

## **PART II**

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

#### **1. Opening by the Chair, Höskuldur Steinarsson**

The Chairman opened the meeting at 3:50 pm at the Radisson SAS Conference Center, Tallinn, Estonia and welcomed representatives from Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), EU, France (in respect of St. Pierre-et-Miquelon), Iceland, Japan, Norway, Russia, Ukraine, and the NAFO Secretariat to the STACTIC annual meeting.

No opening statements were made.

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

Mr. Brent Napier (Canada) was appointed rapporteur.

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

The Chair reviewed the agenda, and in the interest of time, proposed the grouping of items 4 and 5. As well, the Chair identified two questions from the Fisheries Commission that would appear under item 15.

The agenda as attached was adopted. (Annex 1).

#### **4. Review of Annual Returns of Infringements including review of disposition of outstanding infringements by Contracting Parties**

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

The Chair introduced the working papers (STACTIC W.P. 05/15, 05/16 05/18, 05/19, 05/25 and 05/15 revised) and proposed that STACTIC members review them outside the STACTIC meeting and return with comments.

The Chair noted that the level of detail in the reports on disposition of outstanding infringements was improved from previous years but that relevant information is lacking in some cases. He suggested that the STACTIC members should be urged to complete these tables at the earliest possible opportunity.

The revised documents were prepared on the basis of updated information provided by STACTIC members.

#### **6. Review of Compliance**

The Chair opened the item, identified the related documents and indicated that the Secretariat would now provide a presentation on the preliminary analysis conducted on the compliance data by the Secretariat this year.

The Secretariat commented that this was the second year that the Secretariat had provided the compilation of compliance data and the first year they had provided a preliminary analysis of the compiled data. The Secretariat reminded the STACTIC members that it is not in the Secretariat's mandate to provide an analysis, and it was only provided based on a request by STACTIC.

The Secretariat explained that the data for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland were not included under the EU due to their recent accession. The Secretariat then provided a detailed review of the methodology utilized to complete the pre-analysis.

The representative of Canada noted during the presentation that the information reflected in the presentation indicating that Canada had not provided certain information was incorrect and that the corresponding information had been previously submitted to the Secretariat.

The representative of Japan indicated that information provided in the working papers contained erroneous data that had been previously identified and the corresponding correction provided to the Secretariat.

The Secretariat indicated that the presentation was intended to provide the methodology used in the preliminary analysis and was based on the information available at the time. The Secretariat extended an offer to the STACTIC members to work with them individually to update their respective information.

The representative of Canada questioned the methodology surrounding the citations as the information provided in the presentation indicated that Canada had issued only 10 citations when in fact 15 had been issued. The Secretariat explained that the table did not capture multiple citations per inspection and that another table, not yet presented, provided this information. Given this, the representative from Canada indicated that the table should be renamed to more accurately reflect the contents.

The representative of the EU indicated that there was duplication in the provided information as there were instances where EU citations corresponded to citations already issued by Canada.

The Secretariat concluded the presentation with two primary recommendations; Contracting Parties must be more diligent in their provision of compliance data to the Secretariat and there would appear to be a need for standardized reports/forms as certain information was being provided in a non-English format.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and urged STACTIC members to provide updated information. The Chair then turned to the issue of public disclosure of compliance data and questioned the STACTIC members on whether this information should be available to the public.

The representative of Norway indicated that prior to considering the disclosure of information, another round of updates to the information should take place and a more careful review of the data must be conducted as there appeared to be something wrong.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) questioned whether, given last years compilation, any conclusions could be drawn on whether or not there had been an improvement. The Secretariat replied that the preliminary analysis was not conducted last year and therefore no conclusions of this nature could be drawn due to the differing methodologies. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) cited some inconsistencies (number of trips, Observer reports, number of trips inspected) in assumptions/methodology utilized to derive some of the information.

The representative of Canada thanked the Secretariat for the significant work and effort but indicated that the methodology/terms would need to be standardized and agreed on by all parties. Canada also voiced concerns over the conclusions/recommendations provided by the Secretariat and indicated that it is STACTIC's mandate to provide the conclusions/recommendations, not the Secretariat.

