

SECTION III

(pages 83 to 134)

Report of the Fisheries Commission and its Subsidiary Body (STACTIC), 15th Annual Meeting 6-10 September 1993 Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada

PART I.	Report of the Meeting of the Fisheries Commission	85
	1. Opening Procedures	85
	2. Administrative	85
	3. Conservation and Enforcement Measures	86
	4. Conservation of Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area	88
	5. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area	90
	6. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks Straddling National Fishing Limits	92
	7. Formulation of Request to the Scientific Council for Scientific Advice on the Management of Fish Stocks in 1995	97
	8. Closing Procedure	97
	9. Adoption of the Report	97
	Annex 1. List of Participants	98
	Annex 2. Agenda	104
	Annex 3. Press Release	106
	Annex 4. Statement by B. Rawson, Representative of Canada	109
	Annex 5. Part VI - Pilot Project for a NAFO Observer Scheme	111
	Annex 6. Fisheries Commission's Request for Scientific Advice on Management in 1995 of Certain Stocks in Subareas 4 and 5	113
	Annex 7. List of Decisions and Actions by the Fisheries Commission	115
PART II.	Report of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)	117
	1. Opening of the Meeting	117
	2. Review of Annual Return of Infringements	117
	3. Review of Surveillance and Inspection Reports	117
	4. Review of Registration of Vessels Fishing in the Regulatory Area	118
	5. Review of Operation of the Hail System	118

6. Review of the NAFO Inspection Manual	119
7. Minimum Sizes for Cod, Yellowtail flounder and American plaice - Possible Alternatives to Current Measures	119
8. Discussion of Other Conservation and Enforcement Measures	120
9. Election of Officers	122
10. Time and Place of Next Meeting	122
11. Other Matters	122
12. Adjournment	122
 Annex 1. STACTIC Heads of Delegation	123
Annex 2. Agenda	124
Annex 3. STACTIC Form E-Annual Return of Inspections, Catch Record Discrepancies, Apparent Infringements, and Disposition of Apparent Infringements	125
Annex 4. Canadian Report on Operation of the NAFO Hail System	126
Annex 5. Report to the Executive Secretary of NAFO by the Pilot Project Team for the NAFO Hail System	127
Annex 6. Request to the Scientific Council on Minimum Fish Sizes	129
Annex 7. Response from Scientific Council to STACTIC With Respect to Minimum Landing Size	130
Annex 8. Response from STACFIS on Minimum Mesh Size for Groundfish	131
Annex 9. Request to the Fisheries Commission on Minimum Fish Sizes	132
Annex 10. STACTIC Proposal re Inspection Procedures	133
Annex 11. Selective Comparative Quotas and Catches in the Regulatory Area for 1992	134

PART I

Report of the Meeting of the Fisheries Commission

15th Annual Meeting, 6-10 September 1993
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada

Tuesday, 7 September 1993 - 1120-1645
Wednesday, 8 September 1993 - 1040-1710
Thursday, 9 September 1993 - 1300-2315
Friday, 10 September 1993 - 1230-1400

1. Opening Procedures (items 1 to 5 of the Agenda)

- 1.1 The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, E. Wiseman (Canada) on 7 September 1993 at 1120 hours. Representatives from the following Contracting Parties were present: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Estonia, the European Economic Community (EEC), Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland and the Russian Federation. (Annex 1)
- 1.2 L. Teixeira da Costa (EEC) was appointed Rapporteur.
- 1.3 The provisional agenda was adopted with the following amendment (Annex 2):
- to agenda item 21 would be added a point 4: "Shrimp in Div. 3M".
- 1.4 Representatives of the Republic of Korea and the United States of America were welcomed to the Meeting as observers.
- 1.5 It was agreed that normal NAFO practice should be followed in relation to publicity and that no statements would be made to the media until after the conclusion of the meeting when a press release would be drawn up by the Chairman of the General Council and of the Fisheries Commission, and the Executive Secretary. (Annex 3)
- 1.6 The representative of Canada made an opening statement. (Annex 4)

2. Administrative (items 6 to 8 of the Agenda)

- 2.1 The report of the 14th Annual Meeting, September 1992 (NAFO/FC Doc. 92/19) was adopted.
- 2.2 Iceland was welcomed as a Member of the Fisheries Commission pursuant to the decision of the General Council under provisions of Article XIII of the Convention.

- 2.3 Election of officers (item 8) **was deferred** until a later stage of the meeting, and at the closing session, on 10 September, H. Koster (EEC) was elected Chairman of the Commission and P. Gullestad (Norway), Vice-Chairman.

3. Conservation and Enforcement Measures (items 9 to 18 of the Agenda)

- 3.1 It **was decided** to postpone agenda items 9, Incorporation of a Catch Reporting System into the Hail System, and 10, Effort Plans for the Vessels of Contracting Parties Operating in the Regulatory Area, to be discussed at a later stage of this meeting.

At the closing session, the Canadian representative proposed, due to lack of time, that those items be referred to the 16th Annual Meeting. This **was agreed** by the Commission.

- 3.2 On item 11, Operation of the Hail System, the Meeting **agreed** to adopt the following amendment (in bold) for Operation of the Hail System:

Part III E

- "1. A Contracting Party shall ensure that vessels of that Party to which the scheme of Joint International Inspection applies shall report to their competent authorities **or to the NAFO Secretariat if the Contracting Party so desires**".

The Chairman of STACTIC reported that the Executive Secretary indicated that the Pilot Project Team for the Hail System contained in STACTIC Working Paper 93/4 has the computer system in place but will need additional software. The Executive Secretary declared himself prepared to proceed with this project.

The Meeting **endorsed** this project and recommends that the Executive Secretary continue with the project and to expend funds already assigned within the budget (subject to General Council approval).

- 3.3 Item 12, Operation of the NAFO Observer Scheme Pilot Project, **was referred** to STACTIC.

The Chairman of STACTIC informed the Commission that after discussion it was agreed that the Scientific Council request could be accommodated by amending paragraphs in Part VI-Pilot Project for NAFO Observer Scheme of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

The proposed amendment **was adopted**. (Annex 5-FC Doc. 93/7)

- 3.4 Item 13 **was postponed** to a later stage of this meeting. At the closing session the advice of the Scientific Council to the request by the Commission on financing of NAFO scientific work in the Regulatory Area **was accepted** (in the Scientific Council Report for 1993).

- 3.5 Item 14, Nominal Catches by Contracting Parties Exceeding 1992 Quotas, was referred to STACTIC.

The Chairman of STACTIC reported that it was agreed to modify table "Selective Comparative Quotas/Catches in the Regulatory Area for 1992" (see Annex 11 of Part II) incorporating all comments made by Contracting Parties.

The representative of Canada stated that this table was not understandable and should be referred to a future Meeting. This proposal **was accepted** by the Commission.

- 3.6 Item 15, Review of NAFO Rules Regarding Incidental Catches which involved a proposal to count discards of fish against the incidental catch limit percentages, was discussed by STACTIC and then **referred by the Commission to the next annual meeting**.
- 3.7 Item 16, Annual Return of Infringements, Surveillance and Inspection Reports, was reviewed by STACTIC and reported to the Commission. The report **was adopted**.
- 3.8 Item 17, Fishing Vessels Registration, was referred to STACTIC.

The Chairman of STACTIC reported that the Committee agreed the form of "Notification of Fishing Vessels/Hail Reports" by the NAFO Secretariat should be modified in 3 columns for each Contracting Party - Vessel Name/Notification Received by the Secretariat, Hail Reports Received by the Secretariat and Sightings of Vessels. The report for the 1994 Annual Meeting should cover all of 1993 and up to 30 June 1994.

- 3.9 Item 18, Report of STACTIC at the Annual Meeting, was presented by the Chairman of STACTIC (E. Lemche - Denmark) at the closing session on 10 September 1993, and the report **was adopted** by the Commission (see Part II of the Fisheries Commission Report).

The major issues emphasized by the Chairman of STACTIC and the **Fisheries Commission decisions** were as follows:

- a) The Russian project for redfish in the Regulatory Area:
 - minimum mesh size 90 mm;
 - maximum 5 vessels;
 - maximum 250 fishing days in total;
 - a team of scientists will monitor the project, circulating among the 5 vessels;
 - only pelagic trawls will be used in the project;
 - the scientific team will ensure that the trawls are set in such a way that catch of other groundfish is avoided;
 - to be reviewed at the Special Scientific Council Meeting in November 1993 and considered at the Special Fisheries Commission Meeting in 1994.
- b) A NAFO Inspection Manual to be produced by the Executive Secretary along the lines recommended by STACTIC.

- c) Amendment to Part I.D. of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures "Minimum Fish Size" (proposed by Canada) regarding round length, head off and gutted, split length for Cod, A. plaice, Yellowtail, Witch, Redfish, and G. halibut to proceed with the following request to the Scientific Council:

- Feasibility and necessity of determining minimum fish size for the following species: witch, redfish, Greenland halibut.
- To advise on the minimum fish size to be used when processed length equivalent is used for witch, redfish, Greenland halibut, cod, American plaice and yellowtail.

The Fisheries Commission **adopted** this recommendation and requested the Scientific Council to consider the request at its Special Session in **November 1993**. The Commission will further consider this issue at its Special Meeting in 1994.

- d) Amendment to Part I.D. "Minimum Fish Size Measure" (by Canada) of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures regarding discards was discussed at STACTIC without resolution. The Commission decided that this issue is fundamental for the Conservation and Enforcement measures and cannot be changed at this stage as the Contracting Parties have their own regulations. However, the Commission **agreed** that Canada could follow its own equivalent system of regulations with respect of Part I.D. of the Measures.
- e) Amendment to Part IV.5(ii) of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures to add a new paragraph (c) for inspection procedure as in the STACTIC Report, Part II, item 8.4 was **adopted** by the Commission.
- f) On the report of the Shrimp Working Group, the Commission **decided** to incorporate into the Measures a ban on direct fishery of shrimp in Divisions 3LNO in 1994.

4. Conservation of Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area (items 19 and 20 of the Agenda)

- 4.1 Item 19, Transfer of Quotas between Contracting Parties, was postponed to a later stage of the meeting, and at the closing session was **deferred** to the 16th Annual Meeting.
- 4.2 The acting Chairman of the Scientific Council, H. Lassen (EEC), (the Chair), gave a Summary of Scientific Advice by the Scientific Council and referred to the summary sheets, resulting in the following management advice for 1994 and TAC(s) for the regulated species:

- Cod 3M	no directed fishery
- Redfish 3M	20 000 tons
- American plaice 3M	not exceeding 1 000 tons
- Cod 3NO	not exceeding 6 000 tons

- Redfish 3LN	not exceeding 14 000 tons
- American plaice 3LNO	not exceeding 4 800 tons
- Yellowtail flounder 3LNO	7 000 tons
- Witch flounder 3NO	not exceeding 3 000 tons
- Capelin 3NO	no directed fishery

4.3 This presentation was followed by a stock-by-stock discussion as follows:

Cod 3M

The representative of Canada said that despite occasional good recruitment the year-classes did not contribute to the spawning stock biomass (SSB). This indicates the ineffectiveness of the management and technical measures taken by NAFO.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council considered this to be the reason why no direct fishery should be conducted in 1994 to allow stock recovery.

