

PART II

Report of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

**33rd Annual Meeting
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
September 19-23, 2011**

1. Opening by the Chair, Gene Martin (United States)

The Chair opened the meeting at 1652 hrs on Monday, 19 September 2011, at the Westin Hotel in Halifax, NS Canada. The Chair welcomed representatives from the following Contracting Parties (CPs): Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) (DFG), the European Union (EU), France (in respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Japan, the Republic of Korea (Korea), and the United States. The NAFO Secretariat was also in attendance.

In his opening remarks, the Chair outlined the agenda items to be addressed by STACTIC, including possible recommendations resulting from the Performance Review Panel (GC WP 11/2 and FC WP 11/13).

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

Douglas Christel (US) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Nine additional issues were proposed to be added to the agenda as follows:

- *Provisional Agenda Item 8 was split into two agenda items. Agenda Item 8a discussed ongoing edits and clarifications to the CEM described in STACTIC WPs 11/11, 11/15, 11/21, 11/22, 11/23, and 11/36; Agenda Item 8b discussed further revisions to the CEM to be explored by STACTIC that are of a more substantive nature.*
- *STACTIC WP 11/35 (posting of weekly catch) was added as a new issue for discussion under the existing Agenda Item 9a*
- *STACTIC WP 11/34 (amendments to Chapter 2 of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures (CEM)) was added as a new issue under the discussion of revisions to the CEM as Agenda Item 9g*
- *STACTIC WP 11/28 (alternative reporting for defective vessel monitoring systems (VMS)) was added as a new issue for discussion as Agenda Item 9h*
- *STACTIC WP 11/29 (reclassifying tampering with or disposing of evidence and falsifying documents as serious infringements) was added as a new issue for discussion as Agenda Item 9i*
- *Four other issues were added for discussion under Other Matters (Agenda Item 12), including (1) Clarifying the application of minimum mesh size requirements for the redfish fishery Area 3M (FC WP 11/9); (2) consideration of NAFO participation in the International Monitoring Control and Surveillance (IMCS) Network (STACTIC WP 11/33); (3) clarifying the relationship of NAFO with the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission's (NEAFC) Advisory Group for Data Communication (AGDC) (STACTIC WP 11/32); and (4) consideration of recommendations from the Performance Review Panel (GC WP 11/2 and FC WP 11/13).*

The agenda, with the addition of the nine issues listed above, was adopted (Annex 1).

4. Compliance Review 2010 including review of reports of apparent infringements

The Secretariat prepared a draft compliance report for 2010 based on the template from last year that incorporated revisions and improvements from comments from Contracting Parties (CPs) (STACTIC WPs 11/16 and 11/38). An ad-hoc working group, including representatives from the EU, Canada, and the US, reviewed the 2010 draft compliance report prepared by the Secretariat, and drafted section 6 of the report that summarized basic trends in fishing activities within the NAFO Regulatory Area. This group also ensured that

the 2010 compliance report incorporated suggestions emanating from the May 2011 STACTIC intercessional meeting. The US noted that discussions of compliance with vulnerable marine ecosystem (VME) measures are included in the discussion of the compliance of closed area restrictions, and that a summary of chartering arrangements is presented in FC WP 11/1 REV 2. The Chair asked for comments and questions about the draft compliance report. After a brief discussion, the working group made minor editorial changes resulting in a final draft 2010 compliance review report (STACTIC WP 11/38 (Revised)) that was found acceptable to all CPs.

STACTIC approved the final draft of the 2010 compliance review report (STACTIC WP 11/38 (Revised)) for submission to the FC.

5. Review and Evaluation of NAFO Practices and Procedures

Following a recommendation from the May 2011 intercessional meeting, the Secretariat developed a draft web page entitled “NAFO Practices and Procedures” to allow CPs to share information on individual practices and procedures employed to enforce the CEM. The Secretariat presented a draft web page to STACTIC, noting that the infrastructure was ready to post this on the NAFO member page upon approval. CPs indicated that the web page would be very useful as a resource tool. CPs agreed that the contents of the web page should consist of documents sent by CPs to the Secretariat which would be posted without review by STACTIC except on an annual basis as part of this agenda item.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve the creation of the “practices and procedures” web page on the NAFO members’ web site, with the understanding that the web page would be reviewed annually.

