

## **PART II**

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

**26<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, 13-17 September, 2004  
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada**

#### **1. Opening of Meeting**

The Chairman, Martin Newman (EU), opened the meeting and welcomed delegates on September 13, 2004 at 10:10 am. There were no opening statements.

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

Mr. Robert Fagan (Canada) was appointed rapporteur.

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

The Agenda was adopted as modified (Annex 1). It was agreed, as proposed by the USA, to add an agenda item re SCS Doc. 00/23 (FC Doc. 03/18) – Consideration of Possible Options to Provide Observer Data to the Scientific Council.

Chair advised that Fisheries Commission (FC) has requested STACTIC provide clarification on interpretation of rules governing charter arrangements.

#### **4. Review of Annual Returns of Infringements including review of disposition of outstanding infringements by Contracting Parties FC Doc 04/5 (Revised); STACTIC W.P. 04/9**

The Secretariat introduced NAFO FC Doc. 04/5 (revised).

#### **5. Review of Surveillance and Inspection Reports**

Two papers were distributed under this agenda item - STACTIC W.P. 04/23, the Canadian report on surveillance activities and inspections in the NRA and STACTIC W.P. 04/12, the annual return of surveillance and enforcement.

#### **6. Review of Operation of Automated Hail/VMS System**

STACTIC W.P 04/20, prepared by the Secretariat, was circulated to delegates and detailed the status of messages submitted to the Secretariat either manually or automatically for the period January-August 2004. W.P. 04/20 appeared self-explanatory and the small gaps in data were noted including:

- missing Canadian Catch on Exit (COX) report
- missing entry (ENT) and exit (EXI) report for EU/Germany
- missing ENT and EXI report for EU/Portugal

The EU stated that Germany did not fish in the area in this period and would gather details on the remaining other data gaps. Canada noted it would also investigate the missing Canadian report.

#### **7. Review of Compliance**

The review was undertaken in accordance with the terms of reference outlined in W.P.02/14. The thirteen tables that had been compiled by the Secretariat formed the basis of the Compliance Review.

Canada made supplementary presentation on compliance in 2003, including recommendations to address non-compliance. (see details in STACTIC W.P.04/32 Revised 2)

The EU also made a supplementary presentation on compliance (STACTIC W.P. 04/22) which provided an overview of citations for infringements issued each year from 1994-2003. The EU presentation also included information on inspections conducted by Canada on EU vessels in 2004 and noted that most infringements issued were not confirmed by EU inspectors.

The EU also stated that 70% of the citations for infringements issued to their vessels in 2004 had resulted from port inspections.

The Contracting Parties agreed that STACTIC W.P. 04/32 (Revised 2) be presented to Fisheries Commission.

### **8. Harmonization of Reports**

#### **STACTIC W.P.04/3 (Rev.2); STACTIC W.P. 04/13; STACTIC W.P. 04/14**

At the Copenhagen meeting in June, 2004, the delegate of Iceland presented a proposal developed jointly with Denmark (in respect of the Faeroe Islands and Greenland) and Norway to harmonize the VMS message format and reports by fishing vessels consistent with the formats used in NEAFC. Following a number of small amendments, it was agreed to recommend the proposal to the Fisheries Commission for adoption. (STACTIC Working Paper 04/3-Revised 3). The Secretariat provided cost implications of this recommendation (STACTIC W.P. 4/13) which have been forwarded to STACFAD.

It was noted that the NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats had agreed to jointly create a new public website on the North Atlantic format. The Secretariats will continue discussions on developing this site to ensure harmonization. STACTIC recommends that a joint NAFO/NEAFC group of experts be appointed to oversee the North Atlantic format. A similar recommendation has been made by the control group of NEAFC (PECCOE).

Concerning their proposal (STACTIC W.P. 04/14), Norway proposed that discussion be deferred at present to allow for technical discussion at NEAFC.

