

PART II

Report of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

**29th Annual Meeting, 24-28 September 2007
Lisbon, Portugal**

1. Opening of the Meeting (Chair: Mads Nedergaard, DFG)

The Chairman opened the meeting at 2:00pm at the Hotel Altis, Lisbon, Portugal and welcomed representatives of Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), EU, France (in respect of St. Pierre-et-Miquelon), Iceland, Japan, Norway, Russia, the United States, Cuba and the NAFO Secretariat to the annual STACTIC meeting.

He noted the lengthy agenda, the work of Fisheries Commission and the need to focus on the completion of a compliance report, as well as the comments made at the Fisheries Commission concerning the importance of the port state controls paper.

No opening statements were made.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

Mr. Brent Napier (Canada) was appointed rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The Chair introduced the agenda and opened the floor to comments.

Mindful of the lengthy agenda, Canada noted that, as a result of Fisheries Commission and/or bilateral discussions, there may be a requirement to table new proposals that fit within the scope of agenda item 7.

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

4. Compliance review 2005 and 2006 including review of reports of apparent infringements

The Chair introduced the item and reminded representatives that a working group, made up of participants from Canada, the EU, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), and France (in respect of St. Pierre-et-Miquelon) with the support of the NAFO Secretariat, had been established to review the compliance data tables and develop recommendations to be presented to STACTIC at the annual meeting in 2007. The Chair called upon the representative of Canada to provide a synopsis of the Working Group meeting that took place in Copenhagen July 23-24, 2007.

The representative of Canada introduced STACTIC Working Paper 07/21 and provided a summary of the Working Group's terms of reference, process and suggested table-by-table configurations. He described the group's overarching objective of developing tables that would facilitate STACTIC's compliance evaluation through the reduction of existing redundancies and more concise trend analysis. The representative of Canada explained that, for clarity, two table types were designated: Compilation Tables (C-tables) that were of a confidential nature and provided only to individual Contracting Parties for their respective information and follow-up and Report Tables (R-tables) that would provide STACTIC with the basis for the Compliance Review.

Representatives from Canada, the United States and Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) drafted and presented a compliance assessment.

The representative of the EU indicated that other elements that should be considered include: differentiating between serious and other citations and comments on the effectiveness of port and at-sea inspection in relation to the number of serious infringements detected and a cost-benefit analysis of at-sea and port inspections.

The representative of Canada acknowledged comments of the EU representative but noted that the purpose of the compliance review is to evaluate the level of compliance in the NRA, not to do a cost-benefit analysis of the various enforcement tools. In addition, the representative of Canada highlighted the fact that at-sea inspections provide valuable information as part of a process that makes port inspections more effective. As an example he indicated that at-sea inspections may raise suspicions about possible infringements that can then be fully investigated when the vessel arrives in port.

The representative of Canada emphasized that this should be regarded as only a starting point and that STACTIC should strive to go beyond simple data compilation, by building on the process in future meetings, to allow for improved identification of compliance issues within the NAFO Regulatory Area (NRA). As an example, the representative of Canada pointed to the recent Scientific Council Report which detailed signification allocation overruns averaging 25% for the last three years on Greenland halibut stocks and indicated that STACTIC would be remiss if issues such as this were not covered and addressed in the compliance assessment process.

The representative of the EU indicated the Scientific Council's comment on quota overruns of Greenland halibut is not relevant to this assessment. He stated that the inclusion of scientific estimates of Greenland halibut catches was not appropriate for consideration as an assessment indicator because it was difficult to quantify the use of scientific data in this regard. Furthermore the inclusion of scientific data in the compliance review could compromise the relationship between scientists and fishermen.

The representative of Canada disagreed and indicated that STACTIC would not be fulfilling its mandate if it did not comment on information related to significant threats to NAFO regulated species, specifically Greenland halibut. Furthermore, the representative of Canada indicated that the Scientific Council had provided this information without prompting, effectively putting the onus on STACTIC to address this issue of concern or risk being negligent in its duties. The representative of the EU indicated that he could not accept the inclusion of this element for reasons cited during the discussion.

After some discussion it was agreed that the compliance assessment report would not address the Greenland halibut issue, and that Canada's concerns on this issue would be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

It was agreed to adopt and submit the compliance assessment report to the Fisheries Commission (STACTIC Working Paper 07/33).

5. Review of STACFAC's former mandate with regards to STACTIC's new role and responsibilities

The Chair opened the agenda item and asked the representative of the United States to provide an outline of STACTIC Working Paper 07/27.