Several CPs highlighted the successes of recent joint inspection efforts, and supported promoting further cooperation in future planned patrols. CPs noted that the following patrols involving inspectors from multiple CPs have occurred, or will occur, during 2011:

- US inspectors participated in three patrols aboard Canadian Coast Guard vessels *Leonard J. Cowley* and *Cygnus*
- Inspectors from the EU and the Russian Federation joined two other patrols aboard Canadian Coast Guard vessels
- The U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Willow* conducted a patrol in September involving Canadian inspectors
- The EU-chartered patrol vessel *Tyr* is planning a patrol in October involving a French inspector from St. Pierre et Miquelon and Canadian inspectors
- Joint port inspections were conducted by Canadian inspectors and a French inspector from St. Pierre et Miquelon
- Port inspections involving Canada and the EU observers are planned for later in the fall of 2011

6. Review of current IUU list pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 57.3

Two vessels were removed from the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) illegal, unregulated, or unreported (IUU) list because they were scrapped (STACTIC WP 11/19). Following a 30-day comment period by CPs as provided for in the NAFO CEM, these two vessels were deleted from the NAFO IUU list because no objections to removing these vessels were raised (GFS/11-177 dated 03 June 2011). There have been no other vessels identified to be included on the IUU list since the last annual meeting. No other issues regarding the NAFO IUU list were raised by CPs during STACTIC discussions at the 2011 NAFO annual meeting.

STACTIC noted continued improvements in addressing IUU in the NAFO Regulatory Area. At this time, STACTIC did not recommend any further action on issues related to the NAFO IUU list.

7. Inspectors Web Page

The Secretariat provided an update on the development of a three-phase plan to create and implement an inspectors web page based upon the NEAFC inspectors web page.

This plan was outlined in STACTIC WP 11/7 presented at STACTIC’s May 2011 intercessional meeting. The web page would provide information that could assist with at-sea or port inspection efforts by CPs. The

Secretariat presented cost estimates to develop such a web page as part of STACTIC WP 11/7 (Revised) as requested by STACTIC at the intercessional meeting. The Secretariat stated that phase 1 of the web page would involve a vessel registry and could be ready for testing by May 2012, with implementation by July 2012. The Secretariat confirmed that STACFAD had allocated sufficient funds to cover the costs of the implementation of phase 1 of the inspector's web page.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve the creation of the inspector's web page, as outlined in STACTIC WP 11/7 (Revised).

8. Editorial Drafting Group (EDG) of the NAFO CEM

a. Ongoing Edits and Clarifications to the NAFO CEM

During the past two years, the EDG has been working to comprehensively revise existing NAFO CEM to enhance organization and structure, eliminate redundancy, and clarify existing NAFO measures. The EDG completed a draft of the recommended revisions and circulated it to CPS for review prior to this annual meeting. Based on comments received from other CPs, the Scientific Council, and further work by the EDG, STACTIC WPs 11/21 (a comprehensive set of revisions to the CEM), 11/22 (points of clarification based on comments received from CPs on STACTIC WP 11/21), 11/23 (recommendations by the Scientific Council (SC) to revise existing references within the CEM), and 11/36 (additional editorial modifications to the CEM) were presented to STACTIC for discussion and possible adoption. Following a brief discussion, STACTIC considered and accepted minor revisions to some text proposed within these WPs. The EDG prepared a final WP summarizing all accepted revisions to the CEM for consideration by the FC (STACTIC WP 11/21 (Revised) and STACTIC agreed to forward the WP to the FC for its adoption. CPs indicated their preference to present the WP without editorial comments and notations. However, the EDG reported that it would not be possible to revise the document prior to the end of the annual meeting. The EDG will work with the Secretariat in making the proposed revisions to the NAFO CEM.

The Chair and several CPs joined in expressing their appreciation and congratulations to the EDG for completing STACTIC WP 11/21 Revised, noting that it would significantly improve and enhance the utility of the NAFO CEM.