Shrimp 3M

The representative of Canada reported that the by-catch of redfish was very high and climbing.

The representative of Norway said that when the Norwegian fleet used "the grid" in trawls, the problem of redfish by-catches disappeared.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council refrained from comment at this stage as the data relating to this fishery was only recently made available to the Scientific Council.

American plaice 3M

The representative of Canada asked if 1 000 tons (just for by-catch) would help stop the decline of this stock.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council answered yes and referred to page 71 of NAFO SCS Doc. 93/17.

Cod 3NO

The representative of Canada stated that every effort should be made to allow young fish to survive to spawn.

Redfish 3LN

The representative of Canada asked if any positive effect was visible from the introduction of the 130 mm mesh size and if a 14 000 ton TAC was a safe figure for this stock.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council considered that the introduction of the large mesh size had been too recent to show any effect, but stated that 14 000 tons were more to the low side of the advice (page 66 of NAFO SCS Doc. 93/17).

American plaice 3LNO

The representative of Canada asked if a 4 800 ton TAC would by itself stop the decline of this stock.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council answered negatively indicating that environmental conditions also play a role.

Yellowtail flounder 3LNO

The representative of Canada wondered if a 7 000 ton TAC was not detrimental to the rebuilding of this stock.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council stated that the important feature was to give to the stock concerned an appropriate fishing mortality level.

Witch flounder 3NO

The representative of Canada inquired if a 3 000 tons TAC would stop the decline of the stock.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council stated that the TAC in question might contribute to reverse the downward trend.

Cod 2J3KL

On questions relating to Cod 2J3KL, the Chairman of the Scientific Council considered that the situation was still grim and unpredictable.

**5. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks in the
Regulatory Area (items 21.1 to 21.4 of the Agenda)**

5.1 Cod 3M

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) considered that the main problem to be tackled was the effective protection of the small-sized fish and informed that NAFO has already some technical measures that could protect juvenile fish. He stressed that the situation was worse in 1992 because the exploitation of the 1990 year-class started earlier than that of the 1986 year class in 1989 and noted that a rationally exploited cod fishery on Flemish Cap requires first to impede catches on immature fish, and second to control the exploitation rate through fishing effort or catch. He expressed concern about by-catches of cod in the newly developed shrimp fishery on Flemish Cap informing that contacts were being developed among Contracting Parties to find a satisfactory solution for this stock which would include the reduction of TAC and the reduction of incidental by-catch limit. He also referred to the search for a practical arrangement for the 41 cm size limit for cod.

The representative of the European Community wondered if conversion factors would not facilitate controlling the harvest of under-sized fish.

A TAC of 11 000 tons (proposed by EEC) was adopted with 6 abstentions (Canada, Cuba, Iceland, Japan, Norway, the Russian Federation).

5.2 Redfish 3M

The representative of Canada supported the scientific advice and warned about the danger of overfishing. He drew the attention of representatives to the large amount of redfish by-catch in the shrimp fishery.

The representative of the European Community stated that the TAC had to be reduced, but refrained from tabling any concrete proposals at this stage. He considered it important to avoid the catch of juvenile fish in the shrimp fishery. Further he stated that the reduction of this fishery should be gradual and declared that the EEC was prepared to accept a reduction of the TAC in relation to 1993 but reserved his position on the exact level of that reduction. The EEC considered that some technical measures for the newly developed shrimp fishery should be introduced to avoid catches of juvenile fish.

The representative of the Russian Federation said that as this stock was stabilized the decrease should be gradual, and proposed a TAC of 26 000 tons.

The representative of the European Community, Cuba and Lithuania supported the Russian proposal.

A TAC of 26 000 tons was adopted with 3 abstentions (Canada, Iceland, Japan).

5.3 American plaice 3M

The representative of Canada confirmed his acceptance of the scientific advice, and proposed a TAC of 1 000 tons should be established for by-catches only.

The representative of Cuba supported the Canadian proposal.

The representative of the European Community reserved his view on this stock.

The final decision **was adopted** by consensus that **no directed fishery** shall be carried out under the TAC for this stock in 1994.

5.4 Shrimp 3M

The acting Chairman of the Scientific Council, H. Lassen (EEC), presented the advice from the Scientific Council underlining the uncertainty element and the absence of long-standing research on this stock. He pointed out that the by-catch of small redfish was considered a potential for significantly impacting the redfish resource in this area. He stated that effective immediately, sorting grates should be mandatory in shrimp fishing operations in this area as a means of minimizing the by-catch of redfish and other fish species. In reply to the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Mr. Lassen said that the overwhelming problem was indeed the by-catch of redfish and this had been checked against logbook entries of four different Contracting Parties. He also referred to a groundfish survey conducted in the area by the European Community.

The representative of the Russian Federation proposed the creation of a Working Group with interested parties and including experienced people to study in-depth the matter under consideration. He suggested the name of F. Troyanovsky as the convener of this Working Group.

This proposal was endorsed by the Meeting.

The Convener of the Working Group presented the Report of the Working Group, which proposed the following regulatory features for shrimp fishery:

- minimum mesh size of nets - 40 mm;
- mandatory sorting grids or grates with maximum spacing between the bars of 28 mm;
- maximum by-catch of 10% by weight in any one haul;
- minimum of 10% observer coverage.

These regulations would be mandatory as from 1 January 1994, as well, the Contracting Parties could apply it without delay.

The representative of Canada indicated that he would like to see a 15% or 20% observer coverage.

The proposal by the Working Group on Shrimp 3M was adopted as a management measure to be incorporated in the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.

6. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks Straddling National Fishing Limits (items 22.1 to 22.9 of the Agenda)

6.1 Cod 3NO

The representative of Canada proposed that a moratorium would be the best way to protect the 1989 year class in order to help rebuilding the stock.

The representative of the European Community indicated that he was prepared to consider seriously the proposed reductions on the TAC (to 6 000 tons) in conformity with the scientific advice and stressed that there was a certain element of flexibility, and stated that NAFO had an International Observer Scheme and the rules thereby established should be respected. He proposed up to 50% observer coverage and strict inspection control.

The representative of the European Community, stressing the concern of all Contracting Parties regarding this stock, proposed to follow the scientific advice and set a TAC of 6 000 tons plus observer coverage of 50%, an enhanced co-operation between the European Community and Canada to ensure 100% inspection presence in the area and 100% dock side control.

The representative of Canada, noting that a moratorium would be more advantageous for the stocks, characterized the proposal as "a poor second choice". He considered that the scientific advice with the reduced TAC of 6 000 tons was being respected and the proposed additional measures were a clear improvement.

A TAC of 6 000 tons and regulations respecting 50% observer coverage, 100% inspection presence in the NAFO Regulatory Area and 100% dock side control were adopted by consensus.

6.2 Redfish 3LN

The representative of the Russian Federation proposed to follow the scientific advice, i.e. a TAC of 14 000 tons.

The representative of Cuba supported this proposal.

A TAC Of 14 000 tons was adopted by consensus.

6.3 American plaice 3LNO (Yellowtail flounder 3LNO and Witch flounder 3NO)

The representative of Canada stated that the spawning stock has declined precipitously since 1985 to only 15-20% of its earlier level. There is a definite need to protect the 1985 and 1986 year-classes to allow growth of the spawning stock biomass. A moratorium on this fishery would be appropriate. This stock is extremely important to Canada with 98.8% of the TAC allocated to it.

The representative of the European Community stated that the Scientific Council advised a substantial reduction of the fishing mortality (page 82 of NAFO SCS Doc. 93/17).

The representative of Canada considered that the three flatfish stocks were in bad shape. He took the view that no directed fishery should be conducted on the three stocks.

The representative of the European Community said that the three stocks were not in a good condition. However, acknowledging that these stocks should be protected in conformity with the scientific advice, he noted that there were differences between the stocks in question.

The representative of Canada stated that the scientific advice did not take into account the fact that the present conditions were not normal.

It was agreed that the scientific advice should be followed for setting TAC(s) for these stocks (and American plaice 3M), but the following footnote be introduced for the four stocks:

"Considering the advice contained in the Report of the Scientific Council and having regard to the poor state of the stock of American plaice in Divisions 3LNO and 3M; Witch flounder in Division 3NO and Yellowtail flounder in 3LNO, no directed fishery shall be carried out under the TACs agreed for each of these stocks in 1994, which are suspended. The provisions of Part I, Section A.4b) of NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures shall apply."

The final decision was taken by the Meeting that no directed fishery shall be carried out under the TAC agreed - 4 800 tons for this stock.

6.4 Yellowtail flounder 3LNO

The representative of Canada recalled that this stock was of crucial importance to Canada (97.5%). However, in the period 1985 to 1992, it had suffered a very dramatic decline which justified a moratorium for 1994 on this stock.

The representative of the European Community pointed out that the current TAC was not detrimental to the stock. He added that the mesh size would contribute to a better exploitation pattern.

The representative of Canada, whilst recognising the importance of the mesh size as a management tool, indicated that the results from an increased mesh size were at the present stage negligible due to the extreme fragility of this stock.

The final **decision was taken** by the Meeting that **no directed fishery** shall be carried out under the TAC agreed - 7 000 tons for this stock.

6.5 Witch flounder 3NO

The representative of Canada proposed a moratorium on this species considering that the 3 000 tons figure was arbitrary due to the lack of knowledge about this stock.

The representative of the European Community noted that the assessment was not made on average recruitment but on the most recent one.

The final **decision was taken** by the Meeting that **no directed fishery** shall be carried out under the TAC agreed - 3 000 tons for this stock.

6.6 Capelin 3NO

The representative of Norway proposed to follow the scientific advice, i.e. no directed fishery for this species, which was supported by the representative of Canada.

A TAC of "zero" was agreed by consensus.

6.7 Squid Subareas 3 and 4

The representative of Japan proposed to maintain the same TAC as last year, namely, 150 000 tons.

The representative of Canada supported this proposal.

A TAC of 150 000 tons was adopted by consensus.

6.8 Shrimp 3LNO

Following discussion and scientific advice, an amendment to the Conservation and Enforcement Measures **was adopted** as follows:

"Part I- Management (add new paragraph)

- G. Due to biological considerations, all Contracting Parties shall ensure that their vessels shall not conduct a directed fishery for shrimp in Divisions 3LNO in 1994."

6.9 Cod 3L

The representative of Canada recalled the 2-year moratorium on cod 2J3KL as from July 1992 in order to help the rebuilding of this stock. However, the stock continues to decline and the SSB is at its lowest. The causes for this decline remain not clearly defined. No major impact was felt in this stock resulting from the existing moratorium. The representative proposed that the moratorium should continue. And, as it will be the case inside the Canadian 200 mile zone, it is expected that NAFO will follow suit.

The representative of the European Community agreed with the assessment made by the previous representative. He underlined that as a matter of consistency, the moratorium should remain in force inside and outside the 200 mile zone.

The representative of Canada assured representatives that no commercial fishing would take place in 1994 inside the Canadian 200 mile zone and proposed the same resolution as adopted last year that no directed fishery for this stock in 3L be permitted.

The representatives of the European Community and the Russian Federation endorsed this proposal.