In order to establish general Rules of Procedure that would allow for possible future inclusion of IUU lists from other RFMO's, the representative of the United States amended the proposal and tabled STACTIC Working Paper 07/27 (revised).

It was agreed to submit the proposal to the Fisheries Commission for adoption (STACTIC Working Paper 07/27 (revised)).

6. Review of current IUU list pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 49.3

The Chair opened this agenda item and indicated that a review of NAFO's updated IUU list, found in STACTIC Working Paper 07/28, was required. The Chair asked the NAFO Secretariat to provide a quick summary of the updated table. The NAFO Secretariat indicated that only one vessel had been added to the list since STACTIC's intersessional meeting in June and pointed out that a vessel on the IUU list had changed name, ownership and call-sign had become flagged to Cuba.

The representative of Cuba was advised that it would be necessary to make the appropriate representation with NEAFC's Permanent Committee on Control and Enforcement (PECCOE), in advance of its meeting in October, to explore the possibility of having the vessel removed from the NEAFC IUU list.

The Chair concluded that the vessel would remain on the NAFO IUU list until it made the appropriate representations at NEAFC and would not be authorized to fish in the NRA until it was removed from NEAFC's/NAFO IUU lists.

The representative of Norway introduced STACTIC Working Paper 07/29 and explained that the proposal calls for the broadening of the scope of the NAFO IUU provisions by amending Article 49 paragraphs 6 and 8 through the incorporation of IUU blacklists from two other Atlantic RFMO's: the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Resources (CCAMLR) and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) in the same fashion, and with the same objective, as the NEAFC blacklist. The representative of Norway noted that the current IUU blacklists are having the desired impact on IUU activity, however the global nature of this issue requires a more global solution as IUU vessels are apt to change jurisdiction when blacklisted in a specific RFO. He stated that the tuna RFMO's were not included as they were currently involved in a similar IUU blacklist sharing initiative.

The representative of the United States expressed concern that the proposal may go beyond what the NAFO Convention and Rules of Procedure would allow. The representative of Norway cited sections in Article 19 and Article 2 of the Convention that appear to allow for this expansion in scope of the NAFO IUU list, but was open to further discussion on the issue.

The representative of Norway concluded that, on the basis of the comments and discussion with other Contracting Parties, Norway will defer the part of the proposal concerning the amendment of Article 49 paragraph 8 pending the conclusion of the NAFO Convention reform and the additional information that would be gained by attending upcoming meetings of SEAFO and CCAMLR. The representative of Norway however, indicated that, in order to facilitate the use of NAFO's IUU list by other RFMO's, the proposed changes to Article 49.6 should be dealt with separately. At the suggestion of the Chair, Norway submitted STACTIC Working Paper 07/29 (revised), which proposes to amend only Article 49.6, and STACTIC Working Paper 07/32 which proposes to take up the proposed amendment to Article 49.8 at the annual STACTIC meeting in 2008.

It was agreed to submit STACTIC Working Paper 07/29 (revised) to Fisheries Commission for adoption.

It was agreed to consider STACTIC Working Paper 07/32 at the annual meeting in 2008.

7. Possible Amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures

i. Product labelling by species/stock area

The Chair reminded representatives that, after some discussion, there was general agreement on STACTIC WP 07/13 at the June intersessional in Poland.

The representative of the EU indicated that there was a minor editorial inconsistency in the current proposal and tabled STACTIC WP 07/13 (revised). The representative of Canada supported the revised working paper and reminded representatives of the agreement, forged at the intersessional meeting in Gdynia, to evaluate these measures one year from the date that the measures come into effect. The representative of the EU acknowledged the agreed upon evaluation and reminded delegates that the measures would not take effect until July 1, 2008.

The representative of the EU was pleased to note that there were no objections to the proposal, however indicated that internal EU discussion had prompted the need for further review of STACTIC WP 07/13 (revised).

The Chair noted that this subject could be revisited at a later date.

ii. Strengthening ropes, bags, topside chafers

The Chair re-introduced STACTIC WP 07/11 and recalled that representatives generally support the proposal, however indicated that the representative of the EU had requested time to consult with domestic industry.