STACTIC agreed to forward the STACTIC WP 11/21 (Revised) to the FC for consideration and approval.

b. Further Revisions to the NAFO CEM for Exploration by STACTIC

Canada presented STACTIC WP 11/37 proposing the need for the continuation of the EDG to make further revisions to the NAFO CEM as part of Phase II to the work conducted by the EDG. Canada included a list of the types of measures that needed further review, including stowage, labeling, bycatch reporting, and inspector interference measures. The EU and other CPs expressed concern that the scope and type of revisions contemplated by STACTIC WP 11/37 may be too broad and beyond the mandate of the original purpose of the EDG and its work. Further, they suggested that the WP did not include the possible revision of some parts of the NAFO CEM identified by the EDG during its work. Concerns were also expressed that the proposed scope of revisions suggested by the WP were more substantive than the more editorial and clarification revisions of STACTIC WP 11/21. Canada clarified that the proposed second phase of work by the EDG would be to identify issues that impede the implementation and effective enforcement NAFO CEM, and to identify possible revisions needed to strengthen the effectiveness of the NAFO CEM and to close loopholes that detract from achieving the objectives and management goals embedded in the CEM. The Chair pointed out that the second phase could also be used to address recommendations of the NAFO performance review panel (GC WP 11/2).

While there was a consensus that exploration of revisions to other measures was necessary, after lengthy discussions, several CPs were concerned that the original mandate of the EDG (FC Doc. 09/21) was not explicit enough to allow the group to continue working on such issues, and that STACTIC WP 11/37 could not be adopted as drafted. EU and Canada agreed to work together to draft general terms of reference for follow-up of editorial redrafting of the NAFO CEM, which was presented in STACTIC WP 11/40. This WP requests that the FC authorize the EDG to continue work with the intent to streamline the issues identified during the initial

review of the NAFO CEM that could not be addressed and propose new measures to address them. It was understood that this follow-up may also entail addressing recommendations of the performance assessment review including those already forwarded to STACTIC by the FC, as reflected in FC WP 11/13.

DFG recommended that a process be established that would ensure that any future revisions to the NAFO CEM would be consistent with the style and format of revised NAFO CEM.

STACTIC requests that the FC authorize STACTIC to continue the work of the EDG to streamline issues identified during the initial review of the NAFO CEM and propose new measures to address issues identified, including issues raised by the performance assessment review (STACTIC WP 11/40).

9. Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM

a. Discussion points on "Communication of Catches"

Several issues regarding the communication of catches required by the CEM were discussed based upon proposals submitted by Iceland and the EU in STACTIC in WPs 11/25 (harmonizing field codes for catch reports throughout the CEM), 11/26 (streamlining communication of catch), and 11/35 (weekly posting of catch).

Some CPs were concerned with part of the proposal included in STACTIC WP 11/26, which proposed that a vessel only need an observer for 25 percent of its time in the NAFO Regulatory Area because all vessels and observers would have the capability to submit electronic observer reports and daily catch reports. The US cautioned STACTIC that not all vessels of CPs may be able to comply with mandatory electronic reporting requirements proposed in STACTIC WP 11/26.

Based on concerns raised and the need for modifications of the proposals EU and Iceland submitted, revised versions of STACTIC WPs 11/25 (Revised 2) and 11/26 (Revised 2) were prepared. Of note, STACTIC WP 11/26 (Revised 2) deleted the proposed revision regarding the editorial reference to observer coverage. CPs approved these revised WPs for FC consideration.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve changes to the communication of catches, as outlined in STACTIC WPs 11/25 (Revised 2) and 11/26 (Revised 2).

Under this agenda item, DFG presented STACTIC WP 11/35, which would require the Secretariat to email to CPs updated catch statistics (reported catch, estimated catch not reported, and estimated catch available) for each stock listed in Annex 1.A of the CEM. These updates would be distributed on a weekly basis and would be based on vessel catch reporting requirements outlined in Article 27. Russia noted that they could not agree to this WP until after implementation of a cancel report. Discussion regarding this proposal centered on the utility of this proposal. The EU expressed concern that this proposal would be unduly burdensome on the Secretariat, and noted that not all CPs have the same access to daily catch data as others. Accordingly, Iceland, with the support of the EU, suggested that making daily catch reports available on the proposed inspector's web page (see Agenda Item 7 above) would accomplish DFG's purpose in proposing STACTIC WP 11/35, without unnecessarily burdening the Secretariat. CPs felt that further reflection was needed on this proposal and to postpone further consideration until the next STACTIC meeting.