The representative of the EU thanked the Secretariat for its work on the data compilation and associated preliminary review and pointed out that this presentation highlights many of the issues facing STACTIC. The representative of the EU went on to indicate that; they share the conclusions of other STACTIC members regarding the need for continuity and trend information. He reiterated that there were duplicate citations and stated that the EU would provide updated information to the Secretariat. He also agreed with the representative of Canada that it was not the Secretariat's role to provide conclusions/recommendations and that their focus should be on compilation and basic analysis.

The representative of Iceland thanked the Secretariat for its work and questioned the rationale/logic of some of the information provided, indicating that there appears to be misunderstandings on the part of the Secretariat. The representative of Iceland also indicated that there are several legitimate reasons for missing information highlighted in the presentation.

The STACTIC members agreed that it was not the role of the Secretariat to provide conclusions/recommendations.

The representative of Canada cautioned the group that the compliance rates provided in the report appeared to be overestimated, especially when considered in light of information provided by the Scientific Council regarding quota overruns in the Greenland halibut fishery. The figures provided would be better described as detection rates than compliance rates.

The representative of the EU cautioned about jumping to conclusions and cited the potential for erroneous conclusions. The representative of the EU reiterated that the conclusions/recommendations should be left to the STACTIC members.

The representative of Canada presented a supplementary presentation on Canada's assessment of 2004 compliance. Canada observed an improvement in compliance in 2004, however continued to have concerns with respect to none compliance, particularly in the area of catch misreporting. During the presentation the representative of Canada urged STACTIC members to focus on possible recommendations to the Fisheries Commission. In this regard, he noted that Canada would be submitting proposals under agenda item 14 (Accurate Catch Reporting).

The STACTIC members agreed on the establishment of a working group to review the Secretariat's presentation and attempt to formulate conclusions and recommendations for future compliance assessments. The working group returned a report entitled Annual Compliance Review – 2004 (STACTIC W.P. 05/41 revised)

The STACTIC members agreed that a peer review group comprised of the working group would work with the Secretariat in developing the 2005 analysis prior to the 2006 intersessional meeting.

#### **Discussion of the Secretariat's compilation tables/preliminary analysis**

The Secretariat's tables and preliminary analysis facilitated discussion by the STACTIC members on various aspects of the reporting requirements and data collection/interpretation. The STACTIC members welcomed and appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat to ease the burden of STACTIC in producing the compliance report. However while appreciative of the efforts there were several aspects of concern identified by them.

- a. Concern that data submitted by some Contracting Parties (CPs) was not included in the report
  - i. There were several incidences where STACTIC members indicated that the data indicated as missing by the Secretariat had been submitted. (The Chair advised individual STACTIC members to follow up directly with the Secretariat.)
- b. Presentation of certain data allowed for misinterpretation/confusion
  - i. There appeared to be confusion between VMS reports and hail messages when explaining the methodology for calculating the number of trips.
  - ii. The numbers of inspections were divided by the number of infringements to develop "compliance rates". However STACTIC members expressed the view that while this data is useful to determine the "detection rate" (i.e. the percent of inspections that resulted in infringements) it cannot be used as the sole indicator of compliance rates.
- c. In some cases the current method of compiling the infringement summaries by CP may result in a higher percentage of infringements than the actual number of incidents.
  - i. In cases where infringements had been detected by inspectors from one CP and a follow-up inspection conducted by inspectors from the flag CP resulted in a similar finding, multiple infringements resulted from the same incident (i.e. double counting - especially in the case of EU vessels)
- d. Using percentage comparative analysis amongst CP with disproportionate fleet sizes (drawing conclusions from small sample sizes)
  - i. While comparing data amongst CPs using percentages as the basis, the data is often exaggerated for CPs with small fleets (i.e. the potential conservation/ compliance impact may appear to be greater than it is)