The representative of Cuba reminded representatives that the population of seals (around 3 million) had gone completely out of control and for this reason considered that the Scientific Council should make a more thorough analysis on the interaction between seals and cod.

The representatives of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Norway, the European Community, Canada, Iceland and Japan supported the view expressed by the previous representative.

The proposal concerning Cod 3L (FC Doc. 93/8) **was adopted**.

Note by the Executive Secretary:

The proposals regarding the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures adopted by the Fisheries Commission during its discussions under items 3 to 6 of this report were incorporated in the official Fisheries Commission documents and distributed to all Contracting Parties for the final decision (according to provisions of para 6 of Article XI and para 1 Article XII of the NAFO Convention). These documents are: NAFO/FC Doc(s). 93/6,7,8,9,10,11,12 and "Quota Table for 1994". All proposals became measures binding on 15 December 1993.

- 6.10 On the allocation of the quota of former USSR to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia, K. Hoydal (Denmark), NAFO mediator on this issue, reported that he and V. Rabinovitch (Canada) had developed a series of contacts among the parties concerned and presented several proposals, but the parties involved were unable to come to an unanimous solution.

The representative of Estonia thanked the NAFO mediators and presented facts on high unemployment in Estonia's fishing industry. He emphasized Estonia's commitment to the principles of NAFO and welcomed the decision for "block quota" allocation as an adequate temporary solution, prior to the allocation of national quotas and suggested to divide the collective quota between the four Contracting Parties on the basis of the actual catch in 1993.

The representative of the Russian Federation made a statement on this issue noting that there is no legal basis for claim of national allocations from the quota of the former USSR for the three Baltic independent states. He stated that the decision of the Fisheries Commission for "block quota" allocations at the 14th Annual Meeting was unprecedented in the NAFO practice to which Russia had objected setting its autonomous quotas and developing measures for its fleet to prevent overfishing. Further, the Russian representative informed that due to impasse in this problem, Russia was forced to depart from some compromises back to Russia's previous position - to share the former USSR's quotas with the three Baltic Countries on the "tonnage/population" principle proposed by Russian delegation at the 14th Annual Meeting (1992) and its objection to the "block-quota" allocation. However, he stated that Russia is ready to continue further negotiations on the subject with the interested Parties.

The representative of Lithuania stated Lithuania's observance of all NAFO regulations, decisions and requirements and reiterated his support for effective conservation measures in the Regulatory Area. He objected to the Russian proposal on "tonnage-population" principle and supported the "block quota" allocation suggesting the national allocations for the four countries based on the 1993 catches of Contracting Parties involved.

The Latvian statement on this issue distributed to the Meeting supported the "block quota" allocation as a temporary solution for 1993 and proposed to allocate national quota for Latvia based on 1993 catches. It was suggested that those catches of Latvia were not completely fished yet in 1993 be considered as a sufficient basis for the national allocation for 1994, and this procedure should not harm the interests of any other Contracting Party.

The representative of the European Community expressed his disappointment with the lack of satisfactory results and urged the parties to continue their efforts towards a long-lasting solution. He suggested that, in the meantime, the scheme applicable to 1993 should apply to 1994.

The Meeting agreed to apply the existing traditional distribution key to the agreed TACs as outlined in the "Quota Table" in Schedule I of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. The former USSR share was allocated to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia as a "block quota" on the same conditions as last year (this noted in footnote 1 to the Quota Table).

The representative of the Russian Federation introduced a formal objection to the "block quota" allocation.

7. Formulation of Request to the Scientific Council for Scientific Advice on the Management of Fish Stocks in 1995

- 7.1 The Canadian proposed draft of the Fisheries Commission's request for scientific advice on management in 1995 of certain stocks in Subareas 3 and 4 **was adopted** (Annex 6).
- 7.2 The representative of Canada especially emphasized in paragraph 6 of the request regarding G. halibut which is a very important stock for Canada and which should be studied in a comprehensive way as soon as next year. He called on Parties having the appropriate data (Murmansk fleet, European Community and others) to provide those for the Scientific Council deliberations.

8. Closing Procedure (items 24 to 26 of the Agenda)

- 8.1 Agenda item 24, Time and Place of the Next Meeting, was referred to the General Council. The 16th Annual Meeting will be held on 19-23 September 1994 in the Halifax/Dartmouth area subject to the decision of the General Council.
- 8.2 Under Other Business, the representative of Canada took the view that a mechanism to settle disputes between Contracting Parties within NAFO should be found. To that end, Canada would be inviting representatives to participate in a Working Group to consider all aspects of this issue.
- 8.3 Before the adjournment of the meeting, the representative of the European Community thanked the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission on behalf of the Meeting for his hard work, objectivity and impartiality in conducting the meetings of the Fisheries Commission.
- 8.4 The Annual Meeting of the Fisheries Commission was adjourned at 1400 hrs on 10 September 1993.

9. Adoption of the Report

The Report of the Fisheries Commission was reviewed and adopted by *unanimous* consent by the Fisheries Commission on 15 December 1993 (according to GF/93-411 of 05 November 1993).

Annex 1. List of Participants

CANADA

Head of Delegation

B. Rawson, Deputy Minister, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Representative

B. Rawson (see address above)

Alternate

V. Rabinovitch, Assistant Deputy Minister, International Relations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Advisers

C. J. Allen, Resource Allocation Br., Fisheries Operations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

R. A. Andrews, P. O. Box 100 New Gower Street, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 1J3

B. Applebaum, Director-General, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, International Directorate, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

D. B. Atkinson, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, NAFC, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

J. S. Beckett, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Biological Sciences, 200 Kent St., 12th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

L. Bernard, Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêche et de l'alimentation, 200, Chemin Ste-Foy, Quebec City, Quebec

C. A. Bishop, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, NAFC, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

D. Bollivar, Seafreez Foods, 32 Beckfoot Drive, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4C8

W. R. Bowering, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, NAFC, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

R. Branton, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4A2

D. N. Brock, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

W. B. Brodie, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, NAFC, Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

B. Bursey, Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Confederation Bldg., P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6

W. Carter, Minister of Fisheries, Government of Newfoundland, P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6

J. Casey, MLA, Digby-Annapolis, Digby, Nova Scotia

B. Chapman, P. O. Box 8900, St. John's, Newfoundland, A1B 3R9

H. M. Clarke, Fisheries Resource Conservation Council, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

H. Copestake, 17 Sunset Blvd., Ottawa, Ontario K1S 3G8

L. J. Dean, Government of Newfoundland, Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6

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

A. J. Dunne, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

E. B. Dunne, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1

S. J. Engeset, Harbour Grace Shrimp Co. Ltd., c/o Newfoundland Trading Ltd., 11 Morris Drive, Dartmouth, N.S.

L. Forand, 177 Nepean Street, Suite 200, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0B4

D. L. Gill, International Directorate, Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

J. Gough, DFO Communications, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7

J. E. Haché, Fisheries Operations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

R. G. Halliday, BIO, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4A2

D. R. Jennings, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N.S. B3J 2S7

N. P. Katsepontes, Office of the Ambassador for Fisheries Conservation (NEX), Department of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2

A. A. Longard, Marine Resources, N. S. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4

C. F. MacKinnon, Marine Advisor, Groundfish and Seaplants, Nova Scotia Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4

E. McCurdy, c/o FFAW/CAW, P. O. Box 10, 2 Steers Cove, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5H5

P. McGuinness, Vice-President, Fisheries Council of Canada, #806-141 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5J3
 B. J. McNamara, Newfoundland Resources Ltd., P. O. Box 13695, St. John's, Newfoundland A0G 2R0
 E. J. Maher, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
 B. Mewdell, Dept of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Room 1412, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
 E. Mundell, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
 W. M. Murphy, Mersey Sea Foods, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia B0T 1K0
 D. G. Parsons, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
 R. J. Prier, Director, Conservation and Protection, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
 J. Quintal-McGrath, Dept of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
 G. Reid, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6
 D. C. Rideout, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
 M. Rowe, Dept of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., 15th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
 W. Sanford, Office of the Ambassador for Fisheries Conservation, Dept of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
 L. Savard, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Maurice Lamontagne Institute, 850 Route de la Mer, C.P. 1000, Mont-Joli, Quebec G5H 3Z4
 M. Showell, BIO/MFD, P. O. Box 1006, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 4A2
 N. A. Smith, Eastern Fishermen's Federation, 157 Enterprise Square, Box 189, Shelburne, N. S. B0T 1W0
 R. Stirling, Seafood Producers Association of Nova Scotia, P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, N.S. B2Y 3Z6
 L. Strowbridge, Head, Offshore Surveillance, Nfld. Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P.O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
 C. Topp, P. O. Box 40, Mulgrave, N.S. B0E 2G0
 G. Traverse, Director, Resource Management Div., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
 D. Vardy, Government of Newfoundland, P. O. Box 8700, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6
 G. Venner, Department of External Affairs (RWM), 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario
 G. C. Viscount, P. O. Box 9440, St. John's, Newfoundland A1A 2Y3
 W. E. Wells, Fishery Products International, 70 O'Leary Ave., P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5L1
 E. Wiseman, Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E2
 M. Yeadon, National Sea Products, Box 910, Lunenburg, Nova Scotia B0J 2C0

CUBA

Head of Delegation

J. M. Benjamin, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Barlovento, Jaimanitas, Municipio Playa, Ciudad de la Havana

Alternate

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

Representative

J. M. Benjamin (see address above)

Adviser

R. Dominguez, Cuban Fishing Fleet Representative, 1881 Brunswick St., Apt. 908, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

DENMARK (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Head of Delegation

E. Lemche, Director, Gronlands Hjemmestyre, Pilestraede 52, Box 2151, Copenhagen, Denmark

Alternate

K. Hoydal, Director of Fisheries, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 64, FR-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Representatives

E. Lemche (see address above)
K. Hoydal (see address above)

Advisors

H. Leth, Direktoratet for Fiskeri, Fangst and Landbrug, Box 269, DK 3900, Nuuk, Greenland
K. P. Mortensen, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 87, FR-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
A. Nicolajsen, Fiskirannsóknarstofan, Noatun, P. O. Box 3051, Torshavn, Faroe Islands
K. Nygaard, Biological Station, Box 570, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland
P. Pedersen, P. O. Box 310, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland

ESTONIA**Head of Delegation**

L. Vaarja, General Director, National Estonian Board of Fisheries, Liivalaia 14, EE 0100 Tallinn

Representative

L. Vaarja (see address above)

Advisers

R. Aps, National Estonia Board of Fisheries, Liivalaia 14, EE 0100 Tallinn
I. Heinsoo, 958 Broadview Ave., #202, Toronto, Ontario M4K 2R6
S. Nommann, Permanent Mission of Estonia to United Nations, 630 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2415, New York 10111, NY
R. Damberg, Representative in Canada for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 1967 Woodlawn Terrace, Halifax, N.S., Canada
B3H 4G5