STACTIC agreed to postpone further consideration of STACTIC WP 11/35 until the next STACTIC meeting, and suggested that CPs discuss the purpose of this proposal with other CPs.

b. Amendment of Article 15.2

According to Article 15.2 of the NAFO CEM, all fishing for shrimp within Division 3L must be conducted in depths greater than 200 meters. This article then specifies certain coordinates to apparently reflect the 200 meter depth contour with three coordinates. However, these coordinates did not accurately reflect the 200 meter depth contour for reasons unknown to CPs. DFG states that the current coordinates do not accurately outline the 200 meter depth contour in Division 3L where shrimp fishing can occur. STACTIC WP 11/1, offered by

DFG, proposed to specify different coordinates designed to more accurately outline the 200 meter contour. Following discussions with Canada, the coordinates were further refined such that all coordinates are now outside the 200 meters and better reflect the overall 200 meter contour through STACTIC WP 11/01 Rev 2.

STACTIC recommends that the FC adopt the proposed revisions to the coordinates outlined in Article 15.2 of the NAFO CEM, as specified in STACTIC WP 11/01 Rev 2.

c. Modification to Shark Bycatch Reporting Provisions

The US presented STACTIC WP 11/10 (revised) proposing a revision to Article 27, paragraph 1 (f) which allows the reporting of the total quantity of species amounting to less than 1 ton to be done without specifying the species. The US proposal would change the amount triggering this exception to 100 kg, and would require that shark species in amounts less than 100 kg to be reported by species. This WP, as revised, deleted the prohibition against shark finning that was in the original WP submitted at the intercessional meeting and removed the expanded definition of sharks to include sharks, skates, rays, and chimeras.

Japan suggested adding “to the extent possible” to the proposed text because of the difficulty in identifying shark species. DFG suggested that a generic shark 3-Alpha code could be used instead of a species-specific code when species could not be ascertained. To address the concerns raised by Japan and partially incorporate the suggestion made by DFG, the US revised their proposal to state that when it is not possible to identify shark species, an observer or master must identify species as either large sharks or dogfishes using the applicable existing 3-Alpha code (STACTIC WP 11/10 (Revision 3)). The US also offered to lead the development of a shark species identification guide to facilitate observer identification of shark species and improve the accuracy of shark bycatch data.

STACTIC recommends that the FC adopt the proposed revisions to the shark bycatch reporting measures of the NAFO CEM in Article 27, as outlined in STACTIC WP 11/10 (Revision 3).

d. Cancel Message

At the May 2011 intercessional meeting, STACTIC decided that a Russian proposal to implement a cancel report in the communication of catches (STACTIC W.P. 10/15 Rev) would be referred to the NEAFC’s AGDC for technical review, and that consideration of its adoption would be deferred to this meeting. The Secretariat provided updates on this proposal in STACTIC WPs 11/30 and 11/31. This update indicated that the AGDC agreed that the creation of a cancel message was technically feasible and suggested the format. While most CPs acknowledged the need for cancel messages, several CPs, including the EU and Iceland, opposed allowing the master to submit cancel reports, suggesting that it was the duty of the fishery monitoring center instead. Norway suggested that it might be helpful to explore whether cancel messages are needed for other types of messages. After a short discussion, STACTIC was unable to come to a consensus on the issues raised by CPs at this meeting, and deferred further consideration of the WP until the intercessional meeting.

STACTIC concluded that further discussion on the proposed cancelation message was necessary, and postponed action until their next intercessional meeting. Russia agreed to develop a revised proposal for consideration at that meeting.

e. Modification of Annex V.A of NAFO CEM

Article 2.1 of the NAFO CEM defines “fishing vessel” very broadly to include vessels actively harvesting fish, transshipping fish, or engaging in any other activity related to fishing activities. However, Annex V.A of the NAFO CEM does not specify fishing vessel codes for support vessels, bunker vessels, or other non-fishing vessels. Therefore, Russia proposed to create fishing vessel codes for these types of vessels following the FAO vessel codes, as described in STACTIC WP 11/17. Following a brief discussion, CPs agreed that the proposed codes for other types of fishing vessels were needed.

