SECTION II

(pages 51 to 80)

Report of the Meeting on Shrimp Stocks in the Regulatory Area 27-30 March 2000 Washington, D.C., USA

Report of the Meeting on Shrimp Stocks in the Regulatory Area

(GC Doc. 00/3)

27-30 March 2000
Washington, D.C., USA

The Meeting was held in accordance with the decision taken by the General Council at the 21st Annual Meeting, September 1999 (GC Doc. 99/9, Part I, item 4.12).

1. Opening of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Mr. H. Koster (EU), who welcomed delegates to the meeting. A list of participants is attached as Annex 1.

Several delegates made their brief opening statements. The delegates of USA, Canada, Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland), EU, Japan and Estonia provided their statements to the Rapporteur (Annexes 2-7).

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

P.E. Moran (USA) was elected as Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda attached as Annex 8 was adopted.

4. Management systems for shrimp in the Regulatory Area

4.1 *The Chair* stated that the preceding opening comments seemed to indicate concern regarding the current effort allocation for 3M shrimp and its lack of success in controlling harvest to ensure levels of mortality below that advised by the Scientific Council. He noted general agreement among Parties that options should be examined regarding how to best achieve the goal of a 30,000 mt TAC and urged delegates to be open in their analyses. He thanked the delegates who had provided working papers on this subject in advance of the meeting and suggested that these papers be used, in conjunction with information from the Secretariat and the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures, as the basis for initial discussions.

4.2 There followed a discussion on the current effort allocation system for 3M shrimp. Some Parties expressed the opinion that such a system of management could not succeed because it failed to take into account the ability of vessels to improve productivity and, thus, catch levels. It was noted that a TAC system provided concrete, scientifically based limits on catch that made such considerations unnecessary. Other delegates supported a continued use of the effort system, pointing out that it is premature to shift to TAC system, as any consideration on factors which caused the failure of current system including overfishing by Contracting Parties or one Party under the objection or "flag hopping" had not been conducted yet. The opinion was expressed that with proper regulation and reporting (e.g., through enhanced monitoring) the effort allocation system could be made effective.

Parties expressed a broad variety of opinions regarding possible future TAC-based allocation schemes for 3M shrimp. While it was generally agreed that any new TAC system should use as its basis elements of the current management scheme, there was a lack of consensus regarding which elements should be used and how they should be applied.

4.3 Particular concern was expressed regarding on how historical harvests (and opportunities for harvest) should be reflected in future TAC allocations, including the possible use of historic catch versus allocated fishing days. While there was broad support for the use of historical catch, there was no consensus on how such catches should be translated into TAC allocations. It was also pointed out that the current overall over harvest in the fishery would have to be taken into account in designing a new system and that any new scheme should not reward Parties that had undermined the efforts of the current effort scheme. Again, there was a lack of consensus regarding how such considerations should be reflected in a new scheme.

4.4 Delegates then entered into a discussion on the accuracy of the data table found in W.P. (Shrimp) 00/1 by Iceland (Annex 9). Iceland noted that this data was reflected in the paper based on information provided by the Secretariat. A large number of corrections and clarifications to this table were then provided by Parties to the Secretariat. The Executive Secretary stated that these figures were based on available data and that provided by Contracting Parties through hail reports. He also pointed out that the current effort scheme was based on the same data as provided by Parties for 1993 through August 1995. One delegate proposed that Parties submitting revised figures on catch, fishing days or number of vessels shall supplement such figures by stating catch per month (similar to Statlant 21A) and entry, exit and number of fishing days for each trip by the vessels flying the flag of the Contracting Party. After some consideration, it was generally agreed that Contracting Parties should provide data revisions to the Secretariat in time for the June 2000 STACTIC meeting. At this meeting, Parties would be expected to explain these revisions so that newly updated data could then be provided to the Fisheries Commission in time for the 2000 annual meeting. There was no consensus regarding acceptable sources for such data and how (if) they should be verified. However, the Secretariat agreed to make all raw data in its possession available to Parties.

Note (by the Secretariat): Following discussions at the STACTIC June meeting, the original and revised data on 3M shrimp catches were compiled in two Tables of Annex 10.

4.5 In addition, Parties expressed varying opinions regarding the use and appropriate length of a reference fishing period for determining future allocations. The Norwegian Delegation tabled its paper "Possible Allocation Key for a TAC-based Management System for 3M Shrimp" (Annex 11). Some Parties supported the use of relative catch levels at the time of initial allocation, while others proposed the use of a longer reference period. Such a longer period would take into account both the recent development of industries based on this fishery and the choices of Parties to refrain from fishing based on conservation concerns. Some Parties called the establishment of a date after which catches would not be considered when determining historical catch for future TAC allocations. However, there was no consensus on date.

It was pointed out that, regardless of the allocation system used, fishing opportunities should be maintained for all eligible Parties without a history in the fishery through the use of an "others" category. The need for (and amount of) such an allocation was not readily agreed. In addition, several Parties called for the establishment of a guaranteed minimum allocation for Parties with a history. One Party noted that Article XI (4) of the NAFO

Convention implies that the interests of coastal States should be taken into consideration for allocations on the Flemish Cap.

4.6 After considerable discussion, the Chair noted that Parties appeared to be considering four options regarding possible elements of a future TAC allocation scheme. These options were then summarized by the Chair in W.P (Shrimp) 00/8 and presented to the Parties for their consideration and comments. The Chair clarified that the data appearing in this paper were illustrative only and subject to revision. In addition, he noted that Parties should consider the four options presented as part of an on-going process. Following further discussion, this paper was reviewed based on the comments of Parties. The Chairman further advised that catch data and all calculations in the paper were still provisional and requested the delegations to provide their finalized data to the NAFO Secretariat. Such data would be incorporated in the Chairman's paper for further consideration. Note (by the Secretariat): All revised data from Annex 10 were incorporated in the Chairman's Paper. Although there was some support for the each of the options found in the revised version of the Chair's working paper, considerable disagreement remained on a variety of elements. Thus, there was no consensus that this paper could be adopted by the group and passed on to the Fisheries Commission for consideration at the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting. It was only agreed that W.P. (Shrimp) 00/8 as would be revised by modification of catch data should remain a document of the Chair and be retained for use in guiding future work on the issue (Annex 12). The Chair urged that Parties reflect on the options outlined in the paper and be prepared to continue discussions at the 2000 annual meeting.