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)**Head of Delegation**

H. Schmiegelow, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, B1049 Brussels, Belgium

Alternate

H. Koster, Administrator, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, 1049 Brussels

Representatives

H. Schmiegelow (see address above)
H. Koster (see address above)

Advisers

J. R. Beck, Ambassador, Delegation of the Commission of the EC, 350 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8
T. Abadia, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Belliard 28, 5th Floor, Room 22, 1049 Brussels
A. Astudillo, Commission of the European Communities, DGXIV, Rue Joseph II 99, 1049 Brussels
E. Penas, Commission of the European Communities, DG XIV-B.1, 200, Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
H. B. Baggendorff, Eurostat, Commission of the EC, Batiment Jean Monnet, BP 1907 Luxembourg
D. Cross, Eurostat, Commission of the EC, Batiment Jean Monnet, BP 1907, Luxembourg
P. A. Curran, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, 7/20, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
G. F. Kingston, Senior Assistant (Economic and Commercial Affairs), Delegation of the Commission of the EC, 1110-350 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8
J. M. O. Van Mullem, Embassy of Belgium, 3330 Garfield Str. NW, Washington, DC, USA

L. Teixeira da Costa, Council of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 170, B-1048 Brussels
 H. Nilsson, Council of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 170, Ch. 10/37, B-1048 Brussels
 B. Buch, Repr. Permanente du Danemark, Rue D'Arion 73, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
 A. Jakobs de Padua, Bundesministerium fur Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstr. 1, Bonn, Germany
 E. Dahm, Bundesforschungsanstalt fuer Fischerei, Institut fuer Fangtechnik, Palmaille 9, 22767 Hamburg, Germany
 H. P. Cornus, Institut fur Seefischerei, Bundesforschungsanstalt fur Fischerei, Palmaille 9, 22767 Hamburg, Germany
 J. F. Gilon, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche, Directeur des Pêches Maritimes, 3 Place Fontenoy, 75007 Paris, France
 J. Herrero, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
 C. Asencio, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
 J. T. Santos, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Ortega y Gasset, 57, Madrid, Spain
 J. R. Fuertes Gamundi, "Anamer-Agarba", Puerto Pesquero S/N, Vigo (Pontevedra), Spain
 M. Iriondo, Apartado de Correos num. 88, Pasajes, Spain
 J. L. Meseguer, Asociacion de Empresas de Pesca de Bacalao, Especies Afinesy Asociadas (ARBAC), Enrique Larreta 10, Madrid 28036, Spain
 A. Vazquez, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
 E. deCardenas, Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia, P. O. Box 240, Santander, Spain
 M. H. Figueiredo, Direccao Geral das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa, Portugal
 A. I. Pereira, First Secretary, Embassy of Portugal, 645 Island Park Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 0B8
 A. Avila de Melo, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia 1400, Lisbon, Portugal
 M. L. Godinho, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, Alges Praia, 1400 Lisbon, Portugal
 H. Lassen Danmark Fiskeri-og Havundersogelser, Charlottenlund Slot, DK-2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark
 A. Battaglia, IFREMER, BP 4240, F-97500 St. Pierre et Miquelon
 C. C. Southgate, Room 428, Nobel House, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HX
 C. Porro, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 2JR
 J. Casey, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Directorate of Fisheries Research, Fisheries Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, United Kingdom

ICELAND

Head of Delegation

A. Halldorsson, Ministry of Fisheries, Skulagata 4, 150 Reykjavik

Representatives

A. Halldorsson (see address above)

S. T. Einarsson, Marine Research Institute, Skulagata 4, P. O. Box 1390, Reykjavik

JAPAN

Head of Delegation

K. Yonezawa, c/o Fishery Division, Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Representative

K. Yonezawa (see address above)

Advisers

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

H. Inoue, Japan Fisheries Association, Suite 1408, Duke Tower, 5251 Duke Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3J 1P6

T. Takahashi, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association, 3-6 Kanda, Ogawa-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101

A. Umezawa, Fishery Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100

K. Yokawa, Fishery Biologist, Distant-Water Groundfish Section, National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries, 5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu 424, Japan

LATVIA

Head of Delegation

A. Ukis, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Republic of Latvia, 63, Kr. Valdemara str., Riga, 226492

Representative

A. Ukis (see address above)

Advisers

N. Riekstins, Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Republic of Latvia, 63, Kr. Valdemara str, Riga, LV-1142

R. Damberg, Representative in Canada for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 1967 Woodlawn Terrace, Halifax, N.S., Canada
B3H 4G5

LITHUANIA

Head of Delegation

A. Rusakevicius, Deputy Minister-Director of Fisheries Dept, Ministry of Agriculture, Republic of Lithuania, 9, Juozapavichiaus str, Vilnius 2600

Representatives

A. Rusakevicius (see address above)

A. Parochka, Nemuno 32, Klaipeda

Advisers

R. Damberg, Representative in Canada for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 1967 Woodlawn Terrace, Halifax, N.S., Canada
B3H 4G5

A. Vinchiunas, Embassy of the Republic of Lithuania, Elizabetes isle 2, Riga, Republic of Latvia

NORWAY

Head of Delegation

P. Gullestad, Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, 5002 Bergen

Representative

P. Gullestad (see address above)

Adviser

A. Maraak, Norges Fiskarlag, 7000 Trondheim

POLAND

Head of Delegation

J. Fota, Consul, Polish Trade Commissioner's Office, 3501 Avenue du Musee, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 2C8

Representatives

J. Fota (see address above)

L. Dybiec, Ministry of Transport and Maritime Economy, Sea Fishery Dept., Chalubinskiego Str. 416, Warsaw

RUSSIA

Head of Delegation

A. Rodin, First Deputy Chairman, Fisheries Committee of the Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31,
103045

Representative

A. Rodin (see address above)

Alternates

V. Fedorenko, Deputy Chief, Department of International Cooperation, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12
Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

V. Tsoukalov, Chief, Department of Fisheries Resources, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky
Boul., Moscow K-31

Advisers

A. A. Mikhailov, Representative of the Russian Federation in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Suite 2202, Halifax,
Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3

V. Rikhter, AtlantNIRO, Dm. Donskoy St. 5, Kaliningrad 23600

I. G. Shestakova, Fisheries Committee of Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

V. N. Solodovnik, First Secretary (Fisheries Affairs) Embassy of the Russian Federation, 1609 Decatur St. N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20011 USA

F. M. Troyanovsky, Director, Doctor of Biology, Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography
(PINRO), 6 Knipovich St. 183763, Murmansk

Y. Videneev, Assistant Representative of the Russian Federation in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Halifax, N.S.,
Canada B3K 5L3

OBSERVERS

KOREA

K. S. Park, Korean Embassy, 2450 Mass Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. USA

J. K. Yoon, Korean Embassy, 151 Slater St., 5th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

D. J. Christovich, OES/OMC, US Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520

R. Rosenman, Office of Marine Conservation, U.S. State Department, 2201 C St. NW, Washington, DC 20520

D. Swanson, National Marine Fisheries Service-NOAA, 1335 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

H. S. Tinkham, Office of Marine Conservation, OES/OMC Room 5806, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.
20520-7818

L. Tobey, U.S. Consulate General, Cogswell Tower #910, Scotia Square, Halifax, N.S., Canada B3J 3K1

SECRETARIAT

Dr. L. I. Chepel, Executive Secretary

T. Amaratunga, Assistant Executive Secretary

W. H. Champion, Administrative Assistant

F. D. Keating, Account Officer

B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary

F. E. Perry, Documents and Mailing Clerk-Steno

D. C. A. Auby, Clerk-Typist

G. Moulton, Statistical Officer

R. A. Myers, Clerk-Duplicator Operator

B. T. Crawford, Clerk-Duplicator Operator

Annex 2. Agenda

Opening Procedures

1. Opening by the Chairman, E. Wiseman (Canada)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

Administrative

6. Adoption of the Report of the 14th Annual Meeting, September 1992 (FC Doc. 92/19)
7. Review of Commission Membership
8. Election of Officers - Chairman and Vice-Chairman

Conservation and Enforcement Measures

9. Incorporation of a Catch Reporting System into the Hail System
10. Effort Plans for the Vessels of the Contracting Parties Operating in the Regulatory Area
11. Operation of the Hail System
12. Operation of the NAFO Observer Scheme Pilot Project
13. Financing of NAFO's Scientific Work in the Regulatory Area
14. Nominal Catches by Contracting Parties Exceeding 1992 Quotas
15. Review of NAFO Rules Regarding Incidental Catches
16. Annual Return of Infringements, Surveillance and Inspection Reports
17. Fishing Vessel Registrations
18. Report of STACTIC at the Annual Meeting

Conservation of Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area

19. Transfer of Quotas Between Contracting Parties
20. Summary of Scientific Advice by the Scientific Council
21. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area
 - 21.1 Cod in Div. 3M
 - 21.2 Redfish in Div. 3M
 - 21.3 American plaice in Div. 3M
 - 21.4 Shrimp in Div. 3M
22. Management and Technical Measures for Fish Stocks Straddling National Fishing Limits
 - 22.1 Cod in Div. 3NO
 - 22.2 Redfish in Div. 3LN
 - 22.3 American plaice in Div. 3LNO
 - 22.4 Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO
 - 22.5 Witch flounder in Div. 3NO
 - 22.6 Capelin in Div. 3NO
 - 22.7 Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4

- 22.8 Management of Shrimp in the Regulatory Area in 1994
- 22.9 Management and Technical Measures for the following stocks, if available in the Regulatory Area in 1994:

- i) Cod in Div. 3L

- 23. Formulation of Request to the Scientific Council for Scientific Advice on the Management of Fish Stocks in 1995

Closing Procedure

- 24. Time and Place of the Next Meeting
- 25. Other Business
- 26. Adjournment

Annex 3. Press Release

1. The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada through 6-10 September 1993, under the chairmanship of K. Yonezawa (Japan), President of NAFO. All sessions of the constituent bodies of NAFO - the General Council, Scientific Council, Fisheries Commission, and subsidiary bodies, Standing Committees, for finance (STACFAD), for non-Contracting Parties activities (STACFAC), for international control (STACTIC) convened at the Holiday Inn.
2. The Contracting Parties were represented at the Meeting by delegations from: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Estonia, European Economic Community (EEC), Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, and Russia. Observers were admitted from the United States of America and the Republic of Korea.
3. The Annual Meeting was preceded by the meeting of the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (NAFO Headquarters, April, 1993) and the Regular Meeting of the Scientific Council (NAFO Headquarters, June 1993).
4. The Scientific Council, under the chairmanship of H. Lassen (EEC), considered the state of stocks and scientific basis for the management and conservation of fishery resources in the NAFO Convention Area. The scientific advice was reported to the Fisheries Commission indicating the decrease of stock sizes for all groundfish stocks in the Regulatory Area and continuing decline for all cod stocks and flounders.
5. The Fisheries Commission, under the chairmanship of E. Wiseman (Canada), undertook serious discussions on particular substantial issues pertaining to the management and conservation of the fisheries resources in the Regulatory Area and agreed on a number of important new measures pursuing the prime objective of rebuilding depleted fish stocks.

Against this background, Total Allowable Catches and allocations to Contracting Parties in 1994 for all groundfish stocks which are either entirely in the Regulatory Area or associated with the stocks within the 200-mile fishing zones were decreased (attached in the Quota Table).