- e. Errors in the data tables presented
  - i. STACTIC members identified cases where the data presented by the Secretariat (e.g. number of trips) as not factually correct.
- f. Tabular headings did not always accurately reflect the content of the column
  - i. In some cases the explanation of the data did not match the heading (e.g. apparent Infringements column actually was the number of vessels cited)
- g. The presentation focused on administrative compliance but not vessel compliance
  - i. STACTIC members expressed the view that the Secretariat's presentation largely focused on the performance of the CP's in following protocols for report submission but did not focus enough on vessel compliance issues (albeit the accompanying report did contain some information pertaining to vessel compliance). CP's need to know the areas of non-compliance in order to focus MCS efforts and determine conservation impacts.
- h. Deriving conclusions and recommendations
  - i. STACTIC members expressed the view that conclusions and/or recommendations for improvement should be determined by the STACTIC working group. The secretariat should only compile data and generate statistical analysis.

#### **7. Update regarding participation in Pilot Project on Observers, Satellite Tracking and Electronic Reporting**

The Secretariat provided a brief update on the participation to date in the Observer/VMS Pilot Project (STACTIC W.P. 05/20) and indicating there were currently only two vessels actively participating in the pilot, down from a larger number in July and August. The Secretariat continues to receive reports every 24 hours and forwards them, as well as weekly reports, to the two Contracting Parties with inspection presence in the NRA (Canada and the EU).

The representative of Norway provided a brief summary of their experiences (STACTIC W.P. 05/27) and indicated that it had not had a vessel involved in the pilot since January due to the increased cost of oil and the relatively low market value of shrimp. The representative of Norway indicated that although the pilot had lasted for two years a lower number of vessels than intended had participated and therefore it is difficult to draw conclusions. He proposed an extension of the pilot project through 2006 and the Contracting Parties that participated in the pilot should provide reports up to the date of June 30, 2006 so the report can be presented in due time for the Annual Meeting in September.

The representative of Canada supported Norway's proposal for an extension.

The representative of the EU supported Norway's proposal.

The representative of Iceland indicated that, based on catch/discard ratio information, the reduction in observer coverage did not affect compliance but did result in cost savings.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) observed that the results of Iceland's data were from the shrimp and redfish fisheries, two fisheries that have relatively fewer compliance problems and indicated that more data and greater participation were required before conclusions could be drawn, however the findings in the Faroese pilot project concurred with the Icelandic results. Furthermore, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated the Observers performed a valuable function in Greenlandic waters, tracking size and composition of shrimp and by-catches as it is their experience that there is a significant difference in discards reported with and without an Observer.

The representative of Ukraine indicated that, based on the information provided, it appeared as though the observers in their current capacity were unable to provide objective information and that the Scientific Observer scheme proposed by Ukraine would function better.

It was agreed that the pilot project on Observers, Satellite Tracking and Electronic Reporting would be extended through 2006.

### **8. Provisions regarding designated ports and charter arrangements**

The representative of the EU distributed STACTIC W.P. 05/29 (revised). This proposal suggested modifications to the NCEM intended on clearing confusion with regards to the interpretation of the designation of ports. The changes include a requirement to communicate a list of designated ports to the Executive Secretary by January 1, 2006 and any subsequent changes to this list fifteen days prior to the changes coming into effect. As well, the proposal called for authorized vessels or their representative to provide the port authority with estimated arrival, quantity of GHLL and information on the zone(s) where the catches were taken 48 hours before the estimated time of arrival.

The representative of Canada indicated that the modified proposal adequately addressed its original concern over the ambiguity of the term “zone(s)”

The representative of Japan questioned whether this provision applied to transportation vessels or solely to fishing vessels. It was explained by the EU that, based on the current text, a fishing vessel, as defined under Article 2 of the NCEM, included vessels normally engaged in fisheries support activity.

The revised proposal was accepted and the item was closed.

### **9. Possible amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures**

#### **i. boarding ladders**

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) presented STACTIC W.P. 05/22 and indicated that the proposed changes reflected the provisions of the IMO with regard to construction and fastening of boarding ladders and actually went beyond the provisions with the inclusion of additional safety elements provided for by other organizations.