STACTIC recommends that the FC adopt changes to Annex V.A of the NAFO CEM, as outlined in STACTIC WP 11/17.

f. Amendment of Article 27 of NCEM

Noting the broad definition of fishing vessels as described above, Russia also proposed to clarify that only vessels taking part in catch harvesting or transportation of catch from the fishing areas are required to submit the reports outlined in Article 27.1 (STACTIC WP 11/18).

Although many CPs supported the underlying intent of the proposal to reduce unnecessary reporting requirements, some CPs (Canada, France-in respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon, Norway) were concerned that the proposal, as written, would unintentionally exempt more vessels from reporting requirements than desirable. Norway indicated that it was important to know, for example, which support vessels are operating within the NAFO Regulatory Area. Several CPs, including Canada, Iceland, Korea, and Norway explored ways to exempt particular vessels from specific reports outlined in Article 27.1, particularly the catch report (CAT), and suggested revisions to STACTIC WP 11/18 that would be acceptable while still addressing some of Russia's concerns. Russia prepared a revised proposal (STACTIC WP 11/18 (Revised)) in response to these suggestions. However, despite these efforts, several CPs did not think the revised proposal was specific enough to address their concerns. Consensus could not be reached on this WP.

STACTIC did not adopt changes proposed in STACTIC WP 11/18 (Revised). It is STACTIC's understanding that Russia may submit a new paper at the next STACTIC intercessional meeting on this issue.

g. Revisions to Article 18 of the NAFO CEM Regarding Authorization to Fish

DFG offered STACTIC WP 11/34 with the intent to improve the transparency and effectiveness of inspection. In this proposal, CPs would be required to authorize vessels to fish for specific species in designated areas within the NAFO Regulatory Area, as listed in Annex I.A. This list would be required to be transmitted to the Secretariat in electronic format before 1 January of each year and include the information listed in Annex IV.B for each authorized vessel. The Secretariat would be required to make this vessel registry available to all CPs.

Several CPs were confused as to the intent of this proposal and whether it was redundant with existing authorization requirements. DFG clarified that it was intended to provide more fishery/area-specific information on the authorized operations of a particular vessel to facilitate inspections. The EU observed that such information already exists in the reports submitted when a vessel enters or exits the NAFO Regulatory Area. Norway favored the proposal, stating that it would offer more specific information of a vessel's activity, would not cause an excessive burden on flag states, and would not affect quota management. Canada expressed general support for the proposal, as it would facilitate inspections. Korea offered edits to the text to clarify that CPs are not obligated to authorize any vessel to fish for any species or in any area. A question was also raised about the cost of implementing this proposal. Because of the concerns expressed DFG and CPs agreed to defer further consideration of this WP until the intercessional meeting.

STACTIC agreed to defer further consideration of this proposal (STACTIC WP 11/34) until the next intercessional meeting. Further, STACTIC requested that the Secretariat explore any costs associated with the additional messaging requirements.

h. Alternative Reporting for Defective VMS Devices

Currently, the NAFO CEM requires VMS devices to communicate vessel position at least once per hour. Article 26.5 states that if a VMS device is defective, alternative reports must be submitted at least every six hours. In STACTIC WP 11/28, the EU proposed to reduce the alternative reporting deadline from six hours to four hours. Canada, France, Iceland, Norway, and Russia supported the proposal by the EU, and consensus was reached to accept this proposal.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve the alternative reporting requirements for defective VMS units outlined in STACTIC WP 11/28.

i. Reclassifying Tampering with Evidence and Falsifying Documents as Serious Infringements

In STACTIC WP 11/29, the EU proposed to classify concealing, tampering with, or disposing of evidence related to an investigation, or presenting falsified documents or false information as “serious infringements” under Article 37.1. Korea stated that it was concerned that these infringements did not include an intentionality element and suggested adding language to reflect that these infringements must first be based on intentional wrongdoing. Russia expressed a similar concern. Korea mentioned that without the intentionality element, a master may inadvertently make a mistake on a catch report and be cited for a serious infringement under the EU’s proposal.