The following new proposals for international measures of control and enforcement within the Regulatory Area were introduced: no directed fishery for the stocks of American plaice in Divisions 3LNO and 3M, Witch flounder in Divisions 3LNO, and for Yellowtail flounder in Divisions 3LNO as those stocks should be utilized only as by-catch; special measures to prevent the taking of undersize fish in the fishing for Cod in Divisions 3NO were agreed such as a ban on shrimp trawling in this area. Furthermore, the Parties concerned agreed on 50% observer coverage and 100% inspection monitoring. As regards shrimp trawling in Division 3M, a minimum net mesh size of 40mm, sorting grids for fish escapement and deployment of observers on board of fishing vessels were agreed. These conservation measures are directed at drastic reduction of the mortality of juvenile fish and, as the result, a gradual revival of fish stocks.

6. The Fisheries Commission unanimously agreed with a Canadian proposal that taking into account the available scientific advice, directed fisheries for Cod in Division 3L in the Regulatory Area shall not be permitted in 1994, which is consistent with the current moratorium that is being applied by Canada to the fishery of this stock.
7. Following the presentation of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD), the General Council adopted the Organization's budget and accounts for 1994.
8. The General Council adopted the report of the Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (STACFAC), presented by the Chairman C. C. Southgate (EEC), and endorsed the recommendations directed to curtail unregulated fishing activities by non-Contracting Parties vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The General Council strongly emphasized that such activity would be very harmful for depleted resources and against the provisions of the NAFO Convention and the Law of the Sea. In view of the real threat to the major stocks of fish in this area, the General Council adopted Resolution to collect statistics of catches by vessels of non-Contracting Parties for implementation of a Landing Declaration. The Council decided to make further diplomatic demarches to non-Contracting Parties urging them to withdraw their vessels before the beginning of the 1994 fishing season.
9. The General Council considering the UN Resolution 47/443 of 22 December 1992 on large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing confirmed that such fishing is not presently practised by NAFO Contracting Parties in the Convention Area.

10. The following elections took place for the constituent and subsidiary bodies of NAFO:

Chairman of the General Council, President of the Organization	- E. Lemche (Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
Vice-Chairman of the General Council	- A. Rodin (Russian Federation)
Chairman of the Fisheries Commission	- H. Koster (EEC)
Vice-Chairman of the Fisheries Commission	- P. Gullestad (Norway)
Chairman of the Scientific Council	- H. Lassen (EEC)
Vice-Chairman of the Scientific Council	- W. R. Bowering (Canada)
Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD)	- J. Quintal-McGrath (Canada)
Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD)	- E. Penas (EEC)
Chairman of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)	- D. N. Brock (Canada)

General Council
NAFO
Canada
10 September 1993

NAFO Secretariat
Dartmouth, N.S.,

QUOTA TABLE. Total allowable catches (TACs) and quotas (metric tons) for 1994 of particular stocks in Subareas 3 and 4 of the NAFO Convention Area. The values listed include quantities to be taken both inside and outside the 200-mile fishing zone, where applicable.

Contracting Party	Cod		Redfish		American plaice		Yellowtail	Witch	Capelin	Squid (<i>Illex</i>) ^{1,2}
	Div. 3M	Div. 3NO	Div. 3M	Div. 3LN	Div. 3M*	Div. 3LNO*	Div. 3LNO*	Div. 3NO*	Div. 3NO	Subareas 3+4
1. Bulgaria	-	-	390	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
2. Canada	85	2 861	650	5 964	75	4 730	6 825	1 800	0	N.S. ⁴
3. Cuba	407	-	2 275	1 372	-	-	-	-	0	2 250
4. Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	2 461	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. European Economic Community	5 485	2 213	4 030	476	175	61	140	-	0	N.S. ⁴
6. Japan	-	-	520	-	-	-	-	-	0	2 250
7. Norway	1 018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
8. Poland	424	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1 000
9. Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Latvia	1 078 ¹	716 ¹	18 005 ¹	6 104 ¹	500 ¹	-	-	1 170 ¹	0	5 000 ¹
11. Lithuania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. Russia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Others	42	210	130	84	250	9	35	30	-	5 000
Total Allowable Catch	11 000	6 000	26 000	14 000	1 000*	4 800*	7 000*	3 000*	no fishing	150 000 ⁵

¹ Quotas to be fished by vessels from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Russian Federation. The provisions of Part I, Section A.3 of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures shall apply.

² The opening date for the Squid (*Illex*) fishery is 1 July.

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

⁴ Not specified because the allocation to these Contracting Parties are as yet undetermined, although their sum shall not exceed the difference between the total of allocations to other Contracting Parties and the TAC.

⁵ The TAC would remain at 150 000 tonnes subject to adjustment where warranted by scientific advice.

*Considering the advice contained in the Report of the Scientific Council and having regard to the poor state of the stock of American plaice in Divisions 3LNO and 3M; Witch flounder in Division 3NO and Yellowtail flounder in 3LNO, no directed fishery shall be carried out under the TACs agreed for each of these stocks in 1994, which are suspended. The provisions of Part I, Section A.4b) of NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures shall apply.

Annex 4. Statement by B. Rawson, Representative of Canada

Key groundfish stocks in the Northwest Atlantic, especially of cod and flounder, are in collapse. The most dramatic is 2J3KL cod, where the spawning stock biomass has declined by about 90 per cent in the past two years to an estimated 22 000 tons. Fishing for 2J3KL cod stopped last year, but the stock has continued to decline.

Ecological factors are clearly at work depressing this and other vulnerable groundfish stocks. These ecological factors recognize no national boundaries. Just a week ago Canada imposed moratoria on five cod and flounder stocks and severe quota reductions on other groundfish stocks. These are all stocks in the Canadian zone, in 3Ps off the South Coast of Newfoundland, in 4VWX off the East Coast of Nova Scotia and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Virtually all fisheries for Canadian-managed cod and flounder stocks have been closed. The moratoria and other conservation measures taken in 1992 and 1993 have put almost 40 000 Canadian fishermen and plantworkers out of work.

These are drastic measures, but we are determined to save these resources. We must prevent further declines in spawning stock biomasses. We must protect juvenile fish so they can replenish spawning stocks. This is the most serious crisis ever in the fishery in the Northwest Atlantic.

NAFO-managed straddling stocks of cod and flounder are part of this crisis. Declines in spawning stock biomasses for these have been precipitous. In 1985, the spawning stock biomass of 3LNO American plaice was estimated to be 143 000 tons; if catches in 1994 do not exceed 4 800 tons, the spawning stock biomass predicted for the beginning of 1995 would be 13 500 tons. That would be a decline of more than 90 per cent.

Declines in 3LNO yellowtail flounder and 3NO witch flounder are less dramatic, but also clear. The biomasses for both have declined by more than two-thirds since 1985. As well, given the mixing of the flounder stocks, to be effective a moratorium would have to cover all three.

In 1987, the spawning stock biomass for 3NO cod was estimated to be 200 000 tons; if catches in 1994 do not exceed 6 000 tons, the spawning stock biomass predicted for the beginning of 1995 would be just over 20 000 tons. That would be a decline of almost 90 per cent. The NAFO Scientific Council noted as well,

"All necessary steps should be taken to eliminate the catch of small fish from this stock... The spawning stock biomass may never improve beyond current estimates if fisheries on immature cod continue at current high levels."

We have a choice. If we continue to fish and ecological factors continue to depress these stocks, they would face a collapse from which it would take decades to recover ... in effect, a lengthy period of commercial extinction. If we continue to fish and ecological factors are more neutral, these stocks will simply remain at chronically low levels for the foreseeable future. The first possibility would be catastrophic, the second merely dismal.

There is a third possibility, that is not to fish these stocks for the next year and, thereby, allow them to regenerate at their maximum biological potential. This would protect juvenile fish and, if ecological factors are at least neutral, boost the spawning stock biomass; if ecological factors continue to depress the stocks, this could save them from commercial extinction.

Canada is asking other Contracting Parties to do in international waters no more than what Canada is willing to do in its waters for the same fish stocks. In fact, for NAFO-managed straddling stocks of cod and flounder, Canada would make the lion's share of the sacrifice. For these four stocks ... 3NO cod and witch flounder, and 3LNO American plaice and yellowtail flounder ... the NAFO Scientific Council calculated TAC's as upper limits for harvesting if these resources are to be fished. The total is 20 800 tons.

Of this 20 800 tons, Canada would be allocated 16 200 tons and more than 70 per cent; other Contracting Parties would be allocated 4 600 tons or less than 30 per cent. Canada would be willing to forego its share of these stocks in favour of moratoria to protect them. We call on other NAFO Contracting Parties to do the same.

If these moratoria are adopted, fisheries for other regulated species, as well as unregulated species, would continue throughout the NAFO Regulatory Area. Most important among these is redfish, for which the NAFO Scientific Council recommends quotas totalling 34 000 tons; Canada's share would be less than 6 500 tons.

In other words, while Canada is seeking support for moratoria on stocks where it would receive more than 70 per cent of quotas, Canada supports continuation of those fisheries where other Contracting Parties would receive more than 80 per cent of quotas. Clearly, this is not an effort by Canada to gain an advantage or seek a preference over any other Contracting Party.

Just as clearly, Canada is not seeking to exclude or limit other Contracting Parties from participation in these fisheries in the future. Rather, we are proposing and seeking support for critically needed conservation measures that will benefit all Contracting Parties that share NAFO-managed cod and flounder straddling stocks.

3NO cod is an example. If a TAC of 6 000 tons were set in 1994, other Contracting Parties that share this stock would receive quotas totalling 3 000 tons. Yet, if the 3NO cod stock were fully rebuilt, it might well sustain a fishery of around 60 000 tons. Those higher levels of abundance and catches are what we should be aiming for.

As with every NAFO Annual Meeting, there is a lengthy agenda containing many important items. In my opening remarks today, I have addressed only one item, the need for moratoria to protect and begin re-building straddling stocks of cod and flounder. I have done so because Canada believes that it is the most critical decision to be taken at this Annual Meeting.

If we choose to continue harvesting these stocks, we face chronically low levels of abundance for the foreseeable future or, possibly, their commercial extinction. If we choose instead not to harvest these stocks for the next year, we may break the spiral of decline. Then we will have begun the journey back toward greater security, opportunity and prosperity in the fishery. That is Canada's goal.

Annex 5. Part VI - Pilot Project for a NAFO Observer Scheme

The Fisheries Commission

Noting that Canada has a program under which there is extensive observer coverage on board vessels fishing in its waters;

Considering that the placement of fisheries observers on board Contracting Party vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area may be a useful and cost effective method of monitoring compliance with the provisions of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures and that the observers might also provide sampling information for use by the Scientific Council;

Therefore:

1. Endorses implementation of an 18-month pilot project to test operation of a NAFO Observer Scheme in the NAFO Regulatory Area by January 1, 1993.

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 haul reports). **In particular, observers should collect catch and effort data on a set-by-set basis. These data should include location (latitude/ longitude), depth, time net on the bottom, catch composition and discards.**

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.

2. Requests that the Scientific Council recommend a work plan for fisheries observers that are authorized to obtain biological sampling data from Contracting Party vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area.

The Scientific Council has recommended that length sampling of the main species of the daily catch should be set out accordingly to the NAFO standard procedures actually in use in the national sampling programs. Training should be done on a national basis and in conjunction with research institutes in charge of the sampling at sea, and a manual should be provided.

