



1950

International Commission
for the
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries



1970

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2313
(B.p)

ICNAF Comm.Doc.70/6

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1970

Report of Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 21-23 January 1970



Serial No.2313
(B.p)

P.O. Box 638
Dartmouth, N.S., Canada

10 February 1970

Report of Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 21-22 January 1970

Time, Place and Participants

1. A mid-term meeting of STACREM was held in the Conference Rooms of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London, on 21 and 22 January 1970. Delegates from 11 member countries, with advisers and experts, and observers from FAO, Japan and OECD (Appendix I) were welcomed by Mr J. Graham (UK) on behalf of Her Majesty's Government.

Chairman and Rapporteur

2. Mr J. Graham (UK) was unanimously elected chairman of the Committee's meeting. The Executive Secretary was appointed rapporteur.

Agenda

3. Suggested agenda items, circulated by the Executive Secretary in December 1969, were adopted after some rearrangement of the order in which they would be taken (Appendix II).

Factors in Development of Country Catch Quota Schemes

4. The Committee, in considering any possible further additions to the discussions in the STACREM meetings of January 1969 (1969 ICNAF Meeting Proceedings No.11, Appendix I) and of June 1969 (1969 ICNAF Meeting Proceedings No.11) on the development of guidelines for the negotiation of catch limitation schemes, took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the NEAFC *ad hoc* Study Group on N E Arctic, October 1969. The Study Group report added the new point that the percentage shares of different countries would not necessarily remain fixed at all levels of total catch, but that the lower the level of the total allowable catch the greater might be the degree of preference accorded to these countries in the scheme having special needs, *i.e.* factors other than historical performance (see paragraph 10 of Appendix I of 1969 ICNAF Meeting Proceedings No.11). The Committee also noted the possibility of schemes in which countries accounting for the major part of the catch might agree on a quota scheme which they would observe so long as catches by countries outside the agreement did not exceed a level agreed by the participating countries.

5. Because of difficulties in establishing, administering and enforcing quotas, other regulations as closed seasons, closed areas, mesh size etc. were thought to be more realistic and preferable by some delegates who said nevertheless that they would be prepared to cooperate in the work of the Committee. Most delegates agreed that each fishery should be treated as a special case for determination of the type of regulatory measure to be applied. Examples of the results of quota schemes were presented for Pacific halibut, yellowfin tuna, salmon, and fisheries in the Caspian and Azov Seas. These had produced the expected increase in the fish stocks and some increase in total catch but where no additional measures had been introduced the economic benefits had been small.

6. The Committee noted that the Protocol which was adopted by the Commission in June 1969 and which would allow the Commission to set national quotas, was not yet in effect.

7. The Committee noted that the USA intends to propose that the nations fishing in Subarea 5 meet during the week before the 1970 Annual Meeting of the Commission to discuss the application to haddock in Subarea 5 of the principles of allocating national quotas.

Procedures for Administering ICNAF Haddock Quota Proposals

8. The Committee heard the Executive Secretary review the procedures proposed by the Secretariat for quota control under the 1969 haddock quota proposals for ICNAF Subarea 5 and Div.4X. Procedures for receiving, accumulating and periodic reporting the national haddock catches and for advising the participating countries of the accumulated catches having reached 80% of the total quotas, were detailed. It was suggested that although the Commission recommendation does not require it, the Secretariat would be assisted in its duties if haddock by-catches could be reported currently. Following presentation of the US and Canadian proposal for fulfilling the haddock quota requirements, it was agreed

that the performance of the various proposed administrative procedures for haddock quota control should be reviewed at the 1970 Annual Meeting of the Commission.

Administrative, Legal and Technical Factors in Controlling Fishing Effort at the National Level

9. The paper "Problems of Controlling Fishing Effort, with especial reference to the Northwest Atlantic" by Messrs Gulland and Robinson of FAO was reviewed and formed the basis for discussion of how countries participating in a catch quota scheme can arrange their internal affairs to reach the objective of the national catch quota.

10. The Committee agreed that it was desirable to identify all possible kinds of systems or solutions for enabling countries to make a country quota effective and give the maximum benefit to the country. The solution would depend on the particular circumstance of each country. The Committee agreed that an essential need was for good statistics of the catch and that these should become available quickly. Limited entry techniques to reduce fishing capacity were described in connection with the Canadian salmon fishery and in the administration of the US vessel construction subsidy.