4.7 Regarding possible quota allocations for 3L shrimp, the delegate from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) expressed great dissatisfaction with the current 3L allocation scheme and noted that his country has a track record in this fishery, having caught 1789 mt of 3L shrimp in 1993. This claim is supported by NAFO statistics. He also recognized the legitimate claim of Canada in this fishery based on its coastal State status. The delegate from Denmark then proposed that future allocations in this fishery be made with 2/3 of the TAC in the NRA allocated based on catch history and contribution to scientific data collection and the remaining 1/3 allocated into an "others" quota. This proposal, W.P. (Shrimp) 00/11, is attached as Annex 13.

There was little support among those present for the Danish proposal, although there was recognition that the current allocations of 67 mt did not provide for adequate fishing opportunities for Contracting Parties. It was pointed out that these measures were set to remain in place until the 2001 NAFO Annual Meeting. One Party suggested that it might be beneficial to link the 3L and 3M shrimp fisheries in an effort to provide greater opportunities for shrimp harvests, while others called for status quo until some experience and data could be accumulated in the fishery. It was noted that NAFO needed to determine both the distribution of the stock between the Canadian zone and the NRA as well as how allocations should take place in the NRA. After some discussion, two possible approaches were identified in addition to the Denmark proposal: 1) remain at status quo until an alternative allocation scheme can be agreed; and 2) place all available TAC in an "others" category and allow the fishery to develop. At this time the delegate from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) made a statement (attached as Annex 14). It was agreed that all three of the proposed options should be presented to the Fisheries Commission for consideration at the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting.

5. Report to the Fisheries Commission

It was agreed that the Chair's Working Paper (Annex 12) relating to the 3M shrimp fishery would be further revised as appropriate and used as the basis for continued discussion at the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting. It was also agreed that advice would be sought from the Fisheries Commission on what future actions (if any) should be taken by the group with regard to 3M shrimp allocations.

With regard to 3L shrimp, it was agreed that all three options for future TAC management should be presented to the Fisheries Commission at the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting for further discussion and advice on how to proceed.

6. Other matters

No other matters were considered.

7. Adjournment of the Meeting

The Chair adjourned the Meeting on Shrimp Stocks in the Regulatory Area on 30 March 00 at 13.30 hrs.

Annex 1. List of Participants

CANADA

Head of Delegation

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

Representative

E. Wiseman (see address above)

Advisers

C. J. Allen, Resource Management, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
J. Angel, Executive Director, Canadian Association of Prawn Producers, P. O. Box 1C1, Head of St. Margarets Bay, N.S. B0J 1R0
E. Dussault, Director, Atlantic Affairs Div., International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
D. Kulka, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
R. MacIntosh, Counsellor, Embassy of Canada, 501 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C., USA 20008
A. Saunders, Oceans, Environmental and Economic Law Div. (JLO), Dept. of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
R. Steinbock, Atlantic Affairs Div., International Directorate, Dept of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Stn. 1452, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

DENMARK (in respect of Faroes and Greenland)

Head of Delegation

E. Lemche, Head of Representation, Gronlands Hjemmestyre, Pilestraede 52, Box 2151, Copenhagen, Denmark

Alternate

A. Kristiansen, Ministry of Fisheries, Yviri við Strond 17, P. O. Box 87, FO-110 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Representatives

E. Lemche (see address above)
A. Kristiansen (see address above)

Advisers

J. E. Hansen, Bondaheygur 9, FR-100 Torshavn, Faroe Islands
P. M. Pedersen, P. O. Box 310, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland
J. Persson, Greenland Home Rule, Dept. of Industry, Box 269, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland
J. H. Toftum, Ministry of Fisheries, P. O. Box 64, FO-100 Torshavn, Faroe Islands

ESTONIA

Head of Delegation

A. Soome, Officer, Fisheries Dept., Ministry of Environment, Kopli 76, 10416 Tallinn

Adviser

T. Saat, Director, Estonian Marine Institute, 18b Viljandi Road, 11216, Tallinn

EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Head of Delegation

F. Wieland, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries, Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium

Representative

F. Wieland (see address above)

Advisers

H. Koster, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries, Rue Joseph II, 99, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
S. Ekwall, Administrator, Baltic, North Atlantic and North Pacific, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries, Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
R. Rosenkranz, European Commission, Directorate General for Fisheries, Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
R. Uher, Administrator, Council of the European Union, General Secretariat, Rue de la Loi 175, B-1048 Brussels, Belgium
M. H. Figueiredo, Directora de Servicos, Departamento de Relacoes Comunitarias Internacionais e de Cooperacao, Direccao Geral das Pescas e Aquicultura, Edificio Vasco da Gama, Rua General Gomes Araujo, 1399-006 Lisbon, Portugal
R. Akesson, Ministry of Agriculture, 10333 Stockholm, Sweden
S. Feldthaus, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Holbergsgade 2, 1057 Copenhagen K, Denmark
H. Pott, Bundesministerium fur Ernahrung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstr. 1, D-53123 Bonn, Germany
S. Segura, Conseiller des Affaires Etrangeres, Direction des Affaires Juridiques, Ministere des Affaires Etrangeres, 37 Quai d'Orsay, 75700 Paris, France
J. Turenne, Chargé de Mission, Ministere de l'Agriculture et de la Peche, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75007 Paris, France
I. Ybanez, Sub-Director General de Organismos Multilaterales de Pesca, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentacion, Direccion General de Recursos Pesqueros, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
L. M. Esteruelas, Counselor for Agriculture, Embassy of Spain, 2375 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037
G. Taylor, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 3JR