The representative of the EU provided an update, advising that the EU had consulted with industry and that of the three types of topside chafers identified in Annex XV of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures (NCEM's): ICNAF-type, multiple flap-type and large-mesh (modified polish-type), domestic industry had advised that only the large-mesh type was potentially detrimental to conservation and could support its removal from the list of authorized topside chafers. He explained that the large-mesh type was not in compliance with the general rule and should therefore be eliminated. As for the other types of chafer described in Annex XV he considered that a cautious approach should be taken. The representative of the EU indicated that, in any event, the NCEM's already provided language prohibiting the obstruction of the net and that it could not support a general prohibition.

The representative of Canada responded that, in Canada's view, the other types can also be detrimental to the conservation of fish stocks and should therefore be banned. He pointed out that the information provided by some Contracting Parties indicated that these types of net attachments had been banned in their respective domestic regulations.

The Chair noted that there was no resolution on this issue and indicated that this item could be revisited at a later date.

iii. Notification and catch reporting requirements in 3L and 3M shrimp fisheries

The Chair opened the agenda item and called for Iceland to discuss STACTIC Working Paper 07/24. The representative of Iceland explained the background, provided a comprehensive summary of the proposed solution and indicated that the solution would require only inclusion of the Catch report as all of its data elements already existed in the current system. The reporting procedures would also open the possibility of regular catch reporting using the same report template.

The representative of the EU questioned the usefulness of providing (24) hour notification to the NAFO Secretariat as this did not generate any follow-up action. It is an obligation under Article 12.2 for flag-State Contracting Parties to ensure that only one vessel could fish for shrimp in 3L at any one time. Against this background he suggested that the prior notification to the NAFO Secretariat be deleted.

It was agreed that a clear reporting requirement be established for vessels entering and leaving Division 3L with a realistic prior notification period of (1) hour.

It was agreed that the proposal be submitted to the Fisheries Commission for adoption (STACTIC Working Paper 07/24 (revised)).

iv. Accurate catch reporting

a. Automated COE/COX comparison between NAFO and NEAFC reports

The representative of Iceland introduced STACTIC Working Paper 07/25 and provided a brief narration of the background and content. The representative of Iceland offered that, under the current system, the automatic COE/COX comparison discussed in the proposal would not be possible due in large part to data quality issues. Therefore an intermediate solution to notify flag-State FMC's of missing reports would be needed. The Chair thanked Iceland for the work on this proposal and stressed the need to address the data quality issue. The representative of the EU echoed these sentiments, however voiced concerns over the workload this would create for the NAFO Secretariat as, at present, the COE/COX reports still had to be dealt with manually. The representative of Iceland indicated that the proposed solution would be fully automated and manual intervention should be minimal. The representative of Canada expressed gratitude for the effort and indicated that NAFO should be moving towards the eventual use of automated reports.

The representative of Iceland added that the issue of data integrity should be looked at in conjunction with the compliance report to shorten the process and make the assessment more accurate. The Chair agreed that the issue of data integrity was essential to address and acknowledge that the quality of data in both NAFO and NEAFC required improvement before proceeding on this initiative. The representative of Iceland agreed but indicated that data integrity improvement is a priority that should be addressed in the short-

term. The NAFO Secretariat added that, with the shift to a new service provider in 2008, it may be possible to better control the data management process and address some of the integrity issues.

The Chair observed that this issue was worth further discussion and electronic log books and reporting should be a future objective. The Chair noted that this subject could be revisited at a later date.

b. Stowage plan requirements

The Chair requested that Canada report on its intentions in relation to STACTIC WP 07/16. The representative of Canada indicated that he would not be re-tabling the proposal at this time as there appeared to be little support from other representatives. The representative of Canada added that based on the interpretation of other Contracting Parties, that indicated in cases where stowage plans did not meet the basic requirement outlined in the NCEM's a citation should be issued, Canada has decided to proceed along those lines when enforcing the measures in the NRA.

The representative of the EU reiterated that it would not be feasible to implement the measures as proposed by Canada given the volume of catch that would need to be recorded. The representative of the EU explained that stowage plans (he circulated an example of an acceptable stowage plan) allowed inspectors to gauge the potential for non-compliance and flag suspect vessels for validation during port inspections.

The representative of Norway observed that if masters operating in the NRA are having difficulties adhering to the current measures, complicating them could create even more difficulties.

The representative of Japan expressed concern that these proposals could be much more complicated than current measures.