11. It was noted that most countries had statutory authority to implement a quota scheme but many countries had no power to limit entry which might be necessary to achieve the full benefits of effort limitation.

12. The Committee agreed that an essential part of a catch quota scheme is an effective system of obtaining national fishery statistics by species and sub-areas. This could be facilitated by having a log book on each vessel operating under the quota scheme. Data recorded by the captain would not only be of value in reporting under the quota scheme but in stock assessment studies by the scientists. A combination of log book entries, international inspection reports under a scheme which ICNAF now had authority to adopt, and observations by air and sea patrols could significantly reduce the danger of false log book entries. It was agreed

- 1) that the Commission should ask the Panels to study the possibility of using a uniform or standard form of log book;
- 2) that all log book entries made by each vessel operating under a quota scheme should be summarized and not just those entries relating to the catches in the area of restriction;
- 3) that there should be an exchange of existing log book sheets between countries through the Secretariat in order to inform all countries of the kinds of information now being collected.

13. The Committee discussed the problem of small fish discarded at sea or used for fish meal production and its effects on a catch quota scheme. Scientists through their regular stock assessments and experimental fishing regularly calculate and take into account the rate of discarding in the various fisheries. It was agreed

that the Research and Statistics Committee should be invited to give further consideration to this problem.

It was pointed out that supporting quotas by the possible introduction of larger mesh sizes would also relieve the problem.

14. While nations were free to choose their own method of implementing national quotas, it was pointed out that if the national quota was expressed in some agreed unit of fishing effort, this could reduce the variety of national solutions of improving the control of the quota scheme. It was recalled however that scientists had encountered great difficulty in finding a satisfactory unit of fishing effort.

Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 21-22 January 1970

List of Participants

<u>Canada</u>	Dr A.W.H.Needler Mr E.B.Young Dr G.F.M.Smith
<u>Denmark</u>	Mr K. Løkkegaard Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted
<u>France</u>	Mr R. Lagarde
<u>Federal Republic of Germany</u>	Mr G. Mocklinghoff Dr A. Schumacher Dr U. Schmidt
<u>Iceland</u>	Dr J. Jonsson
<u>Norway</u>	Dr G. Saetersdal Mr O. Lund Mr A. Holm Mr S. Remøy
<u>Poland</u>	Mr M. Fila Dr F. Chrzan Mr W. Ertel
<u>Portugal</u>	Captain Tavares de Almeida Eng. J. Coimbra Dr A. Hagatong Dr R. Monteiro
<u>Spain</u>	Mr V. Bermejo
<u>USSR</u>	Dr A.S.Bogdanov Mr A.A.Volkov Mr Y. Riazantsev
<u>UK</u>	Mr J. Graham (Chairman) Mr A.J.Aglen Dr H.A.Cole Mr P. Parkhouse Mr A. Laing
<u>USA</u>	Mr W.M.Terry Mr W.L.Sullivan, Jr. Mr H.R.Beasley Dr H.W.Graham
<u>JAPAN</u>	Mr K. Mimura
<u>FAO</u>	Mr M.A.Robinson Mr J.A.Gulland
<u>OECD</u>	Mr P. Adam
<u>ICNAF</u>	Executive Secretary - Mr L.R.Day

Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 21-22 January 1970

Agenda

1. Welcome by Her Majesty's Government
2. Election of Chairman
3. Appointment of Rapporteur
4. Adoption of Agenda
5. Further examination of factors involved in development of country catch quota schemes
6. Examination of procedures for administering ICNAF quota regulatory proposals for haddock

(A review of procedures developed by various countries to regulate fisheries under the ICNAF haddock quota regulatory proposals can provide a small-scale illustration of some of the specific procedures that can be used to manage catch quota schemes.)

7. Examination of administrative, legal and technical factors involved in instituting controls on fishing effort at the national level

(The potential economic benefits that can be derived when effort controls are applied at the national level in conjunction with international country catch quota schemes have been well documented. Furthermore, experiments with vessel licensing procedures and other methods of effort control are being tried to an increasing extent by various countries. Thus a review in STACREM of the salient features of various effort control programs should illustrate some of the most promising general approaches in this area.)

8. Other business
9. Approval of Report
10. Adjournment