3. Calls on all Contracting Parties that anticipate their fishing operations to exceed 300 fishing days on ground in 1993 to:
 - (a) Deploy on their vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area trained individuals from their own countries, or from other NAFO members where agreed bilaterally, to monitor compliance with the provisions of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures in accordance with criteria agreed by STACTIC and approved by the Fisheries Commission;

- (b) Deploy those observers appropriately to ensure that a minimum of 10 percent of the Contracting Party's total estimated fishing days on ground for 1993 are subject to observation across as many fisheries in the NAFO Regulatory Area as possible;
 - (c) Pay all costs associated with their observers;
 - (d) Advise the Executive Secretary of the vessels on which observers are deployed for subsequent transmission to Contracting Parties with an inspection presence in the Regulatory Area;
 - (e) Table at a special Fisheries Commission meeting to be held in 1994 at the conclusion of 12 months of the pilot program a report assessing the effectiveness and costs of the program and outlining administrative and operational problems while also considering the continuation and possible future expansion of the program.
4. Requests all Contracting Parties to authorize observers on board their vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area:
- (a) To monitor their assigned vessel's compliance with the provisions of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures and, if approved by the Contracting Party which receives the observer, to conduct sampling in accordance with technical guidelines and a work plan developed in accordance with paragraph 2.
 - (b) To prepare a report of their findings at the termination of the observer period. These reports shall be forwarded to the competent authorities of the Contracting Party providing 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.

Annex 6. Fisheries Commission's Request for Scientific Advice on Management in 1995 of Certain Stocks in Subareas 4 and 5

1. The Fisheries Commission with the concurrence of the Coastal State as regards the stocks below which occur within its jurisdiction, requests that the Scientific Council, at a meeting in advance of the 1994 Annual Meeting, provide advice on the scientific basis for the management of the following fish and invertebrate stocks or groups of stocks in 1995:

Cod (Div. 3NO; Div. 3M)
 Redfish (Div. 3LN; Div. 3M)
 American plaice (Div. 3LNO; Div. 3M)
 Witch flounder (Div. 3NO)
 Yellowtail flounder (Div. 3LNO)
 Capelin (Div. 3NO)
 Squid (Subareas 3 and 4)
 Shrimp (Div. 3M)

2. The Commission and the Coastal State request the Scientific Council to consider the following options in assessing and projecting future stock levels for those stocks listed above:

- a) For those stocks subject to analytical dynamic-pool type assessments, the status of the stock should be reviewed and management options evaluated in terms of their implications for fishable stock size in both the short and long term. As general reference points the implications of fishing at $F_{0.1}$, F_{1993} and F_{max} in 1995 and subsequent years should be evaluated. The present stock size and spawning stock size should be described in relation to those observed historically and those expected in the longer term under this range of options.

Opinions of the Scientific council should be expressed in regard to stock size, spawning stock sizes, recruitment prospects, catch rates and TACs implied by these management strategies for 1995 and the long term. Values of F corresponding to the reference points should be given and their accuracy assessed.

- b) For those stocks subject to general production-type assessments, the time series of data should be updated, the status of the stock should be reviewed and management options evaluated in the way described above to the extent possible. In this case, the general reference points should be the level of fishing effort or fishing mortality (F) which is calculated to be required to take the MSY catch in the long term and two-thirds of that effort level.
- c) For those resources of which only general biological and/or catch data are available, no standard criteria on which to base advice can be established. The evidence of stock status should, however, be weighed against a strategy of optimum yield management and maintenance of stock biomass at levels of about two-thirds of the virgin stock.

- d) Spawning stock biomass levels that might be considered necessary for maintenance of sustained recruitment should be recommended for each stock. In those cases where present spawning stock size is a matter of scientific concern in relation to the continuing productive potential of the stock, management options should be offered that specifically respond to such concerns.
- e) Presentation of the result should include the following:
 - i) for stocks for which analytical dynamic-pool type assessments are possible:
 - a graph of yield and fishing mortality for at least the past 10 years.
 - a graph of spawning stock biomass and recruitment levels for at least the past 10 years.
 - a graph of catch options for the year 1995 over a range of fishing mortality rates (F) at least from $F_{0.1}$ to F_{\max} .
 - a graph showing spawning stock biomass at 1.1.1996 corresponding to each catch option.
 - graphs showing the yield-per-recruit and spawning stock per-recruit values for a range of fishing mortality.
 - ii) for stocks for which advice is based on general production models, the relevant graph of production on fishing mortality rate or fishing effort.

In all cases the three reference points, actual F , F_{\max} and $F_{0.1}$ should be shown.

3. The Fisheries Commission with the concurrence of the Coastal State requests that the Scientific Council continue to provide information, if available, on the stock separation in Div. 2J+3KL and the proportion of the biomass of the cod stock in Div. 3L in the Regulatory Area and a projection if possible of the proportion likely to be available in the Regulatory Area in future years. Information is also requested on the age composition of that portion of the stock occurring in the Regulatory Area.
4. The Scientific Council is asked to review all data available on the implications of using 90 mm minimum mesh size in mid-water trawls when fishing for redfish in Div. 3LN, in comparison to 130 mm. This should include consideration of fish lost during haulbacks.
5. Noting that the Scientific Council has scheduled a Symposium on Seals in the Ecosystem for September 1995, the Fisheries Commission requests a report in 1994 on the nature and extent of analyses that are expected to be tabled at the Symposium with respect to the interrelation between seals and commercial fish stocks.
6. Noting the Scientific Council's recommendations for coordinated research on Greenland halibut, the Fisheries Commission and the two Coastal States emphasize the urgency of acquiring information on the distribution and stock status. The Scientific Council is requested to pursue its coordinated efforts and member countries are urged to commit the necessary resources to the research.

**Annex 7. List of Decisions and Actions by the Fisheries Commission
(15th Annual Meeting, 6-10 September 1993)**

Substantive Issue (propositions/motions)	Decision/Action (FC Doc. 93/18; item)
1. Report of the 14th Annual Meeting, FC Doc. 92/19	adopted (item 2.1)
2. Incorporation of a Catch Reporting System into the Hail System	deferred to 16th Annual Meeting (item 3.1)
3. Effort Plans for the Vessels of Contracting Parties Operating in the Regulatory Area	deferred to 16th Annual Meeting (item 3.1)
4. Operation of the Hail System (FC Doc. 93/6)	amended (item 3.2)
5. Operation of the NAFO Observer Scheme Pilot Project (FC Doc. 93/7)	amended (item 3.3)
6. Financing of NAFO's Scientific Work in the Regulatory Area	Scientific advice accepted (item 3.4)
7. Nominal Catches by Contracting Parties Exceeding Quotas	accepted/referred to 16th Annual Meeting (item 3.5)
8. NAFO Rules re Incidental Catches	discussed; deferred to 16th Annual Meeting (item 3.6)
9. Annual Return of Infringements, Surveillance and Inspection Reports	reviewed; adopted (item 3.7)
10. Fishing Vessels Registrations	reviewed; modified (item 3.8)
11. Report of STACTIC at the 15th Annual Meeting (Part II, FC Doc. 93/18)	adopted (item 3.9)
12. Russian Project for Experimental Redfish Fishery	referred to the Scientific Council, November 1993 and Special Meeting of Fisheries Commission 1994 (item 3.9a)
13. NAFO Inspection Manual	agreed (item 3.9b)
14. Minimum Fish Size (Part I.D of the Measures)	referred to the Scientific Council (November, 1993) and Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission (1994) (item 3.9c)
15. Minimum Fish Size Measure (Part I.D of the Measures); FC Doc. 93/12	agreed for Canada to follow its system (item 3.9d)

Substantive Issue (propositions/motions)	Decision/Action (FC Doc. 93/18; item)
16. Inspection Procedure (FC Doc. 93/11)	adopted (item 3.9e)
17. Ban on direct fishery of shrimp in 3LNO, 1994 (FC Doc. 93/10)	adopted (items 3.9f, 6.8)
18. Transfer of Quotas Between Contracting Parties	deferred to the 16th Annual Meeting (item 4.1)
19. Regulatory Measures for shrimp fishery in 3M (FC Doc. 93/10)	adopted (item 5.4)
20. Regulatory Measure for fishery of Cod 3NO (FC Doc. 93/9)	adopted (item 6.1)
21. Regulatory measures for fishery of A. plaice 3M and 3LNO, Yellowtail flounder 3LNO, Witch flounder 3NO - no directed fishery in 1994	adopted (items 5.3, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5)
22. No directed fishery for Cod in Div. 3L of the Regulatory Area in 1994 (FC Doc. 93/8)	adopted (item 6.9)
23. TAC(s) for major species for 1994 in the Regulatory Area:	adopted
Cod in Div. 3M	11 000 tons (item 5.1)
Redfish in Div. 3M	26 000 tons (item 5.2)
A. plaice in Div. 3M	1 000 tons (item 5.3) no directed fishery
Cod in Div. 3NO	6 000 tons (item 6.1)
Redfish in Div. 3LN	14 000 tons (item 6.2)
A. plaice in Div. 3LNO	4 800 tons (item 6.3) no directed fishery
Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO	7 000 tons (item 6.4) no directed fishery
Witch flounder in Div. 3NO	3 000 tons (item 6.5) no directed fishery
Capelin in Div. 3NO	"Zero TAC" (item 6.6)
Squid in Subareas 3+4	150 000 tons (item 6.7)
24. Schedule I-Quota Table for 1994; NAFO Conservation & Enforcement Measures (Part V)	adopted (item 6.10)
25. Distribution of quotas to the Contracting Parties and "block quota" allocation to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia	discussed, adopted (item 6.10)
26. Request to the Scientific Council for scientific advice on management of fish stocks in 1995	adopted (item 7)

PART II

Report of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

15th Annual Meeting, 6-10 September 1993
Dartmouth, N. S., Canada

The Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) met on 8 occasions during the week of 6-10 September 1993. The initial session was convened at 10:15 on 6 September 1993.

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chairman of STACTIC, E. Lemche (Denmark, in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) welcomed the delegates to the meeting. The STACTIC delegations comprised Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), EEC, Estonia, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Russia. (Annex 1)
- 1.2 R. J. Prier (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
- 1.3 The Chairman reviewed the Provisional Agenda and outlined the various documents associated with each of the agenda items. Under item Other Matters he indicated it would be useful to discuss the publication of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. The representative of Canada stated the Fisheries Commission has a number of items under Conservation and Enforcement Measures that STACTIC could be asked for technical advice and if time is available perhaps we could discuss some of these items. No further comments were forthcoming on the agenda and it was **adopted** as presented. (Annex 2)

2. Review of Annual Return of Infringements (item 4 of the Agenda)

- 2.1 The Chairman summarized the number of inspections, apparent infringements, and the status of their disposition (FC Doc. 93/14) and requested the Executive Secretary to examine ways to combine STACTIC Form A and B with regard to inspections, catch record of discrepancies and/or apparent infringements (Form A) and their disposition form (B) into a form E for distribution to Contracting Parties. With respect to the reporting of a number of dispositions of infringements for 1990-91, the EEC undertook to forward these reports directly to the Executive Secretary.
- 2.2 The Executive Secretary completed this task and **STACTIC agreed** to the paper attached in Annex 3.