### **9. Update Regarding Participation in Pilot Project**

#### **STACTIC W.P. Paper 04/15, STACTIC W.P. Paper 04/17 STACTIC W.P. Paper 04/21 STACTIC W.P. Paper 04/26**

The Secretariat provided further update (STACTIC W.P. Paper 04/15) as requested by STACTIC in June. Tables were included to provide details and ongoing progress of project. Norway provided details of its participation in pilot project and noted they will place priority on analyzing reports received next year.

Iceland presented their review of the pilot project (STACTIC W.P. 04/21) and noted the challenge presented by a fishery that occurs in multiple Regulatory areas and suggested that some flexibility in requirements is needed. It is difficult to ensure 50% observer coverage at any one time but can be done over a period of time.

Iceland stated that with regard to testing of communications, it was not necessary to test communication from each vessel. These are already tested and testing is required in the beginning of the project for communication between the Fisheries Monitoring Centre to the Secretariat and from the Secretariat to Contracting Parties.

A discussion on testing requirements concluded that, in practice, the experience has been positive. Several Contracting Parties acknowledged that the focus should be on the technical component and that the pilot project had only been in operation for a few months and it was too early to draw firm conclusions at this time.

## 10. Possible Amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures

A number of proposals were introduced for consideration.

- Norway introduced STACTIC W.P. 04/16 which proposed changes to Article 22 NCEM regarding rules for transshipment of fish. Some Contracting Parties expressed concerns about certain aspects of the text. Several Contracting Parties noted that compatibility with NEAFC rules is important. Norway informed the meeting that it had already sent a similar proposal to NEAFC for consideration. The Secretariat was asked to make inquiries with regard to the cost implications. Further discussion on proposal was deferred.
- Canada proposed amendments to Articles 13, 22 and 23 of the NCEM (authorization to fish, communication of catches and observer program (STACTIC W.P.04/28) which followed STACTIC W.P. 04/4. The paper presented a number of areas where no consensus had been possible or further clarification was required. Changes were proposed in some instances and in others differing opinions were expressed. Canada agreed to modify the proposal based on comments received and bring the paper forward for re-consideration by STACTIC. The EU recalled its position that the increase in catch reporting frequency by masters of vessels should be seen as a package with reduced observer coverage.
- Canada presented a discussion paper on the criteria for reduced observer coverage levels (STACTIC W.P. 04/29). Canada noted that the criteria were risk-based and proposed the establishment of a base level of coverage in accordance with the conservation risk in specific fisheries. This base level would then be adjusted according to the compliance levels on a fleet basis. The paper was intended to generate discussion by Contracting Parties. Other Contracting parties required additional time to consider the guidelines which were seen as complicated.
- Canada introduced a proposal for improvements to the existing NAFO port inspection program (STACTIC W.P. 04/27). A presentation was provided that explained the proposal called for enhanced port inspection procedures to focus on non compliant vessels in the NAFO Regulatory Area. Some Contracting Parties questioned if change was necessary as present scheme was working in a satisfactory manner and procedures seem to become more complicated and that they would take time to consider. EU provided updated information on non-compliance detected during port inspections. Russia inquired about permitted discrepancy between log and catch. EU stated logbook tolerance was 20% for most species but was under review. A number of Contracting Parties expressed concern about two-tiered inspections and the potential complications that may arise for resultant legal proceedings. Canada expressed its continuing concern for the inconsistencies between at sea inspections, observer/VMS reports and port inspections and suggested that a mechanism should be found to reconcile these differences.
- STACTIC W.P. 04/25, there was agreement by all Contracting Parties that the proposed provisions in regards to toggle chains should be presented to Fisheries Commission for adoption.
- STACTIC W.P. 04/30 Revised 3 - Denmark introduced a proposal for modifications to the NCEM in order to ensure more effective inspection of fishing vessels at sea and in port by extending provisions regarding labeling and requiring that fishing masters keep stowage plans of the catch stored on board.

Contracting Parties discussed of number of concerns with the proposal including:

- practical difficulties with sorting and stowage requirements
- potential impact on vessel stability
- recognized need for clearer definition of “clearly separated”

After discussion, a revised proposal was agreed for presentation to Fisheries Commission for adoption.