FRANCE (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon)

Head of Delegation

D. Silvestre, Secretariat General de la Mer, 16 Boulevard Raspail, 75007 Paris

Representative

D. Silvestre (address above)

ICELAND

Head of Delegation

T. Asgeirsson, Director of Fisheries, Ingolfsstræti 1, 150 Reykjavik

Representative

T. Asgeirsson (see address above)

Advisers

S. Asmundsson, Ministry of Fisheries, Skulagata 4, 150 Reykjavik
K. Arnason, Ministry of Fisheries, Skulagata 4, 150 Reykjavik
E. Gudnason, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Raudararstigur 25, 150 Reykjavik
G. Hannesson, Directorate of Fisheries, Ingolfsstræti, 150 Reykjavik

JAPAN

Head of Delegation

T. Iwata, International Affairs Div., Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Alternate

N. Yagi, Embassy of Japan, 2520 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008

Advisers

N. Takagi, Executive Secretary, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association, Ogawacho-Yasuda Bldg., 6 Kanda-Ogawacho, 3-Chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-0052

LATVIA

Head of Delegation

N. Riekstins, Director, National Board of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture, 2 Republikas laukums, Rigá LV-1010

Representative

N. Riekstins (see address above)

Adviser

U. Rinkis, National Board of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture, 2 Republikas laukums, Riga LV-1010

LITHUANIA

Head of Delegation

A. Raudonius, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Agriculture, 19 Gedimino pr., Vilnius 2600

Alternate

A. Rusakevicius, Chief Specialist, Fisheries, Dept. of the Ministry of Agriculture, 19 Gedimino pr., Vilnius 2600

Representatives

A. Raudonius (see address above)
A. Rusakevicius (see address above)

Adviser

R. Bogdevicius, Deputy Director of Fish Resources Dept. of the Ministry of Environment, A. Juozapavichiaus St. 9, Vilnius 2600

NORWAY

Head of Delegation

T. Lobach, Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, N-5804 Bergen

Representative

T. Lobach (see address above)

Advisers

W. Barstad, Norwegian Fishing Vessel Owners Association, P.O. Box 67, Aalesund
H. P. Johansen, Fisheries Counselor, Royal Norwegian Embassy, 2720 34th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008
P. Sandberg, Directorate of Fisheries, P. O. Box 185, N-5804 Bergen

POLAND

Head of Delegation

L. Dybiec, Director, Fisheries Dept., Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Wspólna 30, 00-930 Warsaw

Representative

L. Dybiec (see address above)

Advisers

D. Kravtsova, Parkowa 13/17, M123, Warsaw
M. Kucharski, Embassy of the Republic of Poland, 443 Daly Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6H3
B. Szemioth, Parkowa 13/17, M123, Warsaw

RUSSIA

Head of Delegation

M. G. Botvinko, State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow 103031

Representative

M. G. Botvinko (see address above)

Advisers

V. M. Kolesnikov, Deputy of Head of Resource Department, State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow
I. Mikhno, Embassy of the Russian Federation, 1609 Decatur Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20011
A. Okhanov, Representative of the Russian Federation in Canada on Fisheries, 47 Oceanview Dr., Bedford, Nova Scotia, Canada B4A 4C4
V. N. Shibanov, PINRO, 6 Knipovich St., Murmansk 183763
V. Solodovnik, VNJRO, 17 V. Krasnoselskaya Stret, Moscow 107140
E. A. Yakunin, State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow 103031

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Head of Delegation

A. Rosenberg, Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Representative

A. Rosenberg (see address above)

Advisers

D. Warner-Kramer, International Affairs Officer, Office of Marine Conservation (Room 5806), U.S. Dept. of State, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20520
P. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, Northeast Region, National Marine Fisheries, 1 Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA
P. Moran, International Fisheries Div., F/SF4, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1315 East-West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910
J.-P. Plé, Senior Atlantic Affairs Officer, Office of Marine Conservation (Room 5806), U.S. Dept. of State, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20520
D. E. Swanson, Chief, International Fisheries Div., F/SF4, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

SECRETARIAT

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

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

P. Fenwick, Office of Marine Conservation (Rm 5806), U.S. Dept. of State, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20520
C. Smith, Office of Marine Conservation (Rm 5806), U.S. Dept. of State, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20520

Annex 2. Opening Statement by the Representative of the United States of America (USA)

Mr. Chairman,

I extend a warm welcome to you and all participants to the United States and Washington, D.C. We are happy to see you again and to host this meeting.

As many of you know, I work for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which is also the parent organization of the National Weather Service. For those of you who arrived over the weekend and experienced some of the finest weather Washington has to offer, I arranged for those favorable conditions. I have additionally requested that the weather over the course of the week match the progress made here in this room. I have hope for sunny, bright days.

We welcome the pending discussions of shrimp management and the NAFO allocation practice. There should be many ways in which our primarily theoretical discussions of allocation approaches can be advanced by considering the practical cases of 3L and 3M shrimp management and alternatives to them. Conversely, our consideration of shrimp management should further inform our more general allocation discussions.

We are prepared to work with you, Mr. Chairman, and all delegations to carry out the terms of reference of these two meetings. I wish everyone two successful meetings and a pleasant stay in Washington.

Annex 3. Opening Statement by the Representative of Canada

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Representatives, it is a pleasure for Canada to participate at this meeting on shrimp management. We would like to thank the U.S. Government for hosting this meeting and providing the meeting facilities. We would also like to thank the NAFO Secretariat for providing the usual high level of logistical support.

This meeting on shrimp management is timely. For a number of years the Scientific Council has recommended that shrimp catches on the Flemish Cap should not exceed 30,000t; at its meeting in November 1999, it recommended that 3M shrimp catches in 2001 should not exceed 30,000t. It appears that this advice was significantly exceeded last year as 1999 catches of 3M shrimp were over 41,000t - based on the provisional catch reports submitted to NAFO.