The representative of Ukraine questioned whether NAFO had the mandate to effect these changes as this was a safety issue and not a fisheries issue and IMO rules should apply. The representative of Ukraine also indicated that the rules were satisfactory, as currently written and any deviation from IMO protocols would be illegal.

The representative of the EU supported Denmark’s (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) proposal and indicated that it was his experience that the application of the IMO provisions and the standard of ladders being employed had been deteriorating. The EU also indicated that a recent injury to an inspector due to a rotten boarding ladder highlighted the need for tighter measures. The representative of the EU also indicated that the hazards involved in the work of NAFO inspectors should warrant immediate action on this issue.

The representative of Iceland indicated that, as there was no deviation from the IMO provisions, they supported Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)’s proposal.

The representative of Canada applauded Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)’s effort and indicated that Canada supported the comprehensive proposal. As well the representative of Canada echoed the EU’s sentiments with regards to the need for immediate action.

All STACTIC members, except for Ukraine, accepted this proposal.

#### **ii. duration of inspections**

The representative of the EU presented STACTIC W.P. 05/31 and provided a brief summary of the two proposed amendments; addition of a thirty minute prior notification provision and the extension of the inspection duration from three to four hours to harmonize with NEAFC scheme.

The representative of Russia indicated that the thirty-minute notification proposal was discussed at the Inspector's Workshop, held in Brussels earlier this year, and he expressed support for the proposal

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) did not have any issues with the proposal but did indicate that the element of surprise was important in their domestic enforcement practices.

The representative of Canada indicated that he was pleased to see STACTIC consider recommendations coming from the Inspector's Workshop, however he indicated that, although Canada supported the increased inspection duration there were concerns with the thirty minute prior notification component. He indicated that this proposal was not reflective of the conclusions of the Inspector's Workshop. He also highlighted other potential negative aspects of the proposal, e.g. the possibility of an increase in administrative citations for non-compliance, the potential for evidence to be destroyed during the thirty-minute period and the loss of the element of surprise. He also mentioned the potential for future non-involvement of inspectors in workshops due to the perception that their input was not considered.

The representative of the EU indicated that the proposed 30-minute period was insufficient time for the crew to rectify irregularities and was as much a safety/security issue, citing the need for adequate time for the master to assemble the necessary crew.

The representative of Norway indicated a prior notice of thirty minutes could give time to make illicit actions.

There was no consensus reached so the issue was closed.

### **iii. review of provisions of Article 9 re interpretation**

The representative of the EU presented STACTIC W.P. 05/28 and indicated that this proposal provided needed clarification to Article 9 of the NCEM that stemmed from the desire to avoid misunderstandings and differences of interpretation. The proposed amendments introduced some flexibility with regard to the prohibition on conducting a directed fishery and were balanced by clear rules on the requirement to move five nautical miles in order to ensure that vessels would not retrace the path of a previous haul.

The representative of Canada indicated that the proposal appeared to be less restrictive than the current text and relied heavily on the integrity of the masters. Canada had several areas of concern including the 48 hour provision and the fact that the concept of "area" was not defined. The representative of Canada indicated that they would be willing to entertain a revised proposal that included additional measures such as exploratory tows of limit duration, water depth and distance of relocation. The representative of Canada indicated that any rewording would need to ensure stock protection while also being fair and equitable to masters.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) was content with the EU's proposal, as it appeared easier for inspectors to implement and it provided clear instruction to the master. As well it was Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)'s opinion that the concept of area was understood as area of fishing activity.

The representatives of Canada and the EU agreed to collaborate on a revised proposal with the view to tabling it at the upcoming STACTIC intersessional meeting.

### **iv. product labeling by species/stock area**

The representative from Canada presented STACTIC W.P. 05/33 which provided enhancements to the labeling provisions as set out in Article 18 as well as additions to Annex XX1(c) containing product form codes.

Concerns were expressed by a number of STACTIC members about including the division and date for all species. It was also noted that new product codes may create inconsistencies with the NEAFC Regime.

Canada undertook to revise the proposal to address these concerns.