3. Review of Surveillance and Inspection Reports (item 5 of the Agenda)

- 3.1 In accordance with Rule 14 of the Scheme of Joint International Inspection and Surveillance, each Contracting Party is required to report each year for the previous year the number of air hours flown on NAFO patrol, the number of sightings and the number

of surveillance reports established with the date, time and position of sightings in respect of these surveillance reports. Reports were received from Canada and the EEC which are summarized in FC Doc. 93/15.

4. Review of Registration of Vessels Fishing in the Regulatory Area (item 6 of the Agenda)

- 4.1 The Executive Secretary reviewed this paper which is a compilation of information received from Contracting Parties as of August 1993 listing the vessels which indicated they may fish in the Regulatory Area in 1993 and those that hailed to the Executive Secretary. The paper indicates 314 intended to fish in the Regulatory Area and the Executive Secretary received hails from 197 of these vessels.
- 4.2 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Canada, and the EEC reported that it is normal for more vessels to indicate intent to fish in the area than actually do. The representative of Canada remarked that there is a high compliance rate with the hail requirement.
- 4.3 The Chairman raised the question whether the form should be modified. It was agreed after discussion that the form should be modified and requested that the Executive Secretary look at this and was given the following guidelines. The report should be in 3 columns for each Contracting Party - Vessel Name/Notification Received by NAFO Secretariat, Hail Reports Received by NAFO Secretariat and Vessel Sightings. (FC Doc. 93/16)

The report for the 1994 annual meeting should cover all of 1993 and up to June 30, 1994.

5. Review of Operation of the Hail System (item 7 of the Agenda)

- 5.1 In reference to NAFO/FC Doc. 93/3 Canada reported that this was a first draft and what they would like to see is other Contracting Parties contributing to this draft and eventually submitting it as a STACTIC Report on the Hail System. Some of the questions which require to be answered are: Is the correct format being used?; Are all Contracting Parties hailing?; Are hails sent in a timely manner?; Are the rules for hails being complied with?

The representative of Canada stated that from their information compliance with the hail requirement was high. (Annex 4)

- 5.2 The Chairman asked Russia to clarify its position on the hail system. Russia indicated they were complying with the hail system on a voluntary basis and will continue on this basis. Russia indicated that they **have not withdrawn their objection** to the hail system.
- 5.3 The Executive Secretary reported on the progress of the Pilot Project Team for the Hail Systems contained in his paper (Annex 5). The Executive Secretary indicated they have the computer system in place but will need additional software. The Executive Secretary is prepared to proceed with this project.

- 5.4 STACTIC **endorsed this project and recommends** that the Executive Secretary continue with this project and to expend funds already assigned within the budget.

6. Review of the NAFO Inspection Manual (item 8 of the Agenda)

- 6.1 The Executive Secretary outlined his idea for the publishing of an Inspection Manual and stated the manual would assist inspectors, and could be produced at minimum cost. He estimates approximately 100 copies would be required. He still requires some Contracting Parties to translate the questionnaire. The manual could be produced by the end of the year if authority to proceed is received at this meeting of NAFO.
- 6.2 The Chairman summarized the following comments of the representatives at the Meeting by noting that STACTIC **recommended** the publication of a manual and that Contracting Parties should check with the Executive Secretary to see what translations they are required to produce:
- Executive Secretary to ensure manual is flexible;
 - amendments should be inserts;
 - all Contracting Parties to have an opportunity to review the manual before it is published;
 - with respect to Canada's request for an advisory section Contracting Parties should look at accomplishing this on a bilateral basis;
 - Contracting Parties can forward to the Executive Secretary papers they wish to have incorporated in the draft.

7. Minimum Sizes for Cod, Yellowtail Flounder and American Plaice

- Possible Alternatives to Current Measures (item 9 of the Agenda)

- 7.1 The representative of Canada presented proposal for technical discussions on adding 3 new species to the list - Witch, Redfish and Greenland halibut and three addition columns with their length equivalents.
- 7.2 The Chairman indicated the Scientific Council would have to be requested to provide information on round length for the three new species proposed but as indicated by some Contracting Parties it would be difficult for the Scientific Council to provide information on product form. Therefore, it **was agreed** that a proposal to the Fisheries Commission would be prepared that the Scientific Council be requested to look at the feasibility and desirability of establishing minimum fish size for the three additional species and to advise on the minimum round length for the three new species proposed in the Canadian paper. (Annex 6)
- 7.3 There was continued discussion on the establishment of processed length equivalents.
- The Russian delegation stated it was not reasonable to establish such regulations due to technological difficulties in the procedure of this inspection, as well it would be impossible to implement and to determine conversion factors.

- 7.4 The Chairman of the Scientific Council addressed the questions raised by STACTIC and stated that the Council did not have the information to give definitive answers (Annexes 7 and 8). Since scientific advice was not available, the Committee presented its draft for the request to the Scientific Council by the Fisheries Commission (Annex 9).

8. Discussion of Other Conservation and Enforcement Measures (task from the Fisheries Commission and by STACTIC initiative)
(item 10 of the Agenda)

8.1 **Operation of the NAFO Observer Scheme Pilot Project**

The representatives of the EEC and Canada referred to their documents (FC Doc. 93/4 and 93/5) which describe the participation in the pilot observer project. The general assessment was that the program is developing along the lines of adopted provisions.

The Chairman outlined the advice from the Scientific Council to have NAFO observers collect scientific data, which was clarified by the Scientific Council (Chairman of STACREC) to STACTIC.

The Committee agreed that the Scientific Council advice could be accommodated by amending paragraphs in Part VI-Pilot Project for NAFO Observer Scheme of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. (please see Annex 5 of Part I, FC Doc. 93/7)

8.2 **Amendments to the Minimum Fish Size Measure (by Canada)**

Canada tabled their paper FC Working Paper 93/16 which outlined options for Contracting Parties to either choose the present NAFO regulation or the Canadian regulation as they pertain to the retention of small fish on board. The EEC delegate indicated this was a policy change and that we would be reversing our trend with regard to the protection of small fish within the NAFO Regulatory Area. In addition the EEC delegate indicated there may be problems of enforcement when Contracting Parties other than Canada opt for different options. The EEC recommended this proposal be referred to the Fisheries Commission. Canada did not agree with the EEC but agreed to have this proposal referred to the Fisheries Commission for discussion. Russia had a point of view close to the Canadian proposal and it reserved their final position.

The proposal was referred to the Fisheries Commission.

8.3 **Improvements to the Inspection and Control in the NAFO Regulatory Area**

The Chairman asked for discussion on NAFO/FC Doc. 90/8 and NAFO/FC Doc. 90/9. The Chairman went through NAFO/FC Doc. 90/8 and noted that STACTIC had fulfilled its tasks except for 2 items - **Electronic Tracking System and a Licensing System**. The EEC stated they are working on a system for Member States but it is not anticipated it will be ready for two years. STACTIC will await results of the EEC study. The licensing system remains outstanding. STACTIC recommended that outstanding items remain on the STACTIC agenda.

8.4 Inspection Procedure

The representative of Canada presented proposal and indicated that discussions had taken place with other delegations and it was agreed that Canada would accept the modification for their proposal. This was accepted by STACTIC to **recommend** to the Fisheries Commission a new proposal for the amendment of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures (Annex 10).

8.5 Management Measures for 3NO Cod

The representative of Canada introduced the proposal for observer coverage (100%) of cod fishery in 3NO as new Rule "F" for Part I - Management of the NAFO Measures and for advance notice (48 hours) by the vessels intending to fish in that area as part "G" of the Measures. It was explained that this was proposed to assist in the protection of the catch of small fish.

The representative of the EEC made the following comments regarding section F: questioned what the difference was between this program and the Pilot Observer Program; questioned whether this can be complied with; only 2 Contracting Parties with a quota for 3NO cod are providing observers to the Pilot Project; questions whether the measure is necessary as there are few vessels operating in the area and they can be controlled by other measures.

Section G: we have a hail system and it is working well with a high level of compliance; is it necessary to add on to this measure?; no method of communicating patrol vessel location to fisheries vessels; we are presently awaiting a report from the Shrimp Working Group and we could be facing major increases in enforcement.

Russia indicated because of the lateness in receiving this document they reserved their position.

The Chairman summarized the discussion and indicated he would report to the Fisheries Commission these deliberations as follows: Canada gave the rationale for their paper to STACTIC; the Chairman will relate the concerns voiced by the EEC on Section F and G; Part V not a measure that can be discussed in STACTIC; the Russians indication that the paper was received too late and they reserved their position.

8.6 Nominal Catches by Contracting Parties Exceeding 1992 Quotas

This was referred to STACTIC by the Fisheries Commission and discussed at the STACTIC Meeting. The Meeting **agreed** on modified table "Selective Comparative Quotas and Catches in the Regulatory Area for 1992". (Annex 11)

8.7 Russian Proposal to Use 90 mm Gear in Their Redfish Fishery in Div. 3N and 3O

The Russian representative explained the proposal for a scientific/commercial project in 1994 with the following parameters: maximum 5 vessels; maximum 250 fishing days in total; a team of scientists will monitor the project, circulating among the 5 vessels; only pelagic trawls will be used in the project; the scientific team will ensure, that the trawls are set in such a way that catch of other groundfish is avoided.

The Chairman summed up the discussion and recommendation to the Fisheries Commission that:

- a) The project to be reviewed at the Special Scientific Council Meeting in November 1993.
- b) To ensure the success of such a meeting a review of available data and a synthesis of these data is necessary prior to November. Russia should compile and present its data together with such a comprehensive analysis.
- c) Russia is invited to present their research plan for the experiment indicated above. This research plan should include a specification of the objective of the experiment and how this objective would be met.
- d) The project to be decided upon at the Special Fisheries Commission Meeting in 1994.

8.8 Bottom Trawling for all Species in Division 3L, 3N and 3O (130mm) (by Canada) to Reflect the Recommendations of the Shrimp Working Group

The meeting agreed on the following:

- there be no directed fishery for shrimp in 3LNO in 1994.
- incorporate these measures in Part I, Management of NAFO/FC Doc. 92/21 in a new section under Other Measures.

The representative of the EEC noted that he withdrew the request for clarification (Note 2) of this proposal and would not pursue this matter at this meeting.

9. Election of Officers

D. Brock (Canada) was nominated by the representative of the EEC for Chairman of STACTIC and this nomination was unanimously accepted by the Committee.

The representatives expressed their gratitude to the outgoing Chairman, E. Lemche, and wished him success in his future work within NAFO.

10. Time and Place of Next Meeting

The next meeting of STACTIC should take place simultaneously with the next Fisheries Commission Meeting.

11. Other Matters

The Chairman deferred, because of the lateness of the meeting, his proposal to look at amending the Conservation and Enforcement Measures (FC Doc. 92/21) to make them more readable.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1100 hours on 10 September 1993.