The Chair remarked that discussions on this item had concluded and that no further action would be taken at this time.

c. Record of start/end coordinates for fishing activity

The Chair introduced the agenda item and recalled that representatives were asked to submit log book examples to facilitate discussion on STACTIC WP 07/18 and, to date, only Iceland and Russia had submitted log books examples. The Chair called upon other Contracting Parties to submit the requested documents. He went on to indicate that both of the examples submitted did in fact call for the provision of start and end coordinates.

The representative of Canada stated that Canada was interested in advancing this issue and would be open to text changes to its proposal that would allow for things to move forward.

The Chair added that start/end coordinates would be welcomed by Scientific Council to allow for analysis of fishing effort and patterns.

The representative of Norway indicated that, at present, the information on start/end coordinates was included in Norwegian log books but might be taken out when Norway moved to electronic log books.

The representative from Russia, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and Iceland all voiced support for the initiative and indicated that this information was already being collected in their respective log books.

The representative of the EU stated that the elements of the proposal needed further reflection as regard to linkages to other NCEM articles, in particular, concerning the implications of the by-catch requirements in Article 9 for fixed-gear fisheries.

The Chair noted that this subject could be revisited at a later date.

d. Consistency of Catch Reporting

The representative of Canada presented STACTIC Working Paper 07/31 and explained the proposed changes under Article 21 were intended to remove ambiguity and potential misinterpretation of the current requirement and ensure that important information on both catch and effort days for 3M shrimp was provided to the NAFO Secretariat by Contracting Parties. The representative of Norway supported the proposal and indicated that there was currently some mis-interpretation by some Contracting Parties that could be addressed by this proposal.

It was agreed that the language in the existing text was sufficient and that Contracting Parties must report both catch AND effort days for 3M shrimp.

It was agreed that the NAFO Secretariat be instructed to follow-up with a letter to Contracting Parties clarifying this interpretation.

v. Clarification regarding Article 15.2 on Chartering Arrangements

The representative of the EU presented STACTIC Working Paper 07/30 and detailed how the revision would afford a reasonable degree of flexibility to vessels engaged in chartering arrangements that wished to suspend and recommence activity within the same year. The representative of France (in respect of St. Pierre-et-Miquelon) supported the EU proposal.

It was agreed to revise the text to specify that the cumulative time of the charter period could not to exceed (6) months.

It was agreed to submit the proposal to the Fisheries Commission for adoption (STACTIC Working Paper 07/30 (revised)).

vi. Vessel monitoring system (Article 22.1)

The Chair asked the representative of Canada to re-present STACTIC Working Paper 07/10 and to elaborate on the objective. The representative of Canada indicated that the proposal remained unchanged from that provided at the June intersessional, however noted the Scientific Council report of June 21, 2007 which included a recommendation for shorter intervals than 2 hours for VMS reports.

The representative of Japan, who had asked for time to consult on this issue during the June intersessional in Gdynia, reported that although this change would have minor cost implications, it was an important proposal that warranted support.

The representative of the EU again questioned the rationale for this change in VMS reporting intervals and questioned whether an impact assessment had been conducted. The representative of the EU went on to describe how, in the EU inspection context the benefits of this change would not justify the additional cost.

The representative of Iceland supported the proposal and indicated that this was already in effect with Icelandic vessels and a requirement in bilateral agreements. Secondly, this would make the automatic entry an exit reports more accurate. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) echoed these views and indicated that, domestically, this was a useful compliance tool. The representative of Russia voiced support for the concept but indicated that he would not wish this to impact Contracting Party contributions to NAFO. The representative of the United States supported the proposal and indicated that this was already the practice in the United States and that some fisheries even had shorter intervals than (1) hour. The representatives of Norway and France (in respect of St. Pierre-et-Miquelon) also supported this initiative.

The representative of the EU voiced concern that hourly VMS reporting was already provided for under NCEM Article 52 and that this could be seen as an added control that affects the balance between vessels operating with and without observers. The representative of Russia reiterate concerns regarding the potential increase in contribution cost to Contracting Parties and indicated that to better harmonize with NEAFC the VMS reporting interval should

remain at (2) hours. The representative of Iceland support the Russian representative's point on harmonization but indicated that perhaps it would be better if NEAFC would harmonize with NAFO on (1) hour VMS reporting intervals.

The Chair noted that this subject could be revisited at a later date.

vii. Port state measures

The representative of Norway introduced STACTIC WP 07/1(revised) and acknowledged that there was much work to do on this initiative. He hoped that progress could be made at the annual meeting and agreement could be reach at STACTIC on the (4) basic principles of port state measures: notification (master to enter port), confirmation (flag-State confirms legitimacy of catch), authorization (by port-State to land catch) and transparency of process (dissemination of related forms/data by NAFO Secretariat).