Denmark noted their reluctance to remove reference to product category as there was a lack of a standard definition for production logbook but did not wish to obstruct the process. Denmark proposed that the application of the measure be reviewed over time.

- STACTIC Working Paper 04/31 (Revised 2)  
Iceland presented a proposal which aimed to clarify the rules with regard to inspectors remaining on board a vessel following an inspection where serious infringement was cited.

Contacting Parties agreed proposal be presented to Fisheries Commission for adoption.

- Russia proposed that there should be a discussion to clarify the time of prior notice of at-sea inspection. It was decided to discuss this matter at the intersessional meeting of STACTIC.

#### **11. Review Increase of Inspection Presence in NAFO Regulatory Area including consideration of Article 36 of CEM**

It was noted this item was discussed at STACTIC meeting in June. EU stated that improved co-operation and co-ordination was needed. EU suggested that there may be benefits derived from a workshop for inspectors from all Contracting Parties to discuss procedures currently in use for at-sea and in port inspections and examine ways to improve co-operation. All Contracting Parties supported the suggestion of a workshop for inspectors and EU agreed to host and co-ordinate and requested input from other Contracting Parties in preparing the Agenda for the workshop.

#### **12. Continuation of intersessional discussion on Elaboration of a Scheme for Contracting Parties with content similar to that of Scheme for NCPs**

It was noted this item was delayed pending outcome of work being conducted by STACFAC and the situation remained much the same as discussed in June, 2004. It was agreed that it would be difficult to proceed without a clearer mandate from Fisheries Commission.

#### **13. Request Concerning SCS Doc. 00/23 (FC Doc. 03/18) – Consideration of Possible Options to Provide Observer Data to the Scientific Council.**

Contracting Parties reviewed conclusion reached at STACTIC Meeting, June, 2004. The United States expressed some concern about postponement of this item pending the adoption of a revised observer scheme. After contact with Chair of Scientific Council (SC), the Chair reported that SC would appreciate the provision of data that should include catch and effort data for each haul, location (longitude and latitude), depth, time of net on bottom, catch composition and discards but that an electronic format was required. It was agreed to propose to Fisheries Commission that Contracting Parties be requested to submit such data to the Secretariat in an electronic format where possible.

#### **14. Request from Fisheries Commission for Clarification on Interpretation of Time Period for Charter Arrangements.**

It was noted that when 2004 NCEM came into force, notice of charter arrangement was required to be forwarded to the Secretariat. The request for clarification was centered on the six month time limit for charter arrangements. It was agreed that as the license to fish required a start date and end date, the intent of the regulation was clear. The consensus of the Contracting Parties confirmed the interpretation of the Secretariat that it was meant to indicate six consecutive months.

#### **15. Time and Place of Next Meeting**

Iceland stated they would be pleased to host the next Intersessional Meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland with date to be determined (April/May, 2005).

#### **16. Adoption of Report**

The Committee adopted the report.

#### **17. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm on Thursday, September 16, 2004.

**Annex 1. Agenda**

1. Opening by the Chairman, M. Newman (EU)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of Annual Returns of Infringements including review of disposition of outstanding infringements by Contracting Parties
5. Review of Surveillance and Inspection Reports
6. Review of Operation of the Automated Hail/VMS system
7. Review of Compliance
8. Harmonization of Reports
9. Update regarding participation in Pilot Project
10. Possible amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures
11. Review increase of inspection presence in NAFO Regulatory Area including consideration of Article 36 of CEM
12. Continuation of intersessional discussion on Elaboration of a Scheme for Contracting Parties with content similar to that of Scheme for NCPs
13. Request Concerning SCS Doc. 00/23 (FC Doc. 03/18) – Consideration of Possible Options to Provide Observer Data to the Scientific Council
14. Request from Fisheries Commission for Clarification on Interpretation of Time Period for Charter Arrangements
15. Time and Place of Next Meeting
16. Adoption of Report
17. Adjournment