The representative of Canada later presented STACTIC W.P. 05/33 (revised) and indicated that the revised proposal incorporated the comments made previously by STACTIC members most of the elements are currently applied by vessels and the added clarity would allow for more accurate reporting. Canada indicated it would also endeavor to talk further on NEAFC implications and future modifications.

The representative of the EU appreciated Canada's effort however, after reviewing the proposal in greater detail, indicated that the product labeling initiative was just getting on track and to begin making modifications at this early stage may not be wise. The representative of the EU suggested that further reflection would be appropriate.

As there was no consensus at this time, it was agreed that this issue could be revisited at a later date.

#### **v. measurement of and safe access to fish holds**

The representative of the EU provided background on this issue and indicated that attempting to establish protocols would be problematic due to the multitude of vessel configurations and the best way forward would be to handle this pragmatically.

The representative of Canada supported the EU position and indicated that the present NCEM provided sufficient latitude.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) reminded STACTIC members that the original issue pertained to safety equipment requirements for inspectors and indicated that this was best left to the inspecting parties.

The issue was closed.

#### **vi. strengthening ropes, bags, topside chafers**

This item was a follow-up to the 2005 intersessional meeting of STACTIC, where STACTIC members were requested to provide information regarding fishing gear attachments used in their domestic fisheries. As only Russia, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and Canada have provided the requested information to date, this issue was put over to the next STACTIC meeting. All STACTIC members were again requested to provide the information prior to that meeting.

#### **vii. data exchange and format protocols**

The representative of Iceland presented STACTIC W.P. 05/09 (revision 2) which added two data-elements into the return message and a new error code table to make the return messages more useful and allow for better error detection.

The representatives of Canada, Norway, EU and Russia supported the proposal and the proposal was accepted.

#### **viii. definition of prior notice (Article 28.1)**

Item previously addressed under agenda item 9 ii.

#### **ix. notification requirements in 3L shrimp fishery**

The representative of the EU presented STACTIC W.P. 05/30 to attempt to provide clarity to this issue.

The representative of Iceland acknowledged the improvement however indicated there were technical issues that would need to be reviewed in the context of Data Advisory Group advice. The representative of Iceland also indicated that time should be taken to ensure this is properly addressed and as simple as possible, not feasible at this meeting.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) concurred with Iceland and indicated it would also like to see a simpler scheme. As well, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) recommended the establishment of a working group to review this issue.

The representative of the EU agreed with the comments.

The representative of Canada supported the notion that clarity is required and should be carefully reviewed in a working group comprised of technical and non-technical participants.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested the use of the NAFO website forum.

The working group is comprised of Iceland, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the EU and Canada and will be open to all STACTIC members. The working group is charged with the development of a proposal for presentation at STACTIC intersessional.

#### **x. article 32 – designated ports**

The representative of France (in respect of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon) presented STACTIC W.P. 05/34 for consideration. The proposal called for the port of St. Pierre, France to be added as an available harbour for port inspections given it geographically desirable location.

The representative of the EU had no issues and supported the proposal.

The representative of Canada supported the proposal.

The proposal was accepted.

### **10. Port State Measures**

The representative of Norway indicated that he was not prepared to present their proposal on port State measures, under item 10, at this time as it was Norway's intention to first present the proposal at NEAFC later this year. The representative from Norway pledged to return with a proposal at the earliest possible time. The agenda item was closed.

### **11. Encryption Protocol for Electronic Data Transmission**

The Secretariat introduced STACTIC W.P. 05/26, which was approved by mail vote, and provided an update on the issue, including a modified draft based on Ukrainian comment.

The representative of Ukraine indicated he would review the modifications made to the Secretariat's proposal and provide comments.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that he supported the proposal in principle however suggested that this should be passed on to the advisory working group on data communication.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) furthermore indicated that he would circulate a proposal on the security solution to the HTTPS and this would also be passed on to the advisory working group on data communication. There was no wish to discuss this paper at this meeting.



## **12. Electronic Observer Reports**

This issue was deferred from the STACTIC intersessional meeting in April to allow for further review. The Secretariat introduced STACTIC W.P. 05/23.