The representative of the EU praised Norway for advancing the issue of port state measures and indicated that the work in this regard was important for the eventual integration of port state measures within NAFO's NCEM's. The representative of the EU noted that the scope section of the proposal required clarification. He also commented on the need to examine the text as it relates to domestic vessels, as the borrowed text from NEAFC's was intended to only deal with foreign Contracting Parties and some inconsistencies were evident.

The representative of the EU highlighted some other inconsistencies related to references to NCEM Articles, such as Article 33, which was intended only to deal with activity in the NRA and NCEM Articles related to the Non-Contracting Party (NCP) schemes which did not apply to Contracting Party vessels. The representative of Norway indicated that references to Article 33 were in place to avoid having to duplicate the list but that Norway was open to editorial changes that would address this and other references of concern. Another concern voiced by the representative of the EU was the requirement for 100% inspection of vessels landing NRA fish or fish products. The concern was that one of the rationales for the adoption of the port state measures was to allow for a reduction in port inspections, as was the case in NEAFC, effectively reducing resource constraints while still maintaining effective controls.

The representative of the United States commended Norway for its efforts in this regard and indicated that the United States welcomed the opportunity to work with other Contracting Parties to advance this issue at NAFO. Echoing the EU's opinion that this was a positive step forward the representative of the United States expressed concerns over the clarity of the scope and questioned why NCP issues were not addressed. The representative of Norway indicated that NCP scheme was not addressed to avoid complications at this early stage.

The representative of Canada thanked Norway for this excellent discussion paper and the opportunity to collaborate on this important issue. The representative of Canada expressed hope that, at a minimum, agreement could be reached on the (4) basic principles outlined by Norway, as this would allow for the advancement of this issue. The representative of Canada pointed out that the scope of the Norwegian proposal, specifically 100% port inspections for vessels that fished in the NRA, is the same as the current requirement under the NCEM's. He stated that Canada would be unable to support any reduction to this requirement at this time. He also suggested that STACTIC should re-consider, at future meetings, proposals that had been made in the past related to standardized port inspection protocols and methodologies.

The representative of Russia shared the feelings of gratitude conveyed by others but remarked that Russia shared some of the concerns flagged by Canada and the United States.

The representative of Iceland again welcomed Norway's proposal but cautioned that the incorporation of the new measures must be done carefully given the number of changes required within the NCEM's. The representative of Iceland also agreed with the general principles outlined by Norway and shared the EU's view that port inspections could be reduced from the proposed 100% threshold. With the view to further advancing this important initiative, the representative of Iceland suggest the creation of a Working Group to work on the text with the view to allowing STACTIC to proceed with this issue at its next meeting.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) applauded Norway's work on this initiative and indicated that she had no objections to the principles but recognized that some work remained on specific issues.

The representative of Japan thanked Norway but reiterated the point he had made during the intersessional in Gdynia that the required (3) day notification period identified in Article 42 of the proposal would be difficult for Japan to comply with and indicated that provisions found in the former version, that allowed Contracting Parties to make provisions for other notification periods, had been altered to eliminate this desirable option and now only provided this flexibility to port State Contracting Party.

The representative of the EU suggested that trying to retro-fit measures intended to meet other objectives may not be the way to proceed and that perhaps the development of port state measures in a NAFO context should begin by defining clear objectives, then developing a scheme to address them. The Chair reflected that there were already port state measures incorporated within the existing NCEM's, so there is no pressing urgency to adopt something immediately, however elaborated that many Contracting Parties in NAFO were also members of NEAFC and having a port state measures scheme in NAFO that was aligned with the NEAFC scheme would be desirable. The representative of the EU shared that the success of the NEAFC scheme was that the scope was specific enough to allow for broader measures. The representative of Russian disagreed with the EU opinion and noted that the NEAFC scheme had expanded beyond its original scope.

Given the magnitude of the task at hand, the representative of Norway suggested that a specific intersessional meeting of STACTIC should be convened to allow work on this issue to progress. Representatives of Canada, the United States and the EU agreed that this was required but recommended that exclusive time be allocated at the next intersessional, in lieu of having two intersessionals. The representative of Norway supported this approach and agreed to prepare a revised proposal that would incorporate comments provided during the discussion.

