04917	Fishing
ANITA Vessel no: PAN-2 Call sign: HP-4690 Ves. type: TT	16-10-1991 1125 UTC N4437 W04917	Fishing
Nat: SIERRA LEONE Area: N3N-I		
HAO QUANG NR3 Vessel no: SLE-1 Call sign: 9LGJH Ves. type: TT	14-10-1991 1035 UTC N4317 W04923	Fishing



Vessel	Date/Time Position	Remarks
Nat: PANAMA Area: N3M-I		
-----		
CIDADE DE AVEIRO		
Vessel no: 20393-LP	07-11-1991	Fishing
Call sign:	1056 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4645 W04415	
-----		
COLOMBO		
Vessel no: PAN	05-11-1991	Fishing
Call sign: XXXX	1005 UTC	
Ves. type: TT	N4407 W04933	

## Annex 5. Canadian Report on Groundfish Imports from Non-Contracting Parties (January-December 1991)

Statistics Canada International Trade Division  
 Statistique Canada Division du Commerce International  
 Domestic Imports of Selected Commodities  
 Groundfish Imports by Non-NAFO Countries/Species/HS Code  
 Values in Canadian Dollars QTY(Tonnes) / Value (\$,000)  
 December 1991

Date: 25/03/92

	January to December, 1991			January to December, 1990			Total 1990		
	Quantity (Tonne)	Unit Val Value (\$,000) Per kg)		Quantity (Tonne)	Unit Val Value (\$,000) Per kg)		Quantity (Tonne)	Unit Val Value (\$,000) Per kg)	
Country: Sierra Leone									
Control 1 Total:	0	0	***.***	0	0	***.***	0	0	***.***
Country: Morocco									
Control 1 Total:	0	0	***.***	0	0	***.***	0	0	***.***
Country: Korea, South									
Species Code: Cod									
HS0304200030: Cod Fillets/Frozen	0	0	6.96	0	0	4.71	0	0	4.71
HS0304900011: Cod Blocks/Slabs/Frozen	0	0	***.***	2	10	5.75	2	10	5.75
HS0305620000: Cod Salted and/or in Brine	0	0	***.***	0	0	3.24	0	0	3.24
Control 2 Total:	0	0	6.96	2	10	5.52	2	10	5.52
Species Code: Haddock									
HS0303720000: Haddock Frozen/Whole/Dressed	1	5	4.51	0	0	***.***	0	0	***.***
HS0304900012: Haddock Blocks/Slabs/Frozen	0	0	***.***	1	7	5.95	1	7	5.95
Control 2 Total:	1	5	4.51	1	7	5.95	1	7	5.95
Species Code: Sole									
HS0304200023: Sole Fillets/Frozen	122	688	5.62	798	3 820	4.79	798	3 820	4.79
HS0304900015: Sole Blocks/Slabs/Frozen	35	158	4.50	182	816	4.49	182	816	4.49
Control 2 Total:	157	846	5.37	980	4 635	4.73	980	4 635	4.73
Species Code: Turbot									
HS0304900016: Turbot Blocks/Slabs/Frozen	0	0	***.***	0	0	3.77	0	0	3.77
Control 2 Total:	0	0	***.***	0	0	3.77	0	0	3.77
Species Code: Flatfish									
HS0304200029: Flatfish, Nes Fillets/Frozen	0	0	***.***	1	5	5.17	1	5	5.17
Control 2 Total:	0	0	***.***	1	5	5.17	1	5	5.17

	January to December, 1991			January to December, 1990			Total 1990		
	Quantity		Unit Val	Quantity		Unit Val	Quantity		Unit Val
	(Tonne)	(\$,000)	Per kg)	(Tonne)	(\$,000)	Per kg)	(Tonne)	(\$,000)	Per kg)
Country: Korea, South (Continued)									
Species Code: Pollock									
HS0304200060: Pollock Fillets/Frozen	392	1 328	3.38	139	338	2.43	139	338	2.43
HS0304900014: Pollock Blocks/Slabs/Frozen	454	1 716	3.78	136	321	2.36	136	321	2.36
Control 2 Total:	847	3 044	3.59	275	659	2.40	275	659	2.40
Control 1 Total:	1 005	3 895	3.87	1 259	5 318	4.22	1 259	5 318	4.22
Country: Venezuela									
Control 1 Total:	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**
Country: Honduras									
Control 1 Total:	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**
Country: Panama									
Control 1 Total:	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**	0	0	***.**
Grand Total:	1 005	3 895	3.87	1 259	5 318	4.22	1 259	5 318	4.22