The representative of Canada indicated that there were two primary issues; electronic transmission and the adoption of a standardized format for those transmissions. Canada reminded STACTIC members that it was already agreed at the last Annual Meeting that Observer reports were to be sent to the Secretariat in an electronic format and, irrespective of the format, Contracting Parties should be providing the Secretariat with electronic reports.

The representative of the EU agreed with Canada on the submission of electronic reports but pointed out that a decision on the format issue should be held off until the issue was resolved by the Fisheries Commission.

The Secretariat requested information on whether or not it could send the electronic reports via e-mail “as-is” or was there a requirement for some form of security.

The representative of Iceland indicated that, although the NCEM did not mention the security issue, reports should be handled in the same manner as they are handled when submitted from the vessels.

The representative of the EU concurred with Iceland’s statement and indicated that the Secretariat should err on the side of caution. As well, the EU pointed out the NCEM calls for the removal of elements (e.g. longitude and latitude) prior to submission to other Contracting Parties.

This item was postponed while awaiting information on the future of the Observer Program scheme.

## **13. Evaluation and Options regarding VMS Service Provider**

The Secretariat introduced STACFAD W.P. 05/08 and provided a summary of the issue.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) sympathized with the Secretariat’s problem and indicated that a local resource, proficient in database management and data communication should be sought.

The representative of Iceland noted that the issue has two parts; the VMS is one, and the extraction of information from the database is the other. Iceland supports Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)’s comments on local service provider, where that is applicable.

The representative of Canada indicated that STACFAD was concurrently examining this issue and that a coordinated solution should be sought.

## **14. Accurate Catch Reporting**

Canada presented two proposals aimed at improving the accuracy of catch reporting. STACTIC W.P. 05/38, dealing with the identification of hake and wolffish species was accepted by STACTIC. The second proposal (STACTIC W.P. 05/39) dealt with electronic reporting of catch information and inspection requirements for vessels entering the NRA with catch on board from other jurisdictions. Although this proposal was not accepted by STACTIC there was support from a number of STACTIC members for electronic reporting on a weekly basis and Canada was encouraged to submit a proposal on electronic reporting.

The representative of Canada later presented STACTIC W.P. 05/40 and indicated that the proposal incorporated comments made by STACTIC members.

The representative of Iceland indicated that they supported the notion of information flow, however indicated that the electronic catch reporting proposal should undergo a technical review.

The representative of Canada indicated that the proposal would undergo a technical review with the view to tabling it at the upcoming STACTIC intersessional meeting.

#### **15. Other Matters**

STACTIC considered the questions on the Observer Program put forward by the Fisheries Commission and the response can be found in FC W.P. 05/13.

#### **16. Election of Vice-Chair**

Mads T. Nedergaard was re-elected to the post of Vice Chair.

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

It was proposed that the next meeting would be held in Copenhagen, date to be confirmed.

#### **18. Adoption of Report**

The report was adopted.

#### **19. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm on Wednesday, September 21, 2005.

**Annex 1. Agenda**

1. Opening by the Chair, Höskuldur Steinarsson (Iceland)
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 Compliance
7. Update regarding participation in the Observer/VMS Pilot Project
8. Provisions regarding designated ports and charter arrangements
9. Possible Amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures
  - i. boarding ladders
  - ii. duration of inspections
  - iii. review of provisions of Article 9 re interpretation
  - iv. product labeling by species/stock area
  - v. measurement of and safe access to fish holds
  - vi. strengthening ropes, bags, topside chafers (all delegations to provide national measures on attachments to nets)
  - vii. data exchange and format protocols
  - viii. definition of prior notice (Article 28.1)
  - ix. notification requirements in 3L shrimp fishery
10. Port State Measures
11. Encryption Protocol for Electronic Data Transmission
12. Electronic Observer Reports
13. Evaluation and Options regarding VMS Service Provider
14. Accurate Catch Reporting
15. Other Matters
16. Election of Vice-Chair
17. Time and Place of Next Meeting
18. Adoption of Report
19. Adjournment