It was agreed that the next STACTIC intersessional should focus primarily on this matter.

viii. Electronic reporting, satellite tracking and observers

The representative of Canada informed representatives that STACTIC WP 07/17 (revised) was developed on the basis of comments/discussion that took place on this issue during the June intersessional in Gdynia. The changes were suggested as a means of updating the NCEM's to reflect the transition of the provisions found in chapter VII from pilot project to permanent measures.

It was agreed to submit STACTIC Working Paper 07/17 (revised) to Fisheries Commission for adoption.

ix. Clarification of Article 10.1(e) and Annex I.A

The representative of Russia introduced STACTIC Working Paper 07/26 and explained that the proposal called for the reference to *Sebastes Mentella* in Article 10.1(e) to be stricken from the text to provide for consistency within the NCEM's.

The representative of the EU questioned whether the words "oceanic" and "pelagic" should also be deleted.

The Chair clarified that the desire to harmonize with NEAFC accounted for the need to differentiate in the current NCEM's. The representative of Norway added that previously the gear requirements called for 130mm mesh for redfish, however the desire to harmonize with NEAFC prompted the existing text.

The representative of the United States voiced concerns over the ability to enforce different gear types for the different redfish stocks.

The representative of the EU, Canada and the United States sought further clarification on issues of stock, gear and proper species codes. The representative of Iceland suggested that the only required change was to the addition of the species code "REB" in the annual quota table as the other elements are accurate as defined in the current text.

The representative of the EU suggested that a revised working paper, that included an amended quota table, be drafted for consideration by STACTIC. The representative of Russia agreed to return to the next STACTIC intersessional with a revised working paper.

This issue was deferred to the next STACTIC intersessional.

x. Port Inspection Report

The representative of the EU introduced STACTIC WP 07/14 (revised) and explained that the rationale for the proposal was to have important information regarding infringements, not presently on the form, included. The representative of the EU elaborated that a field was also provided for domestic infringements to alleviate the need for a second report. The representative of Iceland questioned the NAFO Secretariat about whether this report could be produced in an electronic format and received an affirmative reply.

It was agreed to submit STACTIC Working Paper 07/14 (revised) to Fisheries Commission for adoption.

8. Other Matters

i. Coral Protection

The Chair requested clarification on this agenda item that had been suggested by Canada. The representative of Canada informed the Chair that it was Canada's original intention to table an information paper on this subject but that a decision had been made to address this issue at the Fisheries Commission instead.

ii. Information regarding the 2008 Intersessional CWP Meeting

The NAFO Secretariat informed STACTIC representatives that the next FAO intersessional Coordination Working Party (CWP) meeting would be hosted by NAFO in 2008 in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada. STACTIC was informed that the meeting would address in detail the subject of VMS data and their scientific uses.

The representative of Iceland added that a related questionnaire had been circulated by the FAO on domestic VMS processes and encouraged those who had not yet submitted responses to do so in order to facilitate work in this area.

iii. Time and place of the next STACTIC meeting

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) graciously agreed to host the next STACTIC intersessional meeting in Nuuk, Greenland, time and venue to be determined.

9. Adoption of Report

The report was adopted by the representatives.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:35pm on Thursday, September 27, 2007.

Annex 1. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chair, Mads Nedergaard (DFG)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Compliance review 2005 and 2006 including review of reports of apparent infringements
5. Review of STACFAC's former mandate with regards to STACTIC's new role and responsibilities
6. Review of current IUU list pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 49.3
7. Possible Amendments of Conservation and Enforcement Measures
 - i. Product labeling by species/stock area
 - ii. strengthening ropes, bags, topside chafers
 - iii. notification and catch reporting requirements in 3L and 3M shrimp fisheries
 - iv. accurate catch reporting
 - a. Automated COE/COX comparison between NAFO and NEAFC reports
 - b. Stowage plan requirements
 - c. Record of start/end coordinates for fishing activity
 - d. Consistency of catch reporting (e.g. provisional catch reports, log books and trip reports)
 - v. Clarification regarding Article 15.2 on chartering arrangements
 - vi. Vessel monitoring system (Article 22.1)
 - vii. Port state measures
 - viii. Electronic reporting, satellite tracking and observers
 - ix. Clarification of Article 10.1(e) and Annex I.A
 - x. Port Inspection Report
8. Other matters
 - i. Coral Protection
 - ii. Information regarding the 2008 Intersessional CWP Meeting
 - iii. Time and Place of the Next STACTIC Meeting
9. Adoption of Report
10. Adjournment