Canada would like to thank Iceland for its paper and its proposal for a TAC and quota management regime. As noted in the paper, there are flaws with the current effort limitation scheme. These include the absence of a catch limit, the lack of control on advances in fishing efficiency and the potential for a fishery that can produce a significantly higher level of catch than to date.

Canada is open to any management solution that will ensure that an effective, conservation-based management regime is in place for 3M shrimp for 2001.

Mr. Chairman, Canada looks forward to discussing practical solutions to ensure the conservation of the Flemish Cap shrimp stock.

Annex 4. Opening Statement by the Representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

In order to prohibit an olympic fishery for 3M shrimp NAFO decided to implement an effort limitation system from 1996. For many Parties this was a new approach of managing fishery. For the Faroe Islands, however, this was a well-known system. Since 1984 Faroese shrimp trawlers have fished under such regulation system in the area with Svalbard in the North East Atlantic. Furthermore, the Faroese Parliament in 1994 decided to switch from a quota system for the demersal species in Faroese waters to an effort system. This step was taken due to problems getting the quota system to work properly.

After the implementation of the effort system for vessels fishing for 3M shrimp, some Contracting Parties have questioned this system. They have claimed that due to improvement in fishing technique and equipment the fishing will pass far beyond 30,000 metric tonnes per year. Our delegation does not regard it is of any use to try to prove whether this prophecy is right or wrong. However, we can agree that the catches have increased slightly in the years 1997 to 1999.

The statistics for catches and fishing days given in the attachment to NAFO document GF/00-164 clearly demonstrate that the problem is not the effort limitation system. Based on this information we have made some calculations concerning how the fishing would have been if all Contracting Parties had implemented the effort system. Furthermore, we have made calculations about the overfishing by some Parties who actually did adopt the effort limitation system.

The results of these calculations are very interesting. They show overfishing by especially 3 Parties, varying from 20% to 330% in the years 1996-1999. This overfishing amount from 6% to 72% of the total catches. If the total catches are adjusted for this overfishing, the catches in 1996-1998 would have been below 30,000 tonnes each year.

In other words, we can state that there is no proof for, that the effort limitation system has failed. On the contrary the problem discovered so far is that a number of Contracting Parties have failed to accept and implement the decisions made by NAFO. Furthermore they have fished much more than they have been entitled to.

Having said this we also would like to inform, that even Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) has not decided to leave the effort limitation system and adopt a quota system, we are fully prepared to participate in a constructive and creative approach in the discussions about a possible quota allocation system for shrimps in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

Annex 5. Opening Statement by the Representative of the European Union

Thank you Mr. Chairman,

I would first of all like to thank the Government of the United States for hosting this meeting in Washington, D.C., which is extremely pleasant to visit at this time of year with cherry blossoms and nice Spring weather.

Concerning the issues ahead, I would very much like to echo the opening remarks of other Contracting Parties that this is indeed an important exercise. We must most of all look at the system established for 1996 and try to evaluate advantages and disadvantages of both the current system as well as a possible total allowable catch (TAC) and quota system. We must also bear in mind that this is a new fishery since 1995.

I have also some sympathy for what has already been said by Norway. Contrary to the Icelandic suggestion, we believe that both the issues of a TAC and its allocation should be addressed at the same time.

Finally, I would like to stress that we are not meeting in a working group but, as expressed at last year's annual meeting, rather in an exploratory dialogue. Nevertheless, I am looking forward to today's discussions and I hope they will be constructive.

Thank you.

Annex 6. Opening Statement by the Representative of Japan

Thank you Mr. Chairman,

Our delegation also extends our special thanks to the Government of the United States for hosting the meeting.

The basic Japanese position on this fishery is to seek a sustainable use of resources through proper management mechanisms. We respect the NAFO regulations on shrimp in Division 3M.

Japan has allocation of shrimp in Divisions 3M and 3L, but has voluntarily refrained from exercising its rights with regard to these fisheries. It did not operate shrimp fisheries in these areas until last year. This is because Japan was concerned about the possibility of adverse effects of these shrimp fisheries on other fish stocks through by-catch.

However, from the year 2000, Japan is planning to exercise its shrimp fishing rights in 3M and 3L. We think that the by-catch concern regarding demersal fish would be alleviated by using sorting grates.

We hope the outcome of this meeting is successful to the proper management of these shrimp stocks and our delegation is willing to contribute to the discussion.

Thank you.

Annex 7. Opening Statement by the Representative of Estonia

It is always difficult to make rapid changes. The Estonian position is that the possibilities of the effort regulation system are not exhausted, and we suggest to continue the effort regulation of the 3M shrimp fishery using fishing days. To ensure stability and reduce the risk of overfishing, allocation of fishing days to Contracting Parties should take into account the actual number of fishing days used during the previous year.

Estonia is not against introducing the TAC system in the future. However, to achieve this, a transition period is needed before TAC regulation is applied. During the transition period, the state of the stock and the catches should be monitored and the TAC allocation system worked out.

Thank you.

Annex 8. Agenda

1. Opening by Chairman (H. Koster-EU)
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Appointment of Rapporteur
4. Management system(s) for shrimps in the Regulatory Area
    - Current management system for 3M shrimp
    - Possible TAC-based quota allocation systems for 3M shrimp
    - Possible quota allocation systems for 3L shrimp
5. Report to the Fisheries Commission
6. Other matters
7. Adjournment of the Meeting

Annex 9. Working Paper by Iceland
(W.P. (Shrimp) 00/1)

In 1995, NAFO Contracting Parties agreed to initial management measures for 3M shrimp. Despite the management measures, catches have increased substantially, to an unsustainable level. In the year the measures were agreed upon, 1995, the catches were 28,235 mt but were over 42,000 mt in 1999 according to provisional statistics. This number will almost certainly become even higher when more accurate information becomes available. It is clear that these catches are not sustainable as they are significantly above the scientific recommendation of 30,000 mt. In addition, catches are likely to increase even further this year. In the light of the fact that less than 58% of the allocated fishing days were used in 1999 it is clear that this management system allows for a total catch of over 73,000 mt, based on all fishing days being used with catch per fishing day staying at the 1999 level.