The EU preferred not to insert text regarding the intention of a vessel master, stating that a vessel master would always claim that an activity was unintentional to avoid a citation, and that listing the aforementioned activities as serious infringements would help ensure that such activities are minimized. The US, Norway, Canada and others supported the EU, suggesting that inserting references to a master’s intention introduces ambiguity into the NAFO CEM and make it difficult to enforce. Norway cautioned that if STACTIC added reference to a master’s intention for classifying these activities as serious infringements, it is likely that similar additions would be necessary for other activities considered serious infringements.

After considerable discussion, Korea and Russia indicated they could support the proposal regarding paragraph k relating to tampering with evidence and seals, but not paragraph l regarding false information. EU suggested revising paragraph l to specify that providing falsified documents or false information would only be a serious infringement if the activity would prevent a serious infringement from being detected (STACTIC WP 11/29 Revised 2). This revision appeared to address concerns previously expressed by CPs, as no further objections were offered to the proposal, although the Chair recognized that Korea’s and Russia’s reservations would be noted in this report.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve reclassifying tampering with evidence and falsifying documents as serious infringements, as outlined in STACTIC WP 11/29 Revision 3.

10. Observers Scheme – NAFO CEM Chapter VII and Article 28

The EU proposed revising Article 28 and Chapter VII of the NAFO CEM regarding the observer program requirements for participating vessels (STACTIC WP 11/27). The EU contends that the existing observer requirements are very costly to implement, produce very little usable data to control the fishery, and do not contribute to the scientific data used by the Scientific Council. The EU indicated that observer reports are often late and have never been used to identify apparent infringements. Therefore, the EU recommended that the observer program be restructured to more strategically deploy observers in fisheries. They contend that this risk-based approach would more effectively achieve the management objectives of the NAFO CEM.

DFG and Norway supported considering revising the observer program measures in light of the new requirement for daily catch reports and comments from the Scientific Council concerning the utility of observer information (STACTIC WP 11/20), but noted that additional data needs to be collected before a truly risk-based scheme can be employed for distributing observer coverage. Specifically, DFG advocated for the collection of haul-by-haul catch data by both vessel masters and observers to evaluate reporting accuracy. Norway recognized that efforts are underway to move away from traditional observer programs and move toward electronic monitoring techniques. Canada acknowledged Norway’s observations, and suggested that the current observer program could be improved. However, Canada is reluctant to move away from the existing observer program at this time. CPs agreed that the proposal of EU needs further development and consideration. At the suggestion of some CPs, the Chair encouraged CPs to conduct an operational analysis of data collected from current observer requirements and explore whether any changes to current observer program are warranted by the next meeting.

In light of the discussion described above, STACTIC agreed to further consider the concept of the proposal in STACTIC WP 11/27 at the next intercessional meeting.

11. HTTPS NAF Gateways

At the May 2011 STACTIC intercessional meeting, Norway highlighted challenges when its security certificate expired (STACTIC 11/2). The Secretariat was asked to review current procedures for data communication via HTTPS to determine if existing systems are operating according to accepted best practices. Guidance on appropriate protocols was also sought from the NEAFC's AGDC. The Secretariat's response (STACTIC WP 11/24) highlights a suggested strategy to apply encryption protocols and ensuring that digital certificates correctly identify and validate the party submitting information electronically. Following a brief discussion, all CPs supported implementing the Secretariat's proposal.

STACTIC recommends that the FC adopt the proposal to improve the security of data communications, as recommends by Secretariat in STACTIC WP 11/24.

12. Other Matters

a. Clarifying the application of minimum mesh size requirements for the redfish fishery Area 3M

In FC WP 11/9, the FC is considering revising the minimum mesh size for the redfish fishery when using mid-water trawl gear. Russia noted that there are several references to the use of mid-water trawl gear throughout the NAFO CEM. However, there is currently no definition of mid-water trawl gear within Article 2 of the NAFO CEM. If the FC's redfish mesh size proposal is adopted, Russia contends that a definition of mid-water trawl gear would be necessary to help enforce effectively this provision.