Annex 1. STACTIC Heads of Delegation

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

Canada	C. J. Allen
Cuba	B. Garcia Moreno
Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland)	K. P. Mortensen
Estonia	L. Vaarja
European Economic Community	P. Curran
Japan	H. Inoue
Latvia	A. Ukis
Lithuania	A. Rusakevicius
Norway	P. Gullestad
Russia	V. Tsukalov

Observers

Republic of Korea
United States of America

Annex 2. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chairman, E. Lemche (Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of Annual Return of Infringements
5. Review of Surveillance and Inspection Reports
6. Review of Registration of Vessels Fishing in the Regulatory Area
7. Review of Operation of the Hail System
8. Review of the NAFO Inspection Manual
9. Minimum Sizes for Cod, Yellowtail Flounder and American Plaice - Possible Alternatives to Current Measure
10. Discussion of Other Conservation and Enforcement Measures (Request from the Fisheries Commission)
11. Election of Chairman
12. Time and Place of the Next Meeting
13. Other Matters
14. Adoption of Report
15. Adjournment

Annex 3. STACTIC Form E

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
CONSERVATION AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES
ANNUAL RETURN OF INSPECTIONS, CATCH RECORD DISCREPANCIES, APPARENT INFRINGEMENTS,
AND DISPOSITION OF APPARENT INFRINGEMENTS

Contracting Party Reporting: _____ Year: _____

Contracting Party of Inspected Vessels: _____

Summary of total number of:

Inspections: _____ Catch Record Discrepancies: _____

Apparent Infringements: _____ Disposition of apparent infringements
and/or catch record discrepancies: _____

DETAILS OF INSPECTIONS

Name of Vessel Inspected and Side Number	Date Inspected/ Division	Details of apparent infringements and/or catch record discrepancies (indicate applicable section of NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures)	Disposition of apparent infringements(s) and/or catch record discrepancies

STACTIC Form E (09/93)

To be compiled from STACTIC Forms A and B by the NAFO Secretariat for distribution of information to Contracting Parties.

Annex 4. Canadian Report on Operation of the NAFO Hail System

1.0 Introduction

On 27 July 1991 the NAFO Hail System became binding on all Contracting Parties, exclusive of the USSR which lodged an objection.

Subsequent amendments respecting buffer zones for 3LN and 3NO transboundary fisheries and the recognition of air surveillance became binding on 26 November 1991 and 06 January 1992 respectively.

2.0 Hail System

The NAFO hail system requires fishing vessels to report, to competent authorities of their respective Contracting Parties, six (6) hours in advance of entry to or exit from the Regulatory Area and prior to each movement between NAFO Divisions while operating in the Regulatory Area. Additional reporting requirements are necessary for "transzonal" fisheries in Divisions 3LN and 3NO. All hail reports are, within 24 hours of receipt by competent authorities, forwarded to other Contracting Parties with an inspection presence in the Regulatory Area.

3.0 Assessment

Compliance with the NAFO Hail System by all Contracting Party fishing vessels is high. During 1992, Contracting Party vessels operated in the NAFO Regulatory Area for approximately 22 000 days, submitted approximately 1 700 hail reports, and were issued only 12 citations of apparent infringements (hail requirements) by Canadian inspectors. A post analysis of aerial sightings and hail reports also confirmed the high level of compliance observed during at sea inspections.

During the 01 January - 30 June, 1993 period, Contracting Party vessels operated in the NAFO Regulatory Area for approximately 10 000 days, submitted approximately 900 hail reports, and were not issued any citations of apparent infringements by Canadian inspectors. Again, post analysis of aerial sightings and hail reports confirmed the high level of compliance observed during at sea inspections. Notwithstanding this, a small number of vessels (<5) appeared to be operating in contravention of the measures, however, as Canadian air surveillance did not photograph the vessels at the time of sighting, follow-up action could not be pursued.

**Annex 5. Report to the Executive Secretary of NAFO
by the Pilot Project Team for the NAFO Hail System
(30 August 1993)**

1. Background

- 1.1 In 1992, STACTIC established a Working Group to study the automation of the NAFO Hail System.
- 1.2 The reason for developing an automated Hail System is to permit the rapid and accurate communication of positional hails from fishing vessels of Contracting Parties operating in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the NAFO Secretariat, for onward transmission to Contracting Parties with an inspection presence in the Area, in compliance with the NAFO Hail Regulations.
- 1.3 The Working Group recommended to STACTIC in April 1992 the implementation of a pilot project to test data exchange capability between Contracting Parties and the NAFO Secretariat. This recommendation was accepted, and the Pilot Project Team was instructed on 22 September, 1992 by the Executive Secretary to proceed with the pilot.

2. Status

- 2.1 The first step of the project consisted of the execution of file transfer tests between DFO in Ottawa and the Directorate General for Fisheries in Brussels using simple dial-up. This was initially believed to be a straight-forward exercise, however, the tests between Ottawa and Brussels did not achieve satisfactory results, despite considerable effort on both sides. Files could only be transferred when the communication was initiated in Canada. While this proved that files could be transferred, it did not meet the requirement for the Contracting Party (the EEC in the case of the test) to initiate the communication. It was then decided to try X-25 mode.
- 2.2 Tests involving X-25 connections have demonstrated that files can be transferred from Brussels to Ottawa, with the connection being initiated by the EEC in Brussels. However, this does not complete all the requirements of the Pilot Project.

3. Proposed Plan

Requirements for completion of the Pilot Project include:

- 3.1 Purchase of a PC for the NAFO Secretariat (donated by Canada)
 - 3.2 Purchase of communications software (PROCOMM+ for Windows) (donated by Canada)
 - 3.3 Purchase of a modem (US Robotics) (already donated by Canada)
-

- 3.4 Establish a 2400 baud X-25 connection at the NAFO Secretariat office:
 - 3.4.1 Purchase and install an X-25 PAD card for the NAFO PC (approximately Cdn \$2,500)
 - 3.4.2 Perform the initial X-25 connection (approximately Cdn \$300)
 - 3.4.3 Pay the cost for two months use of the X-25 connection (approximately Cdn \$350 per month for access and traffic)
- 3.5 Test X-25 communications between the EEC in Brussels and the NAFO Secretariat.
- 3.6 Test X-25 communications between the NAFO Secretariat and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 In order to fulfil the agreed mandate of the pilot project, the Pilot Project Team recommends that:
 - 4.1.1 The Proposed Plan be accepted,
 - 4.1.2 The X-25 connection for the NAFO Secretariat be funded.

J. P. L. Verborgh
C.E.C.
Brussels

R. A. Cosh
Department of Fisheries & Oceans
Canada

Annex 6. Request to the Scientific Council on Minimum Fish Sizes

Background

At the 14th Annual Meeting, the Fisheries Commission adopted minimum fish size measures in an attempt to reduce or eliminate juvenile fish mortality in the Regulatory Area.

However, as currently written, the minimum fish sizes apply only to fish in the whole round state. As such, this measure can only be applied by inspectors to fish observed on the trawl deck or in the factory area.

Given that this fish represents a very small percentage on the total fish on board any vessel, STACTIC would like to consider the establishment of processed **length** equivalents for three of the major product types found in the Regulatory Area. These three product types are gutted, head-off/ gutted, head-off, tail-off/split fish.

Request

STACTIC recommends that the Fisheries Commission request the Scientific Council to consider and provide advice on the following questions:

1. With reasonable levels of variance, are there specific numeric values that can be established for processed fish that would be the equivalent of the current minimum fish sizes (round length).
2. Is there a reasonably consistent relationship between total body length and head and tail length that could be used by inspectors to establish if vessels are processing fish below current minimum fish sizes. If so, what would these lengths be for gutted, head-off/ gutted, head-off, tail-off and split product forms for cod, redfish, American plaice, yellowtail, witch and Greenland halibut.

The Fisheries Commission refers the Scientific Council to NAFO SCR Doc. 82/VI/45 titled "The Shape of Cod on the Flemish Cap".

Annex 7. Response from Scientific Council to STACTIC With Respect to Minimum Landing Size

The following is the response from the Scientific Council to STACTIC with respect to Minimum Landing Size.

1. **Minimum landing size (whole fish)**

Greenland halibut and flatfishes. STACFIS did not have data readily available to provide STACTIC with appropriate values. Data exist in laboratories, but such data need to be reviewed and the Scientific Council will put this item on the agenda of the June 1994 Meeting.

2. **Minimum landing size (products)**

STACFIS realized that for cod some data are available, however, these data could not be produced at this meeting. These data will provide estimates of head-off and head-off/tail-off length corresponding to 41 cm standard length.

The Greenland halibut and flatfishes data are not available and need to be collected. The Scientific Council will review data in June 1994 should the Fisheries Commission so wish.

Annex 8. Response From STACFIS on Minimum Mesh Size for Groundfish

The following is the response from the STACFIS with respect to Fisheries Commission request.

Minimum mesh size for groundfish

STACFIS noted that no new information was available at present to change the views presented by the Scientific Council in June 1992 (*NAFO Sci. Coun. Rep.*, p. 141-143). If new information were available at the June 1994 Meeting, STACFIS would agreed to consider them at that time. STACFIS agreed there was no basis at present for a derogation of the 130 mm mesh size Conservation and Enforcement Measures for groundfish fisheries in the Regulatory Area.

Annex 9. Request to the Fisheries Commission on Minimum Fish Sizes

STACTIC **recommends** that the Fisheries Commission request the Scientific Council to consider and provide advice on the following questions:

1. Feasibility and necessity of determining minimum fish size for the following species: witch, redfish, Greenland halibut.
2. To advise on the minimum fish size to be used when round length is used for witch, redfish, and Greenland halibut.

Annex 10. STACTIC Proposal re Inspection Procedures

Part IV.5.ii - add new paragraph

- (c) Where an inspection vessel has signalled that an inspection party is about to commence boarding a fishing vessel which has begun or is about to begin hauling its nets, the master of that fishing vessel shall ensure that the net is not retrieved for a period of 30 minutes after receiving the *signal*.

Annex 11. Selective Comparative Quotas and Catches in the Regulatory Area for 1992

<u>Area/Species</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>NAFO Quotas including transfers</u>	<u>Autonomous Quotas</u>	<u>Catch</u>
3NO Cod	Canada	7 984 ¹		7 688
	Cuba	-		53
	Denmark (Faroe Islands)	-		11
3M Redfish	Denmark (Faroe Islands)	-		16
	Denmark (Greenland)	-		1
	EEC	6 665	-	6 814 ⁷
	Japan	1 360 ⁴		1 353
	Latvia	-		7 441
	Others	216		8 350 ²
3LN Redfish	Denmark (Greenland)	-		6
	EEC	476	6 000	3 572 ⁷
	Japan	-		63 ⁶
	Others	84		4 930 ²
3M A. plaice	Denmark (Greenland)	-		1
	EEC	350	-	429 ⁷
	Japan	-		47 ⁶
3LNO A. plaice	Cuba	-		4
	Denmark (Greenland)	-		2
	EEC	328	-	510 ⁷
	Japan	-		23 ⁶
	Russia	-		46
	Others	47		518 ²
3NO Witch Flounder	Canada	4 950 ⁵		4 317
	EEC	-	1 000	572 ⁷
	Japan	-		1 ⁶
3LNO Yellowtail	Others	35		3 825 ²

¹Source: FC Working Paper 93/4

²Including-non-Contracting Parties

³Including quota transfer of 1 500 tons from Russia

⁴Including quota transfer of 500 tons from Canada

⁵Including quota transfer of 1 950 tons from Russia

⁶Quota for Others

⁷Revised by EEC at the Meeting