In order to conserve the stock and ensure that the fishery is sustainable in the future it is necessary to change the current management as it is clearly not working as intended. Limiting the number of days used in the fishery has not been enough to keep catches at a sustainable level. The management must limit the actual catches of 3M shrimp. It is therefore necessary to set a TAC which will then be allocated to NAFO Contracting Parties. This would result in the management of 3M shrimp being in line with other NAFO management measures, including the 3L shrimp management measures agreed upon at NAFO's annual meeting last year. It would also bring the management in line with what is the norm in international fisheries management.

As in other cases where a TAC has been decided upon, the main criterion which should be looked at in deciding the national allocations is the relative catches of individual Contracting Parties. This is the case since the rights of coastal states do not apply to 3M shrimp.

Other criteria, such as dependence, should also be considered in deciding the allocation.

Iceland proposes that the NAFO Contracting Parties agree at this meeting on two separate issues regarding the management of 3M shrimp:

1. In order to ensure the conservation of the stock and the sustainability of the fishery it is necessary to set a TAC and national allocations thereof.
2. In deciding the national allocations, the main criterion to be looked at should be the relative catches of individual Parties.

It is further proposed that new management measures for 3M shrimp, based on a TAC and national allocations thereof, be agreed on at NAFO's annual meeting in September 2000.

Statistics of Shrimp Fishery in the NAFO Regulatory Area (1993-1999)

Contracting Party	1993		1994		1995		1996			1997			1998			1999		
	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Allocated	Used	Catch	Allocated	Used	Catch	Allocated	Used	Catch	Allocated	Used	Catch
Canada	507	3191	333	1042	319	968	445	311	908	443	156	784	443	82	435	456	79	385
Cuba							100			100			100			100	33	119
Den.-Faroes		7076		4998			1785		8685	1606	1241	7387	1607	1271	7741	1606	1111	9119
Den.-Grl.		3788		2275		2400	572		1107	515		104	515	108	865	515	56	576
Estonia				1051		2380	1852	993	1973	1217	692	3239	1217	916	5694	1667	1645	10846
EU	139	754	97	432	44	487	408		198	457	63	593	457	105	1553	457	268	1265
France (SP)							N/A			100	22		N/A	22		100		
Iceland	279	2195	638	2355	1842	7481	N/A	5256	20680	N/A	1362	7197	N/A	968	6572	N/A	1312	7643
Japan							N/A			N/A			N/A			100		
Korea							N/A			N/A			N/A			100		
Latvia			190	324	545	679	421	504	1253	400	369	997	400	313	1191	416	598	2765
Lithuania			453	863	638	980	638	918	1585	579	611	1785	579	866	3107	579	709	3370
Norway	1354	7075	2130	8625	2113	9534	2206	1482	5805	1985	334	1831	1985	214	1339	1985	428	2976
Poland							N/A			N/A	100		400	40	148	100	104	707
Russia	76	54	41	350	1533	3327	N/A	2458	4444	2600	807	1090	2600			2100	417	1126
USA							N/A			N/A			100			100		

Notes:

1. Shrimp effort limitation scheme was introduced from 1996.
2. Days used for 1993-96 taken from STATLANT 21B.
3 Days used for 1997-99 taken from hails.
4. Catches for 1993-1998 taken from STATLANT 21A & B.
5. Catches for 1999 (also 1998 Faroes) taken from provisional monthly catches.

Table 1. Shrimp 3M allocated/used days and catches 1993-1999 (data as discussed at the Washington meeting in March 2000)

	1993		1994		1995		1996			1997			1998			1999		
Contracting Party	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch
Canada	507	3191	333	1042	319	968	445	311	908	443	156	784	443	82	435	456	79	385
Cuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	33	119
Den.-Faroes	-	7076	-	4998	-	5993	1785	-	8685	1606	1241	7387	1607	1271	7741	1606	1111	9119
Den.-Greenland	-	3788	-	2275	-	2400	572	-	1107	515	-	104	515	108	865	515	56	576
Estonia	-	-	-	1051	-	2380	1852	993	1973	1217	692	3239	1217	916	5694	1667	1645	10846
European Union	139	754	97	432	44	487	508	-	198	457	63	593	457	105	1553	457	268	1265
France (SP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	100	22	-	N/A	-	-	100	-	-
Iceland	279	2195	638	2355	1842	7481	N/A	5256	20680	N/A	1362	7197	N/A	968	6572	N/A	1312	7643
Japan	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	-	-	100	-	-
Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	-	-	100	-	-
Latvia	-	-	190	324	545	679	421	504	1253	400	369	997	400	313	1191	416	598	2765
Lithuania	-	-	453	863	638	980	638	918	1585	579	611	1785	579	866	3107	579	709	3370
Norway	1354	7075	2130	8625	2113	9534	2206	1482	5805	1985	334	1831	1985	214	1339	1985	428	2976
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	100	-	400	40	148	100	104	707
Russia	76	54	41	350	1533	3327	N/A	2458	4444	2600	807	1090	2600	-	-	2100	417	1126
USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	N/A	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-
Total	2355	24133	3882	22315	7034	34229	8527	11922	46638	10002	5757	25007	10403	4883	28645	10381	6760	40897

Table 2. Revised Shrimp 3M catches and allocated/used days 1993-1999 (as received at the Secretariat up to June 27 2000)
(Revised data received from Estonia, Faroes, Greenland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Poland); Data for Russia 1993-95 are noted as provisional.