Canada agreed that a definition for this gear type is needed, and agreed to help draft of a proposed definition for this gear type which was put forth in STACTIC WP 11/39, as follows:

Mid-water trawl (pelagic trawl) means trawl gear that is designed to fish for, is capable of fishing for, or is being used to fish for pelagic species, no portion of which is designed to be, or is operated in, contact with the bottom at any time. The gear may not include discs, bobbins, or rollers on its footrope, or chafing gear as part of the net.

Japan did not oppose the definition, but suggested eliminating reference to chafing gear in the definition. This suggestion was accepted by Russia and incorporated into STACTIC WP 11/39 (Revision 1). However, the EU disagreed that a definition for this gear type be adopted at this time, noting that it is not the role of STACTIC to provide international definitions of fishing gears. They felt that additional gear definitions to distinguish other gear types would likely also be necessary before deciding on the definition of only mid-water trawl gear. Given that this proposal was only presented for the first time at this meeting and for other reasons noted above, the EU suggested more time is necessary to consider the implications of this proposal. Norway could accept the revised version of the proposal (STACTIC WP 11/39 (Revision 1)), but expressed sympathy to the arguments made by the EU. CPs agreed to defer consideration of mid-water trawl gear to the intercessional meeting.

STACTIC deferred further consideration of this proposal (STACTIC WP 11/39 (Revision 1)) until the next STACTIC intercessional meeting.

b. Consideration of NAFO participation in the IMCS Network

The IMCS Network is a voluntary organization providing an informal way for fisheries monitoring and enforcement experts to cooperate, share experiences, and exchange information to address IUU fishing practices. The IMCS sent a questionnaire to the Secretariat seeking information on NAFO's interest in participating in the IMCS network. The Secretariat prepared draft answers to the IMCS questionnaire for consideration by STACTIC (STACTIC WP 11/33).

After a brief introduction to the IMCS Network by the Chair, CPs reviewed the Secretariat's draft responses to the IMCS questionnaire. CPs expressed general support for NAFO participation in the IMCS Network in some capacity, noting that many individual CPs already send representatives to IMCS workshops. Like other CPs, EU supported the overall concept of the network, but suggested that it is not

clear at this stage how NAFO would derive benefits from participating in the network. The EU highlighted that NAFO has been actively engaged in collaborative efforts to address IUU fishing practices for many years, and has demonstrated that there are many means to address IUU through other collaborative mechanisms. The IMCS Network could offer a means to further improve international collaboration against IUU fisheries. Both the EU and Canada noted that it would be beneficial to express NAFO's interest in participating in IMCS network to reinforce NAFO's commitment to addressing IUU fishing practices. However, the EU recommended some caution before NAFO offers any formal commitment to the IMCS Network and the status of IMCS needs to be clarified before any formal commitments are made. Korea expressed support for the position offered by the EU. CPs were invited to offer edits to the proposed answers to the questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat which were incorporated into STACTIC WP 11/33 (Revised).

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve the responses to the IMCS Network questionnaire, as presented by the Secretariat in STACTIC WP 11/33 (Revised).

c. Clarification of the relationship of NAFO with the NEAFC's AGDC

NAFO has recently utilized the NEAFC's AGDC, a technical advisory group, to review NAFO initiatives that involve technical issues and data management. In October 2011, the AGDC will update its terms of reference and rules of procedure to give NAFO a more formal role and status in the AGDC. The Secretariat sought STACTIC's input regarding the role of NAFO in the AGDC, the role of NAFO Secretariat participation in the AGDC, the exchange of information between the two groups and the reporting of results, and STACTIC's interest in the AGDC, as outlined by the Secretariat in STACTIC WP 11/32.

STACTIC briefly discussed the questions raised by the Secretariat regarding NAFO roles in the AGDC. The EU emphasized the importance of AGDC to STACTIC, noting that they are the only source of technical advice for electronic data issues. The EU indicated that it was in STACTIC's key interests in work with this group and to be fully integrated into AGDC process. The Chair suggested that STACTIC has an interest in participating in the AGDC to extent necessary. While STACTIC did not address each of the topics identified in STACTIC WP 11/32, the Chair offered to provide further feedback to the Secretariat at a future STACTIC meeting, as necessary.