**Annex 6. Japanese Report on Groundfish Imports from Non-Contracting Parties for January-December 1990 and January-October 1991.**

Non-Contracting Party	Amount of import (tons)									
	Redfish		Cod		Greenland halibut		American plaice		Others <sup>a</sup>	
	1990	1991	1990	1991	1990	1991	1990	1991	1990	1991
Cayman Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honduras	58	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	66	22
Korea	2 028	1 165	2	-	72	1 170	-	9	10 794	6 860
Mauritania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	124	-
Malta	16	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1 030	580
Morocco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	347	527
Panama	-	112	-	-	-	41	-	-	228	48
St. Vincents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
USA	20 521	7 689	33 975	19 024	7 950	4 345	-	1	32 024	38 025
Mexico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chile	125	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	6
Venezuela	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>a</sup> Witch flounder, Yellowtail flounder

NOTE: The figures are extracted from the trade statistics, but do not confirm the imports which were caught by Non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

**Annex 7. EEC Report on Groundfish Imports from Non-Contracting Parties during 1990 and 1991**

Non-Contracting Party	Amount of import ('000 kg)					
	Flatfish		Cod		Redfish	
	1990	1991	1990	1991	1990	1991
Panama	260	507	3 685	3 706	825	536
S. Korea	69	31	1 789	-	-	8
Venezuela	33	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	68	-	423	1	426	7
St. Vincents	372	325	-	-	-	-

CM codes:

Flatfish - 0303 31 and 39

Source: Eurostat

Cod - 0302 5010, 5090 and 6935  
0303 6010, 6090 and 7941

Redfish - 0302 69, 31 and 33  
0303 79, 35 and 37

## Annex 8. Draft Aide Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarches)

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was established in 1979 inter alia to implement obligations under international law regarding conservation and management of fishery resources in the Northwest Atlantic beyond the areas in which coastal states exercise fisheries jurisdiction, referred to as the "Regulatory Area" of NAFO.

In respect to the relevant provisions of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, all States have the duty to take, or to co-operate with other States in taking, such measures for their respective nationals as may be necessary for the conservation of the living resources of the high seas.

NAFO manages numerous important stocks of fish occurring in the NAFO Regulatory Area, including stocks that occur both within the 200-mile zone of the principal coastal state, Canada, and in the area beyond and adjacent to that zone. The NAFO Regulatory Area has been divided into alphanumeric divisions as described in the attached map. It sets Total Allowable Catch (TACs), quotas and other conservation measures for the NAFO Regulatory Area. Fisheries conducted in the NAFO Regulatory Area by vessels of countries that are not members of NAFO, and that are, therefore, operating outside the NAFO conservation regime, undermine that conservation regime and make NAFO stock maintenance objectives unattainable.

The number of vessels from non-member countries fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area has increased from 11 in 1984 to 34 in 1991. Total catches by such vessels are estimated to have steadily increased over the same period by about 70% and amount to approximately 40% of the total NAFO groundfish quotas in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

In the face of declining stocks, the increased presence of vessels from non-NAFO members represents a threat to the conservation of NAFO managed stocks. The TACs for key groundfish stocks, notably cod in division 3NO, American plaice in division 3LNO and redfish in division 3LN, have been significantly reduced over the past two years leading to reduced fishing opportunities for fishermen of NAFO member countries. As a result of these reductions, the fishing activities of the NAFO Contracting Parties and the fishing communities of the Parties dependent on such activities are undergoing an extremely difficult period.

### PARAGRAPHS REGARDING FISHING ACTIVITY OF SPECIFIC TARGET COUNTRY

#### HONDURAS:

One fishing vessel, the Danica, was observed in the NAFO Regulatory Area. As Honduras is not a NAFO Contracting Party, it has not received a quota in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Continued unregulated fishing outside the framework of the NAFO conservation regime is having an increasingly negative effect on the various stocks concerned.

NAFO is prepared, if Honduras wishes, to provide additional evidence of Honduran vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

## MOROCCO:

One fishing vessel, the Ein Chanech, was observed in the NAFO Regulatory Area. As Morocco is not a NAFO Contracting Party, it has not received a quota in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Continued unregulated fishing outside the framework of the NAFO conservation regime is having an increasingly negative effect on these significantly reduced stocks.

NAFO is prepared, if Morocco wishes, to provide additional evidence of Moroccan vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

## SIERRA LEONE:

Two vessels, the Hao Quang and the Great Splendor, were observed in the NAFO Regulatory Area. As Sierra Leone is not a NAFO Contracting Party, it has not received a quota in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Continued unregulated fishing outside the framework of the NAFO conservation regime is having an increasingly negative effect on the various stocks concerned.

NAFO is prepared, if Sierra Leone wishes, to provide additional evidence of Sierra Leone vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

The issue of non-member fishing activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area was addressed at the 1990 and 1991 Annual Meetings of NAFO. A resolution was passed (copy attached) by the General Council of NAFO which outlines possible steps for NAFO Contracting Parties to take to end this activity. The resolution underlines the concern of all NAFO members who view this activity as a serious threat to the conservation of stocks in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

The NAFO Standing Committee has met and is developing proposals for consideration at the annual NAFO Meeting in September 1992. Joint démarches made by NAFO members to all countries fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area who are not members of NAFO, reflect the seriousness of NAFO members' concern. In response to the earlier demarches, some non-Contracting Parties have already taken action to prevent fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Contracting Parties will be calling for all non-Contracting Parties whose vessels fish in the Regulatory Area to halt such activities without delay.

Pursuant to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, NAFO requests \_\_\_\_\_ to forward to the NAFO Secretariat catch and fishing effort statistics respecting fishing activity of their vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the end of 1991, which are required by NAFO scientists in assessing the state of NAFO managed stocks. Statlant forms 21A and 21B for reporting nominal catches and corresponding fishing effort, issued by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, should be used for this purpose.

In view of the threat to the conservation of fish stocks caused by non-Contracting Party vessels, all NAFO members request the Government of \_\_\_\_\_ to take all necessary measures to prevent any fishing by vessels registered in \_\_\_\_\_ contrary to NAFO conservation measures.

K. Yonezawa  
Chairman of the General Council  
President of the Northwest Atlantic  
Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

### Aide Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarche)

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was established in 1979 inter alia to implement obligations under international law regarding the conservation and management of fishery resources in the Northwest Atlantic beyond the areas in which coastal states exercise fisheries jurisdiction, referred to as the "Regulatory Area" of NAFO.

Following the joint diplomatic demarche made by the Contracting Parties of NAFO in September 1991, the Republic of Korea will already be aware of the continuing concern of NAFO Contracting Parties about fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area by vessels from countries that are not Contracting Parties to the NAFO Convention.

The NAFO Contracting Parties wish to express their concern that Korea is licensing vessels to fish in the NAFO Regulatory Area contrary to NAFO conservation measures and urge Korea to rescind all such licenses.

The NAFO Contracting Parties note the Korean authorities have undertaken to reduce the number of licensed vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Observed sightings confirm that Korean vessels are continuing to operate in the NAFO Regulatory Area and these activities are undermining NAFO conservation measures. A list of vessels sighted is attached. NAFO Contracting Parties would be grateful if Korea would inform them as to the measures Korea will take to halt the fishing activity of these vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

NAFO is prepared, if Korea wishes, to provide evidence of Korean vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

Pursuant to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, NAFO again requests Korea to forward to the NAFO Secretariat catch and fishing effort statistics respecting fishing activity of Korean vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the end of 1991, which are required by NAFO scientists in assessing the state of the NAFO managed stocks. Statlant forms 21A and 21B for reporting nominal catches and corresponding fishing effort, issued by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, should be used for this purpose.

In view of the threat to the conservation of fish stocks caused by non-Contracting Party vessels, the NAFO Contracting Parties are also considering the possibility of taking further actions against non-Contracting Parties fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The NAFO Contracting Parties urge Korea to take all necessary actions to prevent any fishing by Korean vessels contrary to NAFO conservation measures.

K. Yonezawa  
Chairman of the General Council  
President of the Northwest Atlantic  
Fisheries Organization (NAFO)



Korean vessels sighted in 1991 and 1992:

Golden Venture

Puk Yang II

Sam Won Ho

### Aide Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarche)

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was established in 1979 inter alia to implement obligations under international law regarding the conservation and management of fishery resources in the Northwest Atlantic beyond the areas in which coastal states exercise fisheries jurisdiction, referred to as the "Regulatory Area" of NAFO.

Following the joint diplomatic demarche made by the Contracting Parties of NAFO in July 1991, Panama will already be aware of the continuing concern of NAFO Contracting Parties about fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area by vessels from countries that are not Contracting Parties to the NAFO Convention.

The NAFO Contracting Parties are pleased that the Panamanian authorities have introduced resolution No. 603-04-151-ALCN encouraging owners of concerned vessels to comply with the NAFO conservation measures, and warning of sanctions for non-compliance with NAFO's conservation policy.

Observed sightings confirm that Panamanian vessels are continuing to operate in the NAFO Regulatory Area and these activities are undermining NAFO conservation measures. A list of the [26] vessels sighted in 1991 and 1992 is attached. Although Panama has not submitted any data to the NAFO Secretariat concerning catches, taking into account the number of vessels involved, it is considered that Panamanian fishing activities and catches are substantial. NAFO Contracting Parties would be grateful if Panama would inform them as to the measures Panama will take to halt the fishing activities of these vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

NAFO is prepared, if Panama wishes, to provide additional evidence of Panamanian vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

Pursuant to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, NAFO again requests Panama to forward to the NAFO Secretariat catch and fishing effort statistics respecting fishing activity of Panamanian vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the end of 1991, which are required by NAFO scientists in assessing the state of the NAFO managed stocks. Statlant forms 21A and 21B for reporting nominal catches and corresponding fishing effort, issued by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, should be used for this purpose.

In view of the threat to the conservation of fish stocks caused by non-Contracting Party vessels, the NAFO Contracting Parties are also considering the possibility of taking further actions against non-Contracting Parties fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The NAFO Contracting Parties urge Panama to take all necessary actions to prevent any fishing by Panamanian vessels contrary to NAFO conservation measures.

K. Yonezawa  
Chairman of the General Council  
President of the Northwest Atlantic  
Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

## Panamanian vessels sighted in 1991 and 1992:

Alpes II	Colombo VI	Peonia No. 9
Alpes III	Colombo VII	Pescamex III
Amazones	Colombo VIII	Pescamex IV
Anita I	Elly I	Porto de Aveiro
Cidade de Aveiro	Espadarte	Porto Santo
Classic Belair	[Izarra]	Rio Gabriel
Colombo III	Leone	Santa Joana
Colombo IV	Leone III	Tierra de Lemos
Colombo V	Marsopla	

### Aide Memoire (for Joint Diplomatic Demarche)

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was established in 1979 inter alia to implement obligations under international law regarding the conservation and management of fishery resources in the Northwest Atlantic beyond the areas in which coastal states exercise fisheries jurisdiction, referred to as the "Regulatory Area" of NAFO.

Following the joint diplomatic demarche made by the Contracting Parties of NAFO in July 1991, Venezuela will already be aware of the continuing concern of NAFO Contracting Parties about fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area by vessels from countries that are not Contracting Parties to the NAFO Convention.

The NAFO Contracting Parties are pleased that the Venezuelan authorities have warned the owners of the Pescagel and Bacanova to comply with NAFO's policy on conservation.

Observed sightings confirm that Venezuelan vessels are continuing to operate in the NAFO Regulatory Area and these activities are undermining NAFO conservation measures.

According to the Venezuelan communication in reply to the NAFO joint diplomatic demarche, Venezuelan authorities indicated the possible use of sanctions for non-compliance with NAFO conservation policy. NAFO Contracting Parties would be grateful if Venezuela would inform them of the outcome of imposing the necessary sanctions to keep them from fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

NAFO is prepared, if Venezuela wishes, to provide additional evidence of Venezuelan vessel activity in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

Pursuant to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, NAFO again requests Venezuela to forward to the NAFO Secretariat catch and fishing effort statistics respecting fishing activity of Venezuelan vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the end of 1991, which are required by NAFO scientists in assessing the state of the NAFO managed stocks. Statlant forms 21A and 21B for reporting nominal catches and corresponding fishing effort, issued by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, should be used for this purpose.

In view of the threat to the conservation of fish stocks caused by non-Contracting Party vessels, the NAFO Contracting Parties are also considering the possibility of taking further actions against non-Contracting Parties fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The NAFO Contracting Parties urge Venezuela to take all necessary actions to prevent any fishing by Venezuelan vessels contrary to NAFO conservation measures.

K. Yonezawa  
Chairman of the General Council  
President of the Northwest Atlantic  
Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

## Annex 9. Draft Summary of Data Concerning Fishing by Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area

### 1. Nature of Information

- 1.1 At the 12th and 13th Annual Meetings of NAFO, Contracting Parties agreed that STACFAC should obtain and compile all available information on the fishing activities of non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area and on landings and transshipment of fish caught in the Regulatory Area by non-Contracting Parties.
- 1.2 Two annual reports of activities, estimated effort and catches were provided by Canada. Sightings information was also provided by Japan, the EEC, and the USSR (Russia).
- 1.3 Import data for 1991 were provided by Japan, the EEC and Canada. While no conclusive links could be established, indications are that as Panama does not have a national cod fishing fleet, EEC imports of cod from Panama must come from reflagged EEC vessels. Japanese statistics showed significant imports of relevant species from Korea but it was not possible to determine how much was harvested in the Regulatory Area. Similarly, the small quantities of Canadian imports of groundfish from Korea could not be linked direct to Korean fishing in the Regulatory area.

### 2. Summary of Data by Country

- 2.1 Vessels from the following non-Contracting Parties have been sighted fishing in the Regulatory Area in 1991 and first quarter of 1992:

Panama  
 Korea  
 Venezuela  
 Honduras  
 Sierra Leone  
 Morocco  
 St. Vincents and the Grenadines

- 2.2 **Panama**

Twenty five Panamanian flagged vessels were sighted fishing in the Regulatory Area in 1991. Of these, 10 were pair trawlers and 3 were gillnetters. Twenty-three of these vessels had EEC nationality crews and two, the Peonia No. 9 and the Marsopla had crews of Korean nationality. These two vessels were also licensed by Korea to fish in the Regulatory Area. The 23 EEC crewed Panamanian vessels caught an estimated 22 000 tons (round weight) of groundfish over 2 200 effort days, at an average catch rate of 10 tons per day. The two Panamanian flag but Korean licensed and crewed vessels fished 7 000 tons of groundfish over 400 days at a rate of 17.5 tons per day.

The EEC imported 4 749 tons (product weight) of groundfish from Panama, not including salted cod. Japan imported 201 tons. There were no Canadian imports.

### 2.3 Korea

Three Korean flagged vessels were sighted fishing in the Regulatory Area in 1991. These Korean flagged vessels were estimated to have caught 7 400 round weight of groundfish over 550 days at an average of 13.4 tons per vessel day. Two Panamanian flagged Korean crewed vessels have been licensed by Korea to fish in the Regulatory Area. These two Korean licensed vessels were estimated to have harvested 7 000 tons of groundfish over 100 days at an average of 10 tons per vessel day. Vessels under the flag of Sierra Leone, St. Vincents, Honduras and Morocco also had Korean crews. Total catches for Korean licensed and crewed vessels were approximately 24 000 tons round weight.

The EEC imported 1 828 tons product weight of NAFO-managed groundfish species from Korea, Canada 158 tons product weight, and Japan 9 195 tons product weight.

### 2.4 Venezuela

Two Venezuelan flagged pair trawlers were sighted in the Regulatory Area in 1991. These vessels had EEC nationality crews. They were estimated to have fished 1 150 tons round weight of groundfish over 125 days at an average rate of 9.2 tons per vessel day.

The EEC imported 33 tons product weight of groundfish from Venezuela. There were no Canadian or Japanese imports.

### 2.5 Honduras

One Korean crewed Honduran flagged vessel (Danica) fished in the Regulatory Area in 1991. It was estimated to have caught 4 000 tons round weight of groundfish over 225 days at an average rate of 17.7 tons per day. There were no EEC statistics for imports from Honduras. Japan imported 22 tons product weight of flounder from Honduras. There were no Canadian imports.

### 2.6 Sierra Leone

One Sierra Leone flagged vessel (Great Splendour) fished in the Regulatory Area in 1991. It had a Korean crew and was estimated to have caught 3 200 tons round weight of groundfish over 225 days at a rate of 14.2 tons per day. There were no EEC or Japanese statistics for imports from Sierra Leone. There were no Canadian imports.

### 2.7 Morocco

One Moroccan vessel (Ein Chanech) fished in the Regulatory Area in 1991. It had some Korean crew and fished an estimated 600 tons round weight of groundfish over 60 days at a rate of 10 tons per day. There were no EEC statistics for imports from Morocco. Japan imported 527t of flounder from Morocco. There were no Canadian imports.

## 2.8 St. Vincents and the Grenadines

One Korean crewed vessel (Hao Quang III) fished in the Regulatory Area in 1991. It caught an estimated 2 000 tons round weight of groundfish over 200 days at a rate of 10 tons per day. The EEC imported 697 tons of flatfish from St. Vincent. There were no Japanese or Canadian imports.

### 3. Conclusions

- 3.1 It seems clear that much of the catch by non-Contracting Party vessels is being imported into the territories of Contracting Parties. This points to the conclusion that the activity of these vessels is being economically supported by trade with Contracting Parties.
- 3.2 Moreover, the nationality of the crews of vessels flying non-Korean third country flags indicates that these vessels are controlled by EEC member states and Korean fishing interests and fly flags of convenience to circumvent NAFO conservation measures and (in the case of Korean crewed vessels) Korean licensing requirements.
- 3.3 Part of the solution therefore should be to prevent vessels owned and controlled in the territories of Contracting Parties from reflagging under flags of convenience.
- 3.4 This would solve only half the problem, however. The activity by Korean flag vessels or vessels operating under flags of convenience with Korean crews was substantial. It accounted for 24 200 tons out of total non-Contracting Party catches of 47 350 tons or over 51% of such catches. There is a high risk that even if Korea reduces the number of the vessels it licenses to fish in the Regulatory Area, unlicensed vessels would simply adopt flags of convenience and continue to fish in the Regulatory Area. Accordingly, means must be found to halt Korean and Korean surrogate fishing in the Regulatory Area.

Annex 10. EEC Draft of Landing Declaration<sup>1</sup>

1. Exporter (Name, full address, country) Exportateur (Nom, adresse complète, pays)	2. Number 000 Numéro	
	DECLARATION IN REGARD TO Atlantic Cod (Gadus Morhua) Atlantic Redfish (sebastes spp) American Plaice (Hippoglossoides platessoides) Yellowtail Flounder (Limanda Ferruginea) Witch Flounder (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus) (2)  Issued with a view to obtaining statistical information on harvest origin (1)  DECLARATION CONCERNANT La Morue Fraiche (Atlantique) (Gadus Morhua) Sébaste (Atlantique Nord) (Sebastes spp) Plie canadienne (Hippoglossoides platessoides) Limande à quene jaune (Limanda ferruginea) Plie grise (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus) (2)  Délivrée en vue de l'obtention d'information statistique concernant l'origine de pêche (1)	
3. Consignee (Name, full address, country) Destinataire (Nom, adresse complète, pays)	4. Country of origin Pays d'origine	5. Country of destination Pays de destination
6. Place and date of catch/shipment/transshipment/ - name and flag of catch-/transport vessel(s) lieu et date de pêche/d'embarquement/-de transbordement/ - nom et pavillon du (des) navire(s) de pêche/de transport		
7. Marks and numbers-Number and kind of packages-DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF GOODS (3) Marques et numéros-nombre et nature des colis-DESIGNATION DETAILIEE DES MARCHANDISES (3)	8. Quantity in tonnes Quantité en tonnes	
9. DECLARATION BY THE CAPTAIN  I the undersigned, declare that in accordance with the entries in the logbook the consignment described above contains Atlantic Cod (Gadus Morhua), Atlantic Redfish (Sebastes spp), American Plaice (Hippoglossoides Platessoides), Yellowtail Flounder (Limanda Ferruginea), Witch Flounder (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus) from the stocks of the North-West Atlantic Ocean fished in the Regulatory Area of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization - NAFO. (2)  DECLARATION DU CAPITAINE  Je soussigné déclare qu'en accord avec les inscriptions dans le livre de bord l'envoi décrit ci-dessus contient de la Morue Fraiche (Atlantique) (Gadus Morhua), Sébaste (Atlantique Nord) (sebastes spp), Plie canadienne (Hippoglossoides platessoides), Limande à quene jaune (Limanda ferruginea), Plie grise (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus) provenant des stocks de l'océan de l'Atlantique Nord-Ouest et capturée dans la Zone de Réglementation de l'Organisation de Pêche de l'Atlantique du nord-Ouest - OPANO. (3)		
10. CAPTAIN (Name, full address, country) CAPITAINE (Nom, adresse complète, pays)	At/A..... on le.....  (Signature)	

(1) This Landing Declaration for statistical purposes has to be presented to the competent authorities upon landing  
 Cette Déclaration Débarquement pour de statistique doit être présentée aux autorités compétentes lors du débarquement

(2) Delete as appropriate  
 Biffer la mention inutile

(3) - Fresh/Frozen (Harmonized System 0302-0303) Frais/Congelé (Système harmonisé 0302-0303)  
 - Fillets/Filets  
 - Meat/Chair  
 - Salted/Salé



## Annex 11. Report on Fishing Activities by Vessels Flying the Flag of Non-NAFO Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area (Draft by the Chairman)

The 12th meeting of the NAFO General Council established the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of Non-Contracting Parties (STACFAC), the terms of reference of which are attached (Attachment 1).

At the 13th meeting of the NAFO General Council a Recommendation was adopted by consensus (NAFO/GC Doc. 91/6) according to which, *inter alia*, STACFAC shall submit a comprehensive report.

STACFAC agreed to report as follows:

- I Database
- II Diplomatic persuasion
- III Other measures such as:
  - consideration of a Landing Declaration system to improve the statistical database
  - consideration of measures to discourage reflagging of vessels to Non-Contracting Parties for fishing in the Regulatory Area

### I. Database

The statistical information available to STACFAC consists of:

- sightings of non-Contracting Party vessels in the Regulatory Area and information obtained from courtesy boardings
- Contracting Party statistics on imports of certain groundfish species from non-Contracting Parties
- information obtained from some non-Contracting Parties on their catches in the Regulatory Area

In relation to the information required from Contracting Parties this information is insufficient. STACFAC does not have at its disposal complete information on catches by non-Contracting Parties.

In order to assess the impact of non-Contracting Party fishing activities estimates have been made on the basis of assumed catch rates and of the period of time during which these vessels have been sighted in the Regulatory Area. These estimates have been compared with statistics on groundfish imports from non-Contracting Parties. Although very significant errors cannot be excluded, this method allowed STACFAC broadly to substantiate the non-Contracting Party fishing activities. (Annex 9 of this STACFAC Report)