	1993		1994		1995		1996			1997			1998			1999		
Contracting Party	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch	Alloc.	Used	Catch
Canada	507	3191	333	1042	319	968	492	311	908	443	156	784	443	82	435	456	79	385
Cuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	33	119
Den.-Faroes	1324	7333	1785	6791	1093	5993	1785	1831	8688	1606	1250	7410	1606	1292	9368	1606	1051	9199
Den.-Greenland	572	3780	482	2272	265	2316	572	202	1098	515	31	105	515	113	862	515	65	537
Estonia	149	268	609	1051	2153	2379	1852	990	1898	1217	1254	3240	1217	1454	5533	1667	1651	10834
European Union	139	754	97	432	44	487	508	-	198	457	63	593	457	105	1553	457	268	1265
France (SP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	22	-	100	-	-	100	-	-
Iceland	279	2195	638	2355	1842	7481	N/A	5256	20682	N/A	1327	6473	N/A	980	6580	N/A	1222	9286
Japan	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-
Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-
Latvia	-	-	190	324	649	679	544	504	1253	490	439	997	490	402	1191	490	438	3080
Lithuania	-	-	453	863	638	980	638	918	1585	579	611	1785	579	866	3107	579	620	3371
Norway	1403	7074	2206	8625	2162	9391	2206	1549	5648	1985	329	1886	1985	211	1339	1985	394	2975
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	100	817	100	40	148	100	104	859
Russia	76	54	41	350	1533	3327	N/A	2458	4444	2600	807	1090	2600	-	-	2100	417	1126
USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-
Total	4449	24649	6834	24105	10698	34001	9197	14019	46402	10492	6389	25180	10492	5545	30116	10455	6342	43036

Annex 11. Possible Allocation Key for a TAC-based Management System for 3M Shrimp - Paper presented by Norway
(W.P. (Shrimp) 00/4)

The allocation key for fishing days for the current effort-regulation system of 3M shrimp is based on the reference period 1993, 1994, and first 8 months of 1995. By applying the same reference period when establishing an allocation key for a TAC-based management system, the shares, and the quotas, for the various Parties will be as illustrated in the table below. In the table a TAC of 30,000 tonnes has been used.

Contracting Parties with no track record in the reference period could be entitled to fish under an others-quota of approx. 3% of the TAC (1,000 t).

Shrimps in 3M

Contracting Parties (FC Members)	**1993 Catch**	**1994 Catch**	**1995 first 8 months Catch 1)**	**Sum of catch**	**Share of Catch quota**	**Quota According to 30000 t 29,000**
Canada	3,191	1,042	645	4,878	7.0%	2,042
Cuba	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Denmark:						
Faroes	7,076	4,998	3,995	16,069	23.2%	6,727
Greenland	3,788	2,275	1,600	7,663	11.1%	3,208
Estonia	0	1,051	1,587	2,638	3.8%	1,104
EU	754	432	325	1,511	2.2%	632
France (SPM)	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Iceland	2,195	2,355	4,987	9,537	13.8%	3,993
Japan	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Korea	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Latvia	0	324	453	777	1.1%	325
Lithuania	0	863	653	1,516	2.2%	635
Norway	7,075	8,625	6,356	22,056	31.8%	9,234
Poland	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Russia	54	350	2,218	2,622	3.8%	1,098
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
USA	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
TOTAL	24,133	22,315	22,819	69,267	100.0%	29,000

1) The catch figure for each Contracting Party for the first 8 months of 1995 is found as 8/12 of the total catch in 1995 respectively.

Annex 12. Working Paper by the Chairman
(W.P. (Shrimp) 00/8, Revision 3)

DRAFT (all data to be scrutinized)

Identification of some options for the purpose of guiding the process initiated by the Fisheries Commission at its 21st Annual Meeting in September 1999

Noting the advice provided by the Scientific Council on 3M shrimp (catches should not exceed 30,000 tonnes in 2000 and 2001);

Noting that the catches of 3M shrimp exceeded in 1996 and 1999 30,000 tonnes and are likely to exceed this level in 2000;

A reinforcement of the current management measures needs, therefore, to be considered by the Fisheries Commission.

The options for doing so are the setting of a catch limit e.g. in the form of a total allowable catch (30,000 tons or less) or a maximum number of fishing days (less than 4762 days which corresponds to a reduction of the current number of days allocated to Contracting Parties by approximately 60%)[1].

In the event that a catch limit is set in the form of a total allowable catch, the following options are identified as a basis for allocation of quota to Contracting Parties.

Acknowledging that options presented in this Working Paper do not reflect considerations pursuant to Article XI (4) of the NAFO Convention nor possible other relevant criteria. The options are identified in no order of priority.

[1] -
- The current total number of fishing days allocated is 11,704 days
- The total number of days used is 6670 days
- The total catch in 1999 is 42,554 tonnes
- The average catch per day can therefore be calculated at 6.3 tonnes per day
- The maximum number of fishing days compatible with the scientific advice can be calculated by dividing 30,000 tonnes by 6.3 tonnes.

OPTION A

This option takes as point of departure the allocation of fishing days under the current management scheme which includes the following elements:

a) Limitation of the number of vessels fishing for shrimp to the number that have participated in the 3M shrimp fishery from 1 January 1993 to 31 August 1995.

b) Limitation to the maximum number of fishing days observed for their vessels in one of the years 1993, 1994 or 1995 (until 31 August 1995).

c) For Contracting Parties with a track record in the period from 1 January 1993 to 31 August 1995 a level of 400 days is permitted.

d) For Contracting Parties with no track record in this period a level of 100 days with one vessel is permitted.

A basis for quota allocation can be derived as follows:

1) allocation will be based on the highest catch in one of the years 1993, 1994 or 1995 (until August 1995)
2) or alternatively

- For Contracting Parties with a track record in the period 1 January 1993 to 31 August 1995 the catch figure will be at least 1600 (400 x average catch per day (mt?))
- For Contracting Parties with no track record in the period 1 January 1993 to 31 August 1995, the basis will be at least 400 (100 x average catch per day (mt?))