STACTIC recommends that the FC approve participation of the NAFO Secretariat in meetings of the AGDC.

d. Consideration of Recommendations from the Performance Assessment Review Panel

The FC requested STACTIC to consider several recommendations specified in FC WP 11/13. STACTIC briefly considered the recommendations of the review panel and agreed to take them up at the intercessional meeting because there was insufficient time to take action on the recommendations at this meeting.

STACTIC agreed to consider recommendations of the Performance Assessment Review Panel specified in GC WP 11/2 and FC WP 11/13 at STACTIC's next intercessional meeting.

e. STACTIC WPs Adopted

The following WPs have been adopted by STACTIC at the 2011 NAFO Annual Meeting:

STACTIC WP	TITLE
11/01 REV 2	Proposal to Amend Article 15.2
11/7 REV	NAFO inspector's web site
11/10 REV 3	Modifications to Shark By catch reporting
11/14 REV	NAFO CEM - Annex XX c - Product Form Codes (STACTIC May 2011)
11/17	Proposal to improve NCEM – Vessel type
11/21 REV	Proposed Revisions to NAFO's Conservation and Enforcement Measures – Final Product of the Editorial Drafting Group (EDG) (Printed separately)
11/24	Security provisions in NCEM –ISO 27001 Best Practices
11/25 REV 2	Communication of catches – Editorial correspondence for CA,OB,RJ and US field codes – NCEM Annexes X; XXa and XXIIc
11/26 REV 2	Communication of catches - NCEM Chapter VII; Annexes X, XXa, and XXIIc
11/28	Communication in case of defective VMS
11/29 REV 3	Serious infringement
11/33 REV	IMCS Network questionnaire
11/38 REV	Annual Compliance Review 2011
11/40	Follow-up of editorial redrafting of the NCEM by EDG

13. Time and Place of Next Meeting

The Chair reported that the EU has indicated it is willing to host the next meeting of STACTIC in Brussels, Belgium in May 2012. STACTIC will solicit input from CPs as to the best date for the meeting, with the intention of holding a 3-day meeting in close coordination with the meeting of the NEAFC's Permanent Committee Control and Enforcement (PECCOE). Tentative dates of 2-4 May 2012 were proposed by the Chair. Given existing time constraints, it is not possible to host the STACTIC intercessional meeting during the same week.

14. Adoption of Report

STACTIC agreed that the first draft of the meeting report will be completed and circulated for review by the morning of September 22, 2011. Following the review by CPs and the incorporation of edits, the report was adopted on September 22, 2011.

15. Adjournment

Participants expressed thanks to the Chair, Rapporteur, and the Secretariat for the efficient conduct of the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 1348 hrs on 22 September 2011

Annex 1. Agenda

1. Opening by the Chair, Gene Martin (United States)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Compliance Review 2010 including review of reports of apparent infringements
5. Review and Evaluation of NAFO Practices and Procedures
6. Review of current IUU list pursuant to NAFO CEM Article 57.3
7. Inspectors Web Page
8. Editorial Drafting Group of the NAFO CEM (EDG)
 - a) Ongoing Edits and Clarifications to the NAFO CEM
 - b) Further Revisions to the NAFO CEM for Exploration by STACTIC
9. Possible revisions of the NAFO CEM
 - a) Discussion points on "Communication of Catches"
 - b) Amendment of Article 15.2
 - c) Modification to Shark Bycatch Reporting Provisions
 - d) Cancel Message
 - e) Modification of Annex V.A of NCEM
 - f) Amendment of Article 27 of NCEM
 - g) Revisions to Article 18 of the NAFO CEM Regarding Authorization to Fish
 - h) Alternative Reporting for Defective VMS Devices
 - i) Reclassifying Tampering with Evidence and Falsifying Documents as Serious Infringements
10. Observers Scheme – NCEM Chapter VII and Article 28
11. HTTPS NAF Gateways
12. Other Matters
 - a) Clarifying the application of minimum mesh size requirements for the redfish fishery Area 3M
 - b) Consideration of NAFO participation in the IMCS Network
 - c) Clarification of the relationship of NAFO with the NEAFC's AGDC
 - d) Consideration of Recommendations from the Performance Assessment Review Panel
 - e) STACTIC WPs Adopted
13. Time and Place of Next Meeting
14. Adoption of Report
15. Adjournment