SECTION V

(pages 207-234)

Report of the Special Meeting of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) 21-24 July 1992 Copenhagen, Denmark

Report of the Special Meeting of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

21-24 July 1992, Copenhagen, Denmark

1. Opening of the Meeting

The Chairman (E. Lemche, Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) opened the meeting with a welcome to all delegates to the Special Meeting of STACTIC. Representatives of the following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), European Economic Community (EEC), Japan, Norway and the Russian Federation (Russia). (Annex 1)

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

R. J. Prier (Canada) was appointed rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The Agenda **was adopted** as amended. (Annex 2)

The Chairman referred to FC Doc. 92/3 which set out the goals of this special meeting and to Annex 17 of the same document which outlined the questions that the Fisheries Commission wished STACTIC to address. In this regard the Chairman proposed to put a report together which answers the questions presented in Annex 17. The Committee **agreed** with this proposal.

4. Pilot Project of NAFO Observer Scheme

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19) and the European Community (Working Paper 92/25). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 3).

In addition the following positions were expressed by Contracting Parties at the meeting.

The EEC took the view that the observers' main task in the context of a pilot project is to record the level of compliance of the vessels observed with current conservation rules in the NAFO Regulatory Area. They are not required to collect evidence of any apparent non-compliance with the said rules which they might observe while on board vessels.

Similarly, observers are not required to request the intervention or presence of inspection vessels in the event that any apparent non-compliance is observed.

Considering this matter, Russia understands that in the case of approval of the pilot NAFO Observer Scheme by the Fisheries Commission, the role, rights and duties of such observers would not in any way duplicate those of NAFO inspectors.

With regard to the reporting duties of the observers, the EEC expressed the view that the observers be requested to prepare a final report on their findings at the termination of the observation period. Consequently, they are not expected to provide periodic or interim reports. These final reports shall be forwarded to the competent authorities of the Contracting Party (providing) sponsoring the observer. The said competent authorities shall examine these reports with a view to preparing an overall evaluation of the findings presented during the entire period of the pilot project. These findings shall be presented to the Fisheries Commission at its special session in 1994.

Canada stated that for the pilot project to provide the basis for an effective and useful assessment of the merits of a long term scheme, it must enable Contracting Parties to take action to reduce infringements of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

Canada is therefore of the view that the observer should be authorized to observe the full range of activities on board the fishing vessel to enable him/her to monitor compliance with the Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

Japan stated that the range of observations should be restricted to regulations in force.

Canada also supports a requirement for observers to make interim reports, which would be transmitted via the Contracting Party to any Contracting Party with an inspection presence in the area, in the case of possibility of fishing contrary to the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

Denmark indicated that they agreed with the Canadian proposal.

5. Incorporation of a Catch Reporting Feature into the Hail System

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19) and the EEC (Working Paper 92/26). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 4).

In addition the following positions were expressed by Contracting Parties at the meeting.

Russia expressed its opinion that determination of improving the hail system effectiveness by the incorporation of catch reports might be done only upon assessment of the effectiveness of the hail system itself.

The EEC is of the opinion that the quota management and the monitoring of the quota uptake is the exclusive competence of the Contracting Parties. Consequently catch reports should be communicated to the competent authorities of the Contracting Parties.

6. Introduction of Production Logbooks or Stowage Plans

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19) and the EEC (Working Paper 92/27). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 5).

7. Introduction of One Uniform Mesh Size, Irrespective of Material

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19), Denmark (Working Paper 92/30), and the EEC (Working Paper 92/28). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 6).

8. Permit for Inspection Trainees to Accompany Inspection Parties: Guidelines for the Conduct of Trainees While They Are On Board of Vessels

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19) and the EEC (Working Paper 92/29). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 7).

9. Program to Coordinate and Fund Inspection Activities in the Regulatory Area

Proposals were presented from Canada (Working Paper 92/19), Denmark (Working Paper 92/32), the EEC (Working Paper 92/31) and Russia (Working Paper 92/34). As a result of deliberations and consultations among delegations **agreement was reached** on the basic responses for the Fisheries Commission (Annex 8).

In addition the following positions were expressed by Contracting Parties at the meeting.

Denmark is considering providing air surveillance in the Regulatory Area.

Russia made a statement that they had previously objected to the use of air surveillance. However they have no objection to a Contracting Party utilizing air surveillance but the cost of air surveillance should not be considered as a cost to be shared by all Contracting Parties under a coordinated NAFO control inspection plan.

10. Adoption of Report

The Report of the Special Meeting of STACTIC, 21-24 July, Copenhagen, Denmark **was adopted.**

11. Decision on Reports Submitted by Contracting Parties Setting Out the Methodology, Benefits and Other Implications of Effort Management Systems in Order to Match Fishing Effort With Available Fishing Opportunities

General **agreement was reached** by all delegations that the reports submitted by Contracting Parties setting out the methodology, benefits and other implications of effort management systems in order to match fishing effort with available fishing opportunities need not be summarized or commented on by STACTIC at this time. Reports as requested were received from Canada (Working Paper 92/23), Cuba (Working Paper 92/21), Denmark (Working Paper 92/33), EEC (Working Paper 92/24), Japan (Working Paper 92/22), Norway (Working Paper 92/20) and Russia (Working Paper 92/35).

12. Other Matters

The Chairman tabled the provisional agenda for the STACTIC Meeting in September 1992 for information.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1520 hours on Friday, 24 July 1992.

Annex 1. List of Participants

CANADA

Head of Delegation

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

E. Dussault, Director, Enforcement Operations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
E. Mundell, International Fisheries Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
R. J. Prier, Director, Conservation and Protection, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
B. Rogers, Head, Observer Program, Newfoundland Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
G. R. Traverse, Director, Resource Management Div., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
E. Wiseman, Fisheries Counsellor, Mission of Canada to the European Communities, 2 Av. de Tervuren, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

CUBA

Head of Delegation

B. Garcia Moreno, International Organizations Specialist, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Playa la Habana

DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)

Head of Delegation

K. P. Mortensen, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 87, FR-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

J. M. Juul, Inspector, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 87, FR-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
E. Lemche, Director, Groenlands Hjemmestyre, Pilestraede 52, Box 2151, DK-1016, Copenhagen, Denmark
T. Pedersen, Fiskerilicenskontrollen, P. O. Box 501, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Head of Delegation

P. Curran, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

D. Dunkley, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, 7/24, 1049 Brussels, Belgium
C. C. Southgate, Presidency of the Council of the European Communities, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Room 428 Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 2JR, United Kingdom
L. Teixeira da Costa, Council of the European Communities, 170 Rue de la Loi, 1048 Brussels, Belgium
B. Buch, Counsellor, c/o Repr. Permanente du Danemark, Rue d'Arlon 73, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
G. T. Conrad, Bundesministerium fur Ernahrung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstr. 1, 53 Bonn, Germany
C. R. Gomes, Direccao Geral das Comunidades Europeia, Av. Visconde Valvor, 76-4°, Lisboa, Portugal
L. M. C. A. Pinheiro, Director-Inspection Dept., Avenida Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa, Portugal
J. Navarro, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Ortega y Gasset, 57, Madrid 28006, Spain
J. Herrero, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Ortega y Gasset, 57, Madrid 28006, Spain
P. J. Ogden, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Room 426 Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 2JR, United Kingdom

JAPAN

Head of Delegation

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

T. Ohno, First Secretary, Japanese Embassy, Pilestraede 61, 1112 Copenhagen K, Denmark
M. Yoshida, Japan Deepsea Trawlers Association, 601 Yasuda Bldg., Kanda-Ogawa-Cho 3-6, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

NORWAY

Head of Delegation

E. Ellingsen, Head of Section, Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, 5002 Bergen

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Head of Delegation

V. Tsoukalov, Chief of Fish Resources Department, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45

V. Fedorenko, Deputy Chief, Department of International Cooperation, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31
I. G. Shestakova, Leading Specialist, Department of International Cooperation, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31
I. E. Degtiarev, Chief of Arkchangelsk Base of Trawl Fleet, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

SECRETARIAT

L. I. Chepel, NAFO Executive Secretary
B. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Susan Frydendahl, Groenlands Hjemmestyre, Pilestræde 52, DK-1016, Copenhagen

Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening by Chairman, E. Lemche (Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

3. Adoption of Agenda

4. Pilot project of NAFO Observer Scheme

   4.1 role and duties of observers within the scheme

   4.2 operational procedures for deploying and removing observers from the fishing vessels

   4.3 training and equipment for the observers

   4.4 rights and obligations of the master of the fishing vessel

   4.5 concepts of the observer reports

   4.6 technical problems and solutions associated with implementation of the observer scheme

   4.7 estimated costs of implementation of the scheme

5. Incorporation of a catch reporting feature into the hail system

   5.1 concepts of improvement of the technical effectiveness of the hail system by the incorporation of catch reports

   5.2 form and context of messages to be sent taking into account the particular communication problems of long-distance fleets and with a view to minimize costs and time

   5.3 timing and frequency of catch reports

   5.4 consideration of the least costly and expedient way for the NAFO Secretariat to make the hail information available to inspection vessels present in the Regulatory Area

   5.5 technical problems and solutions and estimated costs associated with implementation of the decision to provide information to inspection vessels by the NAFO Secretariat

6. Introduction of production logbooks or stowage plans

   6.1 required guidelines to maintain safety on production decks and in the hold of the fishing vessel

   6.2 technical problems and solutions associated with implementation of such decision

   6.3 estimated costs of such a decision

7. Introduction of one uniform mesh size, irrespective of material

   7.1 practical and economical effect for the fishing fleets in the Regulatory Area

   7.2 affect on the work of the inspectors

8. Permit for inspection trainees to accompany inspection parties:

   guidelines for the conduct of trainees while they are on board of vessels

9. Program to coordinate and fund inspection activities in the Regulatory Area

   9.1 extent and costs currently incurred by the Contracting Parties for control and inspection in the Regulatory Area

   9.2 estimates of the appropriate number of inspections, vessels, helicopters, other aircraft and other means needed for rational and effective control and inspection in the Regulatory Area in a given year; estimated cost of these activities

   9.3 design of a coordinated plan for control and inspection by Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area, taking into account the provisions of Part IV, paragraph 13 of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures

   9.4 Costs of the program

10. Adoption of the report of the Special Meeting by STACTIC

11. Summarization of the reports to be provided by Contracting Parties by 15 July 1992 setting out the methodology, benefits and other implications of efforts management systems in order to match fishing effort with available fishing opportunities

12. Other matters

13. Adjournment

Annex 3. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Pilot Project of NAFO Observer Scheme

1. If the Fisheries Commission were to adopt a pilot project for a NAFO observer scheme for a sufficient period starting on 1 January 1993,

1.1 **What would be the role and duties of the observers within the scheme?**

Observers would monitor a vessel's compliance with the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. Observers will record and report upon the fishing activities of the vessel observed and will verify the position of the vessel when engaged in fishing, observe and estimate catches taken with a view to identifying catch composition, monitor discarding, by-catches and the taking of undersized species, record the gear, mesh sizes and attachments employed by the skipper and verify entries made to the logbook (catch quantities and hail reports). In order to fulfil this role, they will:

- estimate total catch weight and species composition (including discards) of individual fishing sets;
- record set times and positions;
- document gear characteristics, such as mesh size, chafer types, trawl size, etc;
- monitor logbook reporting of catches, discards, by-catches and hail reports and, if implemented by the Fisheries Commission, entries in production logbooks or stowage plans, as appropriate; and
- fulfil other duties as decided by the Fisheries Commission.

The role envisaged is strictly an observer one and shall be confined to the Regulatory Area, but could include for example the collection of samples. Any "quasi" scientific role would have to be defined on the advice of the Scientific Council.

The observer shall respect the property and equipment on board, including the confidentiality of all observations made on board and the confidentiality of all documents on board.

1.2 **What would be the operational procedures for deploying and removing observers from the fishing vessels?**

Deployment of observers, operational procedures and removing of observers will be the responsibility of each Contracting Party.

A coordination capability should be available within each Contracting Party to monitor coverage levels and ensure that assigned levels are maintained.

Observers would be assigned to vessels and receive briefings, forms and equipment from competent authorities of the Contracting Party. Contracting Parties could also use observers from existing private sector companies in the Coastal State. In that case, briefings, deployments and debriefings would be completed by contract staff under specific guidelines approved by the Fisheries Commission.

In order to reach the vessel to which they are assigned, observers could: depart on the vessels as they sail from their home ports; be stationed for a period in the Coastal State for deployment to vessels that make port calls; travel by commercial carrier to the coastal state for deployment via port call; or be deployed via NAFO inspection vessel.

The duration of the deployment period shall be fixed by each Contracting Party. The period of deployment shall take account of the coverage of the pilot scheme determined by the Fisheries Commission. After the termination of the deployment period, the observer could then return home, or to a Coastal State port, or transfer to another vessel of the Contracting Party. This last approach would require the development of safe transfer procedures that include the use of NAFO inspection vessels and their boarding craft.

Observers could return home on board fishing vessels concluding fishing trips or by commercial carrier upon conclusion of a deployment. The observer would then be debriefed by competent authorities of the Contracting Party.

NAFO inspection vessels and inspectors in the Regulatory Area could provide organizational support by transporting observers to and from ports or between fishing vessels.

Alternatively, a Contracting Party could charter a vessel (with sea rider) in order to embark and disembark observers and to facilitate the level of rotation required.

1.3 **What training and equipment would be required?**

The training and equipment to be provided to the observer is the responsibility of each Contracting Party.

In general, the selected personnel should have the following skills and qualifications:

- ability to read navigational equipment
- linguistic skills
- sufficient experience to identify species and gear
- a good knowledge of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures
- ability to observe and record accurately

In some cases, observer training could be required to ensure observers are familiar with the operations they will be observing. A list of possible elements for such training is attached as Attachment 1.

The observer should be issued any necessary equipment, taking into account national and international standards of safety at sea. A list of items that could be useful to observers is contained in Attachment 1.

1.4 **What would be the rights and obligations of the master of the fishing vessel?**

Rights

The master at all times shall be responsible for the safe operation and security of the vessel and crew, including the observer.

Observers shall carry out their duties so as to minimize interference with and inconvenience to the vessel's activities, and will respect the customs and rules of the host vessel.

The master shall be informed in good time of the date and location for receiving observers and the duration of the observation period. The master of the vessel may decide, for reasons of force majeure or hazardous weather conditions, not to accept the presence of an observer on board. The master may also decide to amend his planned fishing activities in order to leave the Regulatory Area and if necessary discharge the observer before the conclusion of the observation period.

Obligations

Masters would be required to provide all reasonable assistance to observers including, but not restricted to, the following:

- Safe embarkation and disembarkation conditions at sea
- Appropriate food and accommodations
- Suitable work area with table and adequate lighting
- Access to vessel records and log books
- Access to positional information of the vessel
- Access to the vessel's communications equipment
- Access to all fishing, processing and storage areas
- Access to all fishing gear
- Permission to take photographs of fishing operations provided copies of photographs are given to the master

1.5 **What would be the format, contents, and frequency of reports and to whom should such reports be addressed?**

Final trip reports would be transmitted by the observer to competent authorities of the Contracting Party.

STACTIC discussed but did not agree on whether the final reports or summaries thereof should be sent to the Executive Secretary for onward transmission to Contracting Parties with an inspection presence in the area.

STACTIC also discussed, but did not reach agreement on the need for periodic reports to signal any fishing activity inconsistent with the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

The final report shall record the full range of activities engaged in by the fishing vessel, the overall level of compliance with conservation measures including practices which are at variance with these measures. It shall be presented in a predefined format and include detailed information on the following subjects:

Vessel Information.

A record of vessel information such as side number, vessel name, Contracting Party, vessel type, home port, owner, length, horse power, hold capacity, gross tonnage/class.

Trip Activities.

A record of each change in activity, directed species, gear type, or location.

Catch and Effort.

A comparison of master's logbook and observer estimates, subdivided by directed species, division, and fishing effort, including by-catches and discards.

Non-Contracting Party Vessel Sightings.

A record of non-Contracting Party vessels sighted subdivided by date, time, division, latitude, longitude, and side number, vessel name, nationality, activity, if possible.

Fishing Gear.

A record of fishing gear used including such information as mesh size, specifications, attachments, buoy markings, number lines or gillnets, bait type, and size of hooks.

Processing and Production.

Observations on entries in production logbooks or stowage plans, if implemented by the Fisheries Commission.

Activities Inconsistent with NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

A record of any fishing activities inconsistent with the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

Cooperation from the Master.

Comments, if necessary, on cooperation obtained while on board.

It is the prerogative of each Contracting Party to request additional information from its observers.

Contracting Parties shall evaluate the contents of the reports and conclusions to establish the level of compliance with the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

1.6 **What would be the technical problems and solutions associated with implementation of such a scheme?**

STACTIC discussed possible problems associated with implementation of the scheme, including training, accommodations, recruitment and deployment, working conditions, security and confidentiality and the need to minimize interference with fishing activity of vessels under observation.

STACTIC felt that it was up to the Contracting Parties to address any such difficulties in a manner most appropriate to their operations.

1.7 **What would be the estimated cost of such a scheme?**

Canada provided a summary of possible costs by Contracting Parties for a 12-month period which is attached as Attachment 2. These costs are based on Canadian contract salary and expenses of approximately $400.00 (Cdn.) per observer sea day. The amounts do not include travel from the Contracting Party to the NAFO Regulatory Area. Costs could be lower for some Contracting Parties because of employment of their own nationals and payment in their own currencies.

The EEC provided an estimate of costs for the EEC fleet based on the degree of coverage mentioned in FC Working Paper 92/6. The cost of chartering a support vessel, travel costs, salary levels, insurance and training for the duration of the pilot scheme (18 months), is attached as Attachment 3.

Japan had provided an estimate in FC Doc. 92/3, item 2.4 which was approximately $150,000.

Attachment 1. A List of Possible Training Elements and Possible Equipment Required for Observers

Possible Training Elements

- General introduction and background on NAFO
- Conservation and Enforcement Measures
- Administration and deployment procedures
- Vessel familiarization
- Safety at sea
- Authorities and responsibilities of observers and masters
- Fishing gear identification
- Species identification
- Navigation
- Communications and security (situation reports)
- Procedure for the estimation of catch in live weight
- Conversion and density factors
- Data collection and forms
- Reporting requirements

Possible Equipment

- Weigh scales
- Large briefcase
- Clipboard
- Calculator
- Measuring board
- Mesh measurement gauge
- Measuring tape
- Hard hat or helmet
- Training or operation manual
- Polaroid camera
- Data forms

Attachment 2. Cost Estimate of a NAFO Observer Scheme

Contracting Party	Anticipated number of vessels	Estimated total[1] days on ground	10% DOG ($000 Cdn.)	15% DOG ($000 Cdn.)	20% DOG ($000 (Cdn.)
Cuba	10	450	45 (18)	68 (27)	90 (36)
Faroe Islands	5	800	80 (32)	120 (48)	160 (64)
Japan	5	250	25 (10)	38 (15)	50 (20)
Norway	10	350	35 (14)	53 (21)	70 (28)
Russia	30	1 400	140 (56)	210 (84)	280 (112)
EEC	140	20 700	2 070 (828)	3 105 (1 242)	4 140 (1 656)
TOTAL	200	23 950	2 395 (958)	3 594 (1 437)	4 790 (1 916)

[1] Approximate 1990/91 levels.

Attachment 3. Estimate of Costs for the EEC Fleet

Cost of Pilot Project for EEC

Estimates of the overall costs of the pilot project can be made on the basis of the degree of coverage planned (present level is 10% of fleet capacity) the cost of chartering a support vessel to facilitate rotation/deployment of observers, travel costs, salary levels, insurance and training and the duration of the scheme (18 months).

Charter of Vessel

1.5 million ECU p.a =	2.250.000 ECU.
Salaries of 6 Observers	
Travel costs	
Insurance	
Equipment	
Training =	979.000
	3.229.000 ECU.

Ecu p.a. = 1.6 Canadian dollars

Annex 4. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Incorporation of a Catch Reporting Feature Into the Hail System

1. *If the Fisheries Commission were to decide to incorporate a catch reporting feature into the hail system,*

   1.1 **Would the technical effectiveness of the hail system be improved by the incorporation of catch reports?**

   The technical effectiveness of the Hail System and the incorporation of catch reports are two separate matters.

   The technical effectiveness of the Hail System, which is simply a position reporting requirement, could be improved by shortening the communication routes e.g. by requiring that the vessels report directly to NAFO Executive Secretary. A further improvement could be obtained through the automation of the communication procedures, as discussed in the STACTIC Working Group on that subject (see NAFO FC Doc. 92/2).

   The introduction of catch reports into the present hail system would increase the volume of data which would require processing (see 1.2). There was disagreement on whether this increase, under the present communication procedures, was likely to detract from the technical effectiveness of the hail system *per se*, i.e. the timely processing of the hail data. EEC expressed the view, based upon its experience as a major user of the hail system, that the incorporation of catch reports would unavoidably imply decreased effectiveness of the hail system in its current state and after any eventual automation, as the extra task of transmitting catch data would very substantially increase the volume and type of data. Canada was confident that automation of the communications procedures would overcome any problems resulting from increased volume of messages.

   1.2 **Taking into account the particular communication problems of long-distance fleets and with a view to minimize costs and time, what would be the form and content of messages to be sent?**

   It should be pointed out that communication problems do not only exist for the fleet but all along the communication route via the competent authorities of Contracting Party to the inspection team in the NAFO Regulatory Area. All elements in this communication chain should be considered. Therefore, the cheapest solution for the fleet will not necessarily yield the best overall result.

   The form and the content of the messages should be standardized, in particular to distinguish between vessel position reports, catch reports or other communications. Insignificant catches of non-regulated species (e.g. less than 10 tons per week) could be grouped as "other species" in the messages in order to reduce the overhead.

The form and content of a catch reporting feature could be similar to the current hail message, containing the species name, division, and total round weight of catch by species by division onboard. A possible message format could be as follows:

- name of vessel
- call sign
- external identification and numbers
- the date, the time, and geographical position
- indication of the message code "entry, exit, move, zone, catch"
- catch on board by species, division, and total round weight
- the name of the master

An example of a catch report:

- Any Fishing Vessel
- WXYZ
- FV1234
- 30/06/92/1200
- 4700/4625
- catch
- Red/3M/500/3L/100/3N/50
- Cod/3M/400/3L/50/3N/50
- GHL/3M/400/3L/100
- Oth/3M/150/3L/25
- Joe Fisherman

1.3 **What would be the appropriate timing and frequency of catch reports?**

Reports of catches on board would be made on entry into the Regulatory Area, on exit from the Regulatory Area and, weekly or fortnightly on a fixed day, e.g. Wednesday, as long as the vessel remains in the Regulatory Area. Fortnightly reporting would require 50% fewer reports than weekly reporting. This would reduce the data entry workload and costs for Contracting Parties.

1.4 **What is the least costly and most expedient way for the NAFO Secretariat to make the catch information available to inspection vessels present in the Regulatory Area?**

At present, the NAFO Secretariat transmits positional hail messages by facsimile to competent authorities (which could include inspection vessels) of Contracting Parties. The addition of catch reports to messages sent under the existing system would increase the cost of transmission to an extent. Separate messages for catch reports might increase costs depending on fishing patterns.

The experience of the EEC however is that the facsimile messages received from the Executive Secretary by its inspection vessel via satellite are frequently of poor quality and illegible. Alternative communications systems should therefore be evaluated with a view to determining a more efficient method.

1.5 **What would be the technical problems and solution associated with the implementation of such a decision?**

The proposed extension of the Hail System would have to be supported by an efficient data processing and telecommunication system. The nature of this system may be complex for some Contracting Parties because it involves both maritime and international terrestrial communication links between different Parties within narrow time constraints. The EEC's experience with the catch reports from certain fishing vessels operating in EEC waters demonstrates the importance of this issue.

The implementation of the decision could therefore be preceded by a study identifying the problems of evaluating different possible solutions. Implementation of the Fisheries Commission decision need not however be delayed by such a study if the Fisheries Commission agrees to implement a catch reporting requirement on an ad hoc basis pending the completion of the study.

1.6 **What would be the estimated costs of such a decision?**

The study suggested in the reply to the previous question would provide a cost estimation for each retained solution. It was noted that STACTIC at present was unable to provide a cost estimate. Some delegations felt that the reasons for this were lack of information from some Contracting Parties which could be obtained in the near future. Other delegations indicated that costs could not be estimated until the available options were evaluated and final choice of systems agreed.

Canada provided the following example of what could constitute the format of a NAFO catch hail message sent from the vessel to the Contracting Party or the Executive Secretary.

Currently, a typical NAFO hail message (without catch reporting) can contain the following details:

		Words
A/Any Vessel	2	
B/WXYZ		1
C/FV1234		1
D/30/06/92/1200	2	
E/4700/4625		2
F/Move	1	
G/Joe Fisherman		2
		11

The number of hail messages that each Contracting Party might receive in a given year depends on the number of vessels deployed to the Regulatory Area.

The introduction of a catch reporting feature to the hail system, could increase the message cost depending on final format. Assuming that insignificant catches (< 10t/week) of non-regulated species can be grouped, the following sets out the potential word contents for the catch reporting feature:

A/Any Vessel
B/WXYZ
C/FV1234
D/30/06/92/1200
E/4700/4625
F/Catch
/Red/3M/500/3L/100/3N/50
Cod/3M/400/3L/50/3N/50
GHL/3M/400/3L/100
Oth/3M/150/3L/25
G/Joe Fisherman

Item F includes an additional 8 words.

Annex 5. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Production Logs/Stowage Plans

1. If the Fisheries Commission were to approve the introduction and inspection of production logbooks or stowage plans, in particular, what guidelines would be needed to maintain safety on production decks and in the hold of the fishing vessel?

1.1 Safety on production decks

In the event that vessels fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area are obliged to maintain production logbooks, observers and inspectors engaged in their duties may have occasion to visit production decks in order to view the last haul taken by the vessels. Such visits would be brief and occasional and consequently should not necessitate the introduction of specific safety measures in addition to those in place to protect the security of the workforce operating there.

1.2 Safety in the Hold

The introduction of stowage plans which indicate the precise location of the different species taken by fishing vessels will necessitate fairly lengthy visits by inspectors/observers to the hold for inspection/observation purposes. These duties will mainly consist of counting of cartons/boxes; examining and verifying contents and ensuring that the stowage plan corresponds to the stowage capacity, etc. Consequently, the inspectors/observers will spend considerable time in the hold.

With regard to safety aspects, it is imperative that all stored species are securely fixed to their designated position, that the inspectors/observers have access to different sections of each species area/zone without incurring risks to their personal safety and that they have adequate space within which cartons can be examined. In light of the foregoing it may be deemed necessary that individual species be partitioned in shelved areas thus facilitating random access without jeopardizing the equilibrium of stacked cartons.

2. What would be the technical problems/solutions associated with the implementation of such a decision?

2.1 Technical problems solutions associated with the introduction of production logbooks

In order to check entries in production logbooks inspectors/observers will have to convert production weight into live weight so that the latter can be verified against the logbook entries which are made in live weight. The inspectors/observers could be guided by conversion factors established by the master of the vessel.

2.2 **Technical problems/solutions associated with the introduction of a stowage plan**

Apart from the safety aspects of visiting stowage areas which are addressed at point 1.2 above it is anticipated that the introduction of a stowage plan could give rise to additional technical problems, the rational use of floor space, the installation of partitions and shelving and agreement on common stowage factors and safety aspects of fishing vessels.

3. What would be the estimated costs of such a decision?

3.1 **Production logbooks**

Printing and distribution of production logbooks. The format of such logbooks will have to be agreed in the framework of STACTIC/NAFO.

3.2 **Stowage plan**

In order to facilitate inspection of the contents of vessels holds all frozen or salted catches will have to be stored separately that is, in specified partitions and shelving installed. The cost of this exercise will depend upon the size of the hold, the number of species fished by the vessel and how catches are conserved-salted or frozen. Loss of storage space arising from alterations to the hold will also have to be added to the total costs.

Annex 6. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Uniform Mesh Size

1. If the Fisheries Commission were to introduce one uniform mesh size, irrespective of material, what practical and economic effect would this have for the fishing fleets in the Regulatory Area?

1.1 ***Introduction of one uniform mesh size***

The introduction of a uniform mesh size irrespective of material will necessitate some skippers discarding existing nets and purchasing new nets which conform to the designated mesh size. Bearing in mind the costs, skippers should be granted a reasonable period so that the modification can be properly planned.

Moreover the introduction of a uniform mesh size (130 mm) irrespective of material will result in an increased mesh size in currently used polyamide nets (120 mm) and accordingly will lead to a reduction in fish catches and economic efficiency.

1.2 **How could this affect the work of the inspectors?**

The introduction of the uniform mesh size when fishing for regulated species should assist control activity generally. In particular it would remove the need for inspectors to identify the material from which nets are made.

Annex 7. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Inspection Trainees

1. If the Fisheries Commission were to permit inspection trainees to accompany inspection parties,

What guidelines should be established for the conduct of the trainee while he or she is on board the vessel?

1.1 Guidelines

Given that the trainee inspector is simply accompanying inspection parties on board fishing vessels he/she should not operate independently of the said parties nor act on his/her own initiative while on board fishing vessels under inspection. The role of the trainee inspector should be limited to observing inspection procedures.

The trainee inspectors shall be subject to those procedures and rules governing the conduct of inspections generally prescribed in Part IV, (Points 5-6), of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Scheme.

Annex 8. Response to the Fisheries Commission Request to STACTIC re Program to Coordinate and Fund Inspection Activities in the Regulatory Area

1. If the Fisheries Commission were to approve a program to coordinate and fund inspection activities in the NAFO Regulatory Area,

1.1 **Extent and costs currently incurred by the Contracting Parties for control and inspection in the Regulatory Area**

The Contracting Parties present related the following current costs they incur for control and inspection in the Regulatory Area as it relates to surface surveillance:

Canada	Total cost $4.2 million (Cdn.) Total days in Regulatory Area - 340 Cost per day $12,350
Cuba	none
Denmark	Total cost $290,000 (Cdn.) Total days in Regulatory Area - 30 Cost per day $9,666
EEC	Total cost $2.8 million (Cdn.) Total days in Regulatory Area - 250 Cost per day $11,200
Japan	none
Norway	none
Russia (based on 1990)	Total cost $2.9 million (USA) Total days in Regulatory Area - 270 Cost per day $10,900 (USA)

Russia referred to FC Doc. 92/3, Annex 15 which was a Russian proposal to coordinate the cost of inspections in the Regulatory Area and develop a method to share the cost of control and inspection in the Regulatory Area.

1.2 **Estimates of the appropriate number of inspections, vessels, helicopters, other aircraft and other means needed for rational and effective control and inspection in the Regulatory Area in a given year; estimated cost of these activities**

The following recommendations for sea surveillance are based on 200 fishing vessels from Contracting Parties operating in the Regulatory Area in the course of a year.

Number of inspections - 900
Number of inspection vessels - 3 on a continuous basis
Number of inspectors per inspection - 2

Additional boardings would be required for non-Contracting Parties, special interest areas and fisheries of concern.

Average boarding of a fishing vessel operating in the Regulatory Area would be once per month.

The cost of keeping three inspection vessels all year round and conducting an inspection on a fishing vessel once per month will cost approximately $10-12 (Cdn.) million annually.

Helicopter. Canada is the only Contracting Party that has a helicopter at its disposal in the Regulatory Area. However, it is seldom used. Canada would like to retain the option to use the helicopter but cost is not relevant in this case.

Other aircraft. Canada is the only Contracting Party providing aerial surveillance. Canada utilizes 2 000 air hours in Regulatory Area annually.

1.3 **Design of a coordinated plan for control and inspection by Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area, taking into account the provisions of Part IV, para 13 of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures**

It was agreed that Contracting Parties continue to follow the "Guidelines for the Coordination and Optimization of Inspection and Control in the Regulatory Area" and the provisions of Conservation and Enforcement Measures Part IV, paragraph 13. It should be noted that when the level of inspections increase then the level of coordination will increase. This would be done with a specific view to obtain an equilibrium between vessels in the Regulatory Area and inspections. This approach is preferred over the development of a coordination plan at this stage.

It was agreed that each Contracting Party supply the necessary information to the NAFO Executive Secretary about each inspection vessel including such information as:

VHF or MF communication

Facsimile or telex possibilities or other communications possible to be used between inspection vessels.

1.4 **Costs of the program**

No cost could be assigned to a coordination program but is included in previous discussions on cost.