Basis for allocation (1993, 1994, 1995/1 Jan-31 Aug)

Contracting Party	Highest Catch	Minimum Level	Basis	%
Canada	3191	-	3191	7.38
Cuba	-	400	400	0.93
Denmark:				
Faroes	8545	-	8545	19.76
Greenland	3780	-	3780	8.74
Estonia	2379	-	2379	5.50
European Union	754	1600	1600	3.70
France (SPM)	-	400	400	0.93
Iceland	5422[1)]	-	5422	12.54
Japan	-	400	400	0.93
Korea	-	400	400	0.93
Latvia	679	1600	1600	3.70
Lithuania	980	1600	1600	3.70
Norway	9391	-	9391	21.72
Poland	-	400	400	0.93
Russia	3327	-	3327	7.70
USA	-	400	400	0.93
TOTAL			43235	100%

1) corrected on the basis of average catch rate per day for period 1 January – 31 August 1995

OPTION B

This option takes as point of departure the period of application of the current management scheme for 3M shrimp.

As allocation basis, it will be taken the catches in each of the years from 1996-1999 subject to certain corrections of the figures.

Two sub-options are identified:

B_1 - Catches for the period 1996-1999 with the adjusting of the catch figures of the Contracting Parties which are inconsistent with the fishing pattern (e.g. the catches of Contracting Parties which exceeded their allocated fishing days those catches were adjusted to the allocated fishing effort).

B_2 - Catches for the period 1997-1998 with elimination of the years 1996 and 1999 with "extreme" catches.

It should be further clarified that in this table Contracting Parties with no "track record" allocated with a "constant-nominal" 400 mt through the whole period, which most probably should not change principal proportional values of the whole mathematical estimates and basic "shares" but in full fairness, reflect a presence and interest of all Contracting Parties as stakeholders of this resource.

Contracting					96-99	Sub-Option B 1		97-98	Sub-Option B 2	
Party	1996	1997	1998	1999	Catch	%-1	%-2	Catch	%-1	%-2
Canada	908	784	435	385	2512	1.9%	1.6%	1219	2.1%	2.1%
Cuba	400	400	400	119	1319	1.0%	0.9%	800	1.4%	1.3%
Denmark:						0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%
Faroes	8688	7410	9368	9199	34665	25.7%	22.7%	16778	28.4%	28.3%
Greenland	1098	105	862	537	2602	1.9%	1.7%	967	1.6%	1.6%
Estonia	1898	3240	5533	10834	21505	16.0%	14.1%	8773	14.8%	14.8%
European Union	198	593	1553	1265	3609	2.7%	2.4%	2146	3.6%	3.6%
France (SPM)	400	400	400	400	1600	1.2%	1.0%	800	1.4%	1.3%
Iceland-1	5205	6293	6580	6938	25016	18.6%		12873	21.8%	
Iceland-2	20682	6473	6580	9286	43021		28.2%	13053		22.0%
Japan	400	400	400	400	1600	1.2%	1.0%	800	1.4%	1.3%
Korea	400	400	400	400	1600	1.2%	1.0%	800	1.4%	1.3%
Latvia	1253	997	1191	3080	6521	4.8%	4.3%	2188	3.7%	3.7%
Lithuania	1585	1785	3107	3371	9848	7.3%	6.4%	4892	8.3%	8.3%
Norway	5648	1886	1339	2975	11848	8.8%	7.8%	3225	5.5%	5.4%
Poland	400	817	148	859	2224	1.7%	1.5%	965	1.6%	1.6%
Russia	4444	1090	-	1126	6660	4.9%	4.4%	1090	1.8%	1.8%
USA	400	400	400	400	1600	1.2%	1.0%	800	1.4%	1.3%
Total-1	33325	27000	32116	42288	134729	100.0%		59116	100.0%	
Total-2	48802	27180	32116	44636	152734		100.0%	59296		100.0%

NOTES:

a) Iceland 1- data adjusted for reference number of fishing days i.e. 1323 days calculated on the basis of the average catch per day
Iceland 2 - actual catch data as reported by Iceland

b) %-1 - this is a ratio from Total - 1
%-2 - this is a ratio from Total - 2

c) All catch data should be verified by Contracting Parties and reported back to the NAFO Secretariat.

d) The data notified by Poland for 1997 are also included in the Icelandic figures.

A further adjustment may be considered for the maximum number of vessels fishing for shrimp which shall not exceed the number that participated in the reference period (total number of named vessels during the reference period).

OPTION C

This option takes as point of departure catch history.

As allocation basis will be taken the catches in each of the years from 1993-1999.

Two sub-options are presented:

C_1 - the sum of the catches for the whole observation period, 1993-1999. In future probable scenario, if decided, the relative share of each Contracting Party would be applied on 90% of the TAC, and the remaining 10% would be set aside as OTHERS quota.

C2 - the sum of the catches for a short reference period (1997,1999). As in C_1, the relative share of each Contracting Party would be applied on 90% of the TAC and, remaining 10% would be set aside as OTHERS quota.

Contracting Party	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	93-99 Catch	Sub-Option C 1 %-1	Sub-Option C 1 %-2	97-99 Catch	Sub-Option C 2 %-1	Sub-Option C 2 %-2
Canada	3191	1042	968	908	784	435	385	7713	3.7%	3.4%	1604	1.7%	1.6%
Cuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	119	119	0.1%	0.1%	119	0.1%	0.1%
Denmark:													
Faroes	7333	6791	5993	8688	7410	9368	9199	54782	26.2%	24.1%	25977	27.1%	26.4%
Greenland	3780	2272	2316	1098	105	862	537	10970	5.2%	4.8%	1504	1.6%	1.5%
Estonia	268	1051	2379	1898	3240	5533	10834	25203	12.0%	11.1%	19607	20.5%	19.9%
European Union	754	432	487	198	593	1553	1265	5282	2.5%	2.3%	3411	3.6%	3.5%
France (SPM)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Iceland-1	2195	2355	7481	5205	6293	6580	6938	37047	17.7%		19811	20.7%	
Iceland-2	2195	2355	7481	20682	6473	6580	9286	55052		24.2%	22339		22.7%
Japan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Latvia	-	324	679	1253	997	1191	3080	7524	3.6%	3.3%	5268	5.5%	5.4%
Lithuania	-	863	980	1585	1785	3107	3371	11691	5.6%	5.1%	8263	8.6%	8.4%
Norway	7074	8625	9391	5648	1886	1339	2975	36938	17.6%	16.2%	6200	6.5%	6.3%
Poland	-	-	-	-	817	148	859	1824	0.9%	0.8%	1824	1.9%	1.9%
Russia	54	350	3327	4444	1090	-	1126	10391	5.0%	4.6%	2216	2.3%	2.3%
USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total-1	24649	24105	34001	30925	25000	30116	40688	209484	100.0%		95804	100.0%	
Total-2	24649	24105	34001	46402	25180	30116	43036	227489		100.0%	98332		100.0%

NOTES:

a) Iceland 1 - data adjusted for reference number of fishing days i.e. 1323 days calculated on the basis of the average catch per day
Iceland 2 - actual catch data as reported by Iceland

b) %-1 - this is a ratio from Total - 1
%-2 - this is a ratio from Total - 2

c) All catch data should be verified by Contracting Parties and reported back to the NAFO Secretariat.

d) The data notified by Poland for 1997 are also included in the Icelandic figures.

OPTION D

This option takes as point of departure the conversion of allocated fishing days in an allocation basis.

Contracting Party	Allocated fishing days	%
Canada	456	3.9
Cuba	100	0.9
Denmark:		
Faroes	1606	13.8
Greenland	515	4.4
Estonia	1667	14.3
European Union	457	3.9
France (SPM)	100	0.9
Iceland	1191[1)]	10.2
Japan	100	0.9
Korea	100	0.9
Latvia	490	4.2
Lithuania	579	5.0
Norway	1985	17.0
Poland	100	0.9
Russia	2100	17.9
USA	100	0.9
TOTAL	11646	100% ...

[1)] corresponding to allocated fishing days reference level minus 10%

% Annex raw data.

Annex 13. Proposal by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Island and Greenland)

(W.P. (Shrimp) 00/11)

Allocation of 3L Shrimps

Taking into account the criteria for quota allocation discussed at the meeting of the Quota Allocation Working Group in March 2000, which most Parties can agree upon – that is fishing track records and contribution to scientific data collection, Denmark, in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland propose, that:

1. 2/3 of the quota in NRA shall be allocated according to catch statistics and contribution to scientific data collection,

2. and taking into account the large number of Parties entitled to participate in utilization of the "others" quota, that 1/3 of the quota in NRA is allocated as "others" quota.

Annex 14. Statement by the Delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

On several occasions Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands & Greenland-DFG) has flagged its view on the 3L shrimp fishery. Based on research fishery and exploratory fishery we have argued for a reopening for a commercial fishery for shrimp in 3L. To the very last end the Fisheries Commission at the last annual meeting adopted management measures which allow Contracting Parties to undertake commercial fishery in 2000 and 2001. The solution was that each Contracting Party is allocated a quota of 67 tonnes in the Regulatory Area.

However, DFG made it clear at the Fisheries Commission meeting, that this is not a satisfactory solution for DFG. Faroe Islands and Canada have track record for shrimp in 3L. And it is at least our definite view that this track record should be taken into account in the allocation of the available quota.

Therefore we only accepted the equal sharing as a preliminary solution. We have been looking forward for this process to come up with a recommendation to Fisheries Commission which takes into account the interests of those Contracting Parties with a track record as well other relevant criteria such as data collection and scientific surveys.

In this regard I would like to point to the fact that the Faroe Islands have contributed to data collection and scientific research with regard to this stock. In 1994 and from 1996-1999 the Faroe Islands conducted a row of 9 surveys in Div. 3L in order to provide NAFO with data on the shrimp in this area and the potential opportunities for commercial fishery.

The reopening of the 3L shrimp fishery was mainly based on information from this work.

Based on the track record and the contribution to data collection and scientific surveys DFG during the first session of this meeting proposed that two-thirds of the quota for the Regulatory Area be allocated to Contracting Parties with a fishing track record in the area and one-third be set aside as an others quota.

Unfortunately, Contracting Parties do not show any substantial support for this proposal.

Our delegation has listened carefully to the opinions expressed by other Parties regarding the allocation of the 3L shrimp quota. We have noted a general view by a number of Parties, that track record for one year is not considered as enough for allocation purposes. Some CP (USA) indicated 3 years to be more appropriate and referred to Working Paper 00/2 for the W.G. on Allocation Fishing Rights. This is the same time period as was used as basis for the allocation of the 3M shrimp fishery.

However, it has to be borne in mind, that not only the Faroe Islands had the opportunity to fish in 3L in 1993. Vessels from other Contracting Parties could as well have participated in this fishery, but they did not use the opportunity. The result is that DFG has to suffer from the lack of interest by vessels from other Contracting Parties to participate in the 3L shrimp fishery prior to the closing of it effective from 1994.

Taking the fishing track record as indication of "real interests" the DFG was the only Contracting Party showing a "real interest" in this fishery.

DFG has presented its proposal for a future allocation of the 3L shrimp for the Regulatory Area. The proposal is based on criteria we have been discussing during the meeting of the Quota

Allocation W.G. and to which most Contracting Parties can agree upon - fishing track record and contribution to data collection and scientific research.

Although DFG seems to stand alone in this topic I can assure all Contracting Parties that DFG will not accept that the track record from 1993 and the contribution to data collection and scientific research be set aside in the allocation of the quota for 3L shrimp.

At relevant up-coming meetings of NAFO, DFG will revert